

POLITICAL PARTIES AND DEMOCRACY IN THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL PERSPECTIVES

SELECTING CANDIDATES
FOR LEGISLATIVE OFFICE

SEFAKOR ASHIAGBOR

POLITICAL PARTIES AND DEMOCRACY IN THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL PERSPECTIVES

SELECTING CANDIDATES
FOR LEGISLATIVE OFFICE

SEFAKOR ASHIAGBOR

NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTE

The **National Democratic Institute (NDI)** is a nonprofit organization working to strengthen and expand democracy worldwide. Calling on a global network of volunteer experts, NDI provides practical assistance to civic and political leaders advancing democratic values, practices, and institutions. NDI works with democrats in every region of the world to build political and civic organizations, safeguard elections, and promote citizen participation, openness, and accountability in government.

Through research into such issues as party law, candidate selection and party finance, NDI provides comparative information on various aspects of party politics, shedding light on obstacles to and possible approaches for creating more effective and inclusive parties. Drawing from academic analyses as well as practical party experiences, the Institute's *Political Parties and Democracy in Theoretical and Practical Perspectives* series examines topics central to the role and function of political parties. The series includes:

Selecting Candidates for Legislative Office
Sefakor Ashiagbor, National Democratic Institute

Adopting Party Law
Dr. Kenneth Janda, Northwestern University

Political Finance Policy, Parties, and Democratic Development
Dr. Michael Johnston, Colgate University

Developments in Party Communications
Dr. Pippa Norris, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University

Implementing Intra-Party Democracy
Dr. Susan Scarrow, University of Houston

For more information on NDI's political party programs or to obtain electronic copies of these publications, please visit the Institute's website: <http://www.ndi.org>.

Copyright © National Democratic Institute (NDI) 2008. All rights reserved. Portions of this work may be reproduced and/or translated for noncommercial purposes provided NDI is acknowledged as the source of the material and is sent copies of any translation. Printed in the United States of America.

2030 M Street, NW
Fifth Floor
Washington, DC 20036
Telephone: 202-728-5500
Fax: 202-728-5520
Website: www.ndi.org

This printing of this publication was made possible through the support provided by the Office of Democracy and Governance, Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance, U.S. Agency for International Development, under the terms of Award No. DGC-A-00-01-00004-00. The opinions expressed herein are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the U.S. Agency for International Development.

ISBN: 978-1-880134-37-5



POLITICAL PARTIES AND DEMOCRACY IN THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL PERSPECTIVES

NDI would like to thank the following for their comments on draft versions of this publication: Dr. Denise Baer, Adjunct Professor of Political Science at the University of Illinois; Dr. David Farrell, Jean Monnet Chair of European Politics at the University of Manchester; Mr. Edward McMahon, Research Associate Professor at the University of Vermont's Departments of Political Science, Community Development and Applied Economics; Dr. Susan Scarrow, Professor of Political Science at the University of Houston; and Mr. Tony Worthington, International Development Consultant. This research would not have been possible without the cooperation and assistance of the political party officials and activists who agreed to share their experiences. In particular, the Institute is grateful to the individuals who vetted the case studies of their respective party's selection procedures for accuracy. The following current and former NDI staff made various contributions to the paper: Victoria Canavor; Grant Godfrey; Meredith Katz; Raymond Kuo; Mario Mitre; Katy Mudge; Julian Quibell; Niamh O'Connor; Bjarte Tørå; Rebecca Vanasek; and Elvis Zutic. Shlomit Barnea served as a research assistant. NDI would also like to acknowledge Stephanie Levy for her work on the design and layout of this paper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	1
I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
II. ISSUES TO CONSIDER	5
INTRODUCTION	5
THE POLITICAL AND REGULATORY ENVIRONMENT	5
<i>Electoral System Design</i>	6
<i>State Regulation of Selection Procedures</i>	6
<i>Statutory Quotas and/or Incentives for Balanced Candidate Lists</i>	7
<i>Social Norms and Inter-Party Competition</i>	7
INTRA-PARTY DEMOCRACY	8
<i>Institutionalization</i>	8
<i>Decentralization</i>	9
<i>Inclusiveness</i>	11
<i>Direct and Indirect Participation</i>	12
RECRUITMENT AND ELIGIBILITY ISSUES	13
<i>Who is Eligible and Who Decides?</i>	13
<i>Recruitment Processes</i>	14
<i>Common Considerations in Identifying Candidates</i>	15
BALANCING THE TICKET	19
<i>Rhetorical and Informal Strategies</i>	19
<i>Quotas and Other Types of Affirmative Action</i>	19
<i>Specialized Support Systems</i>	21
MECHANISMS AND STRATEGIES FOR PRESERVING PARTY COHESION	22
<i>Inspiring Confidence in Selection Processes</i>	22
<i>Candidate Pledges and Codes of Conduct</i>	22
<i>Dispute Resolution</i>	23
SOME LOGISTICAL CONSIDERATIONS	24
<i>Meeting Formats</i>	24
<i>Voting and Ratification Systems</i>	24
<i>Financing Candidate Selection Processes</i>	25
CANDIDATE SELECTION FOR COALITIONS	25
<i>Agreeing Not to Compete</i>	26
<i>The “Back-Door Primary” Option</i>	26
<i>Joint Candidate Selection</i>	27
CONCLUSION	28

III. CASE STUDIES	30
THE AFRICAN NATIONAL CONGRESS (SOUTH AFRICA)	30
THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY (UNITED KINGDOM)	34
FINE GAEL (IRELAND)	39
THE INSTITUTIONAL REVOLUTIONARY PARTY (MEXICO)	42
THE KUOMINTANG (TAIWAN)	47
THE LABOUR PARTY (UNITED KINGDOM)	50
THE LIBERAL PARTY (CANADA)	56
THE NEW PATRIOTIC PARTY (GHANA)	61
THE PANHELLENIC SOCIALIST MOVEMENT (GREECE)	64
THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY (BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA)	67

IV. APPENDICES	70
ACRONYMS	70
GLOSSARY OF TERMS	71
ELECTORAL SYSTEMS AND SOME CONSEQUENCES FOR CANDIDATE SELECTION	73
REFERENCES AND OTHER SOURCES	75

LIST OF TEXTBOXES

1. SAMPLE REQUIREMENTS FOR BRANCH INVOLVEMENT IN CANDIDATE SELECTION	9
2. BALANCING LEADERSHIP AND BRANCH INTERESTS IN CANDIDATE SELECTION	11
3. ONE MEMBER ONE VOTE	12
4. SAMPLE CANDIDATE REQUIREMENTS	13
5. SAMPLE CANDIDATE APPLICATION FORM TOPICS AND QUESTIONS	14
6. TIMELINES FOR CANDIDATE SELECTION	16
7. EVALUATING ASPIRANTS IN SOUTH AFRICA'S DEMOCRATIC ALLIANCE	18
8. SOME APPROACHES TO BALANCING THE TICKET	20
9. COMMON PROVISIONS OF CODES OF CONDUCT	23
10. SOME OPTIONS FOR JOINT CANDIDATE SELECTION BY COALITIONS	27
11. PRACTICAL QUESTIONS FOR CANDIDATE SELECTION	28
12. THE DEMOCRATIC ALLIANCE'S LIST-COMPILATION PROCESS	33
13. THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY'S WOMEN2WIN	38
14. POSITIVE DISCRIMINATION MECHANISMS FOR WOMEN IN THE LABOUR PARTY	52
15. REFORMING CANDIDATE SELECTION IN GHANA'S NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS	62
16. PASOK'S MAROUSSI EXPERIMENT: CANDIDATE SELECTION BY DELIBERATIVE POLLING	65

LIST OF TABLES

1. CANDIDATE SELECTION IN IRELAND'S THREE LARGEST PARTIES	41
2. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE INSTITUTIONAL REVOLUTIONARY PARTY'S CPN AND CNPI	44
3. CANDIDATE SELECTION IN MEXICO'S THREE LARGEST PARTIES	46
4. CANDIDATE SELECTION IN THE UNITED KINGDOM'S THREE LARGEST PARTIES	54
5. EXAMPLES OF VARIATIONS IN LIBERAL PROVINCIAL & TERRITORIAL ASSOCIATION SELECTION PROCEDURES	59
6. CANDIDATE SELECTION IN THE CANADIAN CONSERVATIVE AND LIBERAL PARTIES	60

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Sefakor Ashiagbor is a Senior Advisor for political party programs at the National Democratic Institute (NDI). She provides technical support to help inform the design, implementation and evaluation of the Institute's political party programs worldwide and conducts research on issues affecting the development of political parties in nascent democracies. Ms. Ashiagbor's career at NDI began with a focus on Sub-Saharan Africa. She traveled extensively throughout the continent, managing a range of capacity building and research programs in such areas as political party development, management of extractive industries, women's political participation, election monitoring and legislative development. She also served in field positions in Ghana and Malawi. Ms. Ashiagbor earned a Master's degree in International Relations from the London School of Economics and Political Science, and a Bachelor's degree in History from Selwyn College, Cambridge.

PREFACE

Democracies need strong and sustainable political parties with the capacity to represent citizens and provide policy choices that demonstrate their ability to govern for the public good. Yet it is widely recognized that many political parties, both in established democracies and in nascent multiparty systems are in a state of near crisis. Globally, citizens have grown increasingly frustrated with their political parties and leaders. At the same time, support has risen for independent candidates, special interest parties and anti-party movements. Greater citizen participation, accountability of leadership, transparency and institutional safeguards are now more important than ever for political parties to regain the public's confidence.

For more than 20 years, the National Democratic Institute (NDI) has worked with political parties around the world to create more open political environments in which citizens can actively participate in the democratic process. As a political party institute, NDI approaches its work from a practical viewpoint, offering nonpartisan assistance to promote parties' long-term organizational development, enhance their competitiveness in local and national elections, and help them participate constructively in government. This support takes many forms, from interactive training and guided practice to consultations and tailored resources that help parties become more open and representative organizations.

Working effectively with political parties requires an understanding of the incentives that affect party leaders and shape prospects for reform. Through applied research, the

Institute provides comparative information on various aspects of party politics, shedding light on obstacles to and possible approaches for creating more effective and inclusive parties. In 2004, NDI began producing *Political Parties and Democracy in Theoretical and Practical Perspectives*, a series of research papers that blends theoretical knowledge, empirical research, and practical experience. These papers provide comparative information on topics central to the role and function of political parties. They aim to help readers gain a better understanding of each topic and, in particular, the complexities of the issues addressed. These papers do not attempt to offer theories on party organization or instant solutions for addressing the issues explored. Rather, they flag potential pitfalls and bumps along the way and illustrate the practical considerations of which parties may need to be aware.

The first section of this paper, "Selecting Candidates for Legislative Office," discusses key issues that political parties may want to consider in selecting candidates for legislative office. In the second section, case studies provide overviews of the practical experiences of 10 political parties around the world in candidate selection. NDI is grateful to those who helped bring this paper to fruition by assisting with research and providing comments on various drafts.

Kenneth Wollack
President

Ivan Doherty
Senior Associate,
Director of Political Party Programs

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The selection of candidates for legislative office is a key stage in the recruitment function that political parties perform in democratic societies. The candidates whom parties select define the leadership and representational options available to voters. In dominant party systems or in party strongholds, political leaders may even be predetermined by a party's choice of candidates. Process and outcome not only reflect a party's values and operating environment, they have broad implications for a party's public image: they can make the difference between a united, energized organization and one that is demoralized and divided. In either case, the implications for a party's chances of electoral success cannot be overstated.

Various aspects of candidate selection have been the subject of extensive study and debate among political scientists. Despite the extensive literature generated, practitioners still find that user-friendly resources describing key issues to consider as well as the advantages and disadvantages of the different options available to them remain in short supply. This paper aims to help bridge that gap. Drawing upon selected academic literature and comparative candidate selection experiences, the first section identifies issues that political parties may want to consider in devising their selection procedures as well as the principal advantages and disadvantages of some available options.

Selection procedures are as much a reflection of a party's values and interests as they are a reflection of its operating environment. Regulatory frameworks, social norms and the level of inter-party competition all help shape that environment and may change over time. Thus, while the focus of this paper is the process internal to and controlled by the parties themselves, it begins with a discussion of these factors and their potential impact on candidate selection.

Next, the paper examines the advantages and risks associated with varying degrees of intra-party democracy in candidate selection as measured by different levels of institutionalization, decentralization and inclusiveness: each refers to a sliding scale along which different parties' organizational structures and procedures may be placed. Either extreme on each of these scales can pose certain dangers: too little institutionalization,

inclusiveness or decentralization can threaten the transparency and legitimacy of selection processes while too much of all three can severely limit parties' abilities to adapt to fluid political environments and to enforce party loyalty and discipline. Parties may have legitimate concerns about finding a balance between party cohesion and participation: some of the institutional safeguards that parties have used to balance trade-offs in each of these areas are described. For instance, waiting periods for branch and membership participation can protect parties against "instant" branches or members, while party leaders' preapproval of candidates can help protect party identity.

In determining the most desirable candidates, parties may have to find a happy medium between the individuals best placed to serve the party's interests – not only during the campaign, but also in office, if elected – and those with the public appeal necessary for success at the polls. In addition to ensuring that potential candidates meet legally established eligibility criteria, parties may choose to formally define requirements for candidate slots. Such criteria can be helpful in discouraging unqualified persons from coming forward. When overly restrictive, however, they can discriminate against certain kinds of potential candidates, reducing participation in the process or even limiting the options available to the party in difficult races. Worse still, they can be so restrictive as to make broader participation in other aspects of the process meaningless. Common considerations include: a history of active involvement in party life; public appeal; political skills; ethics; access to funds; and an aspirant's socioeconomic or educational background.

Regardless of the candidate selection procedures they use, parties may decide that special arrangements are required to make their slate of candidates more representative in terms of gender, geography, persons with disabilities, youth, ethnicity, race or specific marginalized groups. Rhetorical strategies afford party leaders the greatest flexibility but may be insufficient to induce change. Quotas and other types of affirmative action, while controversial, can be set at different levels (e.g. 30 percent or 40 percent) and can be applied at different stages in candidate selection processes. Specialized support systems can also be used

to provide targeted training and other forms of support to historically marginalized groups.

Candidate selection involves an inescapable trade-off between competition and cohesion within the party. Procedural frameworks can promote transparency, foster participation and mitigate conflict, but only when parties abide by their own stated rules. Efforts to circumvent the rules increase the potential for conflict, leaving parties vulnerable to court actions (where the option exists) as well as to embarrassing negative press coverage. Further, voters and members may have legitimate concerns that a party that fails to respect its own rules is unlikely to follow due process if elected to office. While aggrieved aspirants deserve opportunities to seek redress, leadership should also have the option of sanctioning wayward members whose actions could pose a threat to or undermine party cohesion. Codes of conduct and steps to increase the transparency of selection processes can also help to prevent conflict. In addition, parties should consider establishing formal procedures for recording, filing, hearing and adjudicating any complaints that may arise.

Parties also face a number of logistical considerations such as different voting and ratification systems. The paper provides a brief overview of the strengths and disadvantages of some of the options available and offers a few thoughts on financing candidate selection processes. Finally, under certain conditions, political parties may choose to contest elections through coalitions or alliances. In these situations, they face two main choices. In joint preselection the constituent members of the coalition work together to vet aspiring candidates before they are presented for final selection. Under separate preselection, constituent members of the coalition are free to preselect potential candidates using their own procedures. In a second step, together, coalition members decide among the various candidates.

The first section concludes that while parties benefit from adopting and respecting clear selection rules, these systems must be designed in the context of what is realistic for the party in question. Given the diversity of parties and the electoral systems in which they operate, there is no single best way for parties to choose their candidates. Indeed, many parties frequently change their selection rules in response to evolving needs.

In the second section, case studies review the experiences of 10 political parties around the world. While some of the parties

featured are relatively satisfied with their processes, others continue to explore options for further reform. As such, the case studies are not intended to serve as models. Moreover, they do not seek to offer in-depth analysis of each party's experience. Instead, the snapshots simply seek to shed light on how each party's process has evolved over time, the principal stages in current procedures, and any particular strengths and weaknesses. The selected parties reflect a variety of ideological positions and operate in a range of political and regulatory contexts.

In South Africa's African National Congress (ANC), branches nominate candidates for legislative elections. Provincial and national delegate conventions vote on lists that are ranked according to nominees' popularity. The party uses a formal process to assess incumbents' performance and requires zippering on its candidate lists. There are provisions for appeals at every stage in the process.

In the United Kingdom's Conservative Party, Constituency Associations select their candidates from a central list of preapproved candidates. Assessment of individuals for inclusion in the preapproved list is conducted on a rolling basis and is combined with training. Although it rejected quotas in the past, in recent years, the party has experimented with various efforts to increase the number of women and ethnic minority candidates selected to contest in "safe" or "winnable" electoral districts.

In Ireland, Fine Gael uses a simple nomination process with minimal prescreening of aspirants. Given the country's Single Transferable Vote system, the number of candidates to be fielded in each electoral district is a key decision: too many or too few candidates can cost parties seats in the legislature. Although selection is by a membership vote, the national executive determines the number of candidates to be selected and, under certain conditions, may add, delete or substitute names on lists approved by branches. Party rules include strong safeguards against "paper" branches and "instant" members.

In Mexico's Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI), the party's national leadership determines candidates for the regional lists. However, party rules lay out a number of options for selecting candidates for majoritarian seats: closed or open primaries and delegate conventions. In the lead up to each selection process, the National Political Council (*Consejo Político Nacional* or CPN) issues calls for nominations that specify

which selection option will be used as well as other details. In the era of competitive politics, the party has moved to institutionalize and broaden participation in candidate selection for majoritarian seats. However, processes continue to reflect considerable national influence over local choice and are often controversial.

In Taiwan, following its defeat in the 2000 presidential elections, the Kuomintang (KMT) embarked on a comprehensive reform program that included changes to candidate selection. Given concerns over the party's perceived links with corrupt politics, the party introduced stringent ethical standards for aspiring candidates. Further, a combination of membership votes and public opinion polls were introduced for selecting candidates for First Past the Post (FPTP) seats. The respective weights of the membership votes and public opinion polls have varied between 70:30 and 50:50. Candidates for national list seats are determined by the party's Central Standing Committee.

In the United Kingdom's Labour Party, Constituency Labour Parties (CLPs) may select their candidates from a list of centrally preapproved candidates or consider other aspirants. If selected, unscreened nominees are subject to national executive endorsement. Selection is based on one member one vote. The party has used positive discrimination measures – such as all-women shortlists and procedural quotas – to increase the number of women, black and ethnic minority candidates.

In the Canadian Liberal Party, Provincial and Territorial Associations (PTAs) have the option of adopting modifications to the party's federal nomination rules. Although branches vote to select their candidates, rules includes built-in measures for the direct appointment of candidates at the party leader's discretion. Membership drives are an integral part of the nomination campaign.

In Ghana's New Patriotic Party (NPP), delegates at the branch level select parliamentary candidates. Overall, selection by delegates has proved effective in allowing branch participation in selection processes. However, while no formal procedures exist for determining the fate of incumbents, national party officials have sometimes intervened to protect sitting Members of Parliament (MPs) with mixed results. Further, given concerns over the use of money to influence delegate votes, some members have advocated for selection by a membership vote, a reform that has not yet been adopted by the party.

In Greece's Panhellenic Socialist Movement or PASOK, branches are consulted in determining candidate lists for 56 electoral districts that include single and multi-member constituencies. These consultations take the form of membership meetings, whose reports are forwarded to the party's electoral committee. The committee, whose members are elected at the party congress, reviews reports from the branch meetings and finalizes the list of candidates. The national list is drafted by the party president and approved by the national executive.

In the Social Democratic Party (SDP) of Bosnia-Herzegovina (BiH), party branches and functional units (e.g. women's, youth, trade and pensioners' wings) nominate potential candidates. Party executives at the municipal, cantonal and national levels consolidate and then determine the final lists. The party imposes 35 percent quotas for women (there is a statutory gender quota in BiH) and youth and strives to ensure multiethnic representation on its lists. The party is considering introducing delegate conventions for candidate selection.

ISSUES TO CONSIDER

INTRODUCTION

Candidate selection for legislative office, the internal method by which a party determines its contestants for general elections, is a critical component of the recruitment function that political parties perform in democratic societies. The candidates whom parties select define the leadership and representational options available to voters. In dominant party systems or in party strongholds, political leaders may even be predetermined by a party's choice of candidates. Process and outcome not only reflect a party's values and operating environment, they have broad implications for a party's public image. As their party's public face in election campaigns – and in office, if elected – candidates play key roles in shaping their party's image. They interpret and articulate a party's record as well its proposals for the future. They define relations between various constituencies and central party units or government. Collectively, they reflect a party's demographic, geographic and ideological values and interests.

Selection processes can energize party faithfuls, attract new members, generate positive media attention, inspire public confidence and set the stage for victory at the polls. In many cases, however, internal disputes over candidate selection have ripped parties apart or uncovered practices that have made them subjects of public ridicule or contempt, resulting in a reduced membership and lost electoral votes. In Taiwan's Kuomintang (KMT), for example, controversial candidate selection procedures contributed to a split in the party, electoral loss, and eventual internal party reform. According to one party official, "Losing the election hurt, but what hurt even more was the way it happened – James Soong used to be a member of the KMT, and together we could have polled 60 percent of the vote. So we learned our lesson. Next time around, the party rank and file will determine our candidate. Last time, it was the party delegates (to the party's national assembly) who determined the candidate, but these delegates were themselves chosen by the central committee" (Manikas and Thornton 2003).

Drawing upon selected academic literature as well as comparative political party experiences, this section outlines issues that parties may want to consider in devising their selection rules. It begins with a discussion of the impact that the political and regulatory environment – including electoral systems, statutory quotas, evolving social norms, and changes in inter-party competition – can have on candidate selection.

Next, it examines the advantages and risks associated with varying degrees of intra-party democracy in candidate selection as measured by different levels of institutionalization, decentralization and inclusiveness. Parties may have legitimate concerns about finding a balance between party cohesion or identity and participation: some of the institutional safeguards that parties have used to balance trade-offs in each of these areas are described. In determining the most desirable candidates, parties may have to find a happy medium between the individuals best placed to serve the party's interests – not only during the campaign, but also in office, if elected – and those with the public appeal necessary for success at the polls. A discussion of candidate recruitment strategies and criteria follows. Parties may also be interested in some of the options for encouraging marginalized groups such as women, youth or ethnic minorities that are described.

Candidate selection involves an inescapable trade-off between competition and cohesion within the party. The paper describes some of the steps that parties can take to mitigate and resolve conflict over the selection process. Finally, the section provides a brief overview of logistical considerations such as voting systems and meeting formats and some options for selecting candidates for coalitions.

THE POLITICAL AND REGULATORY ENVIRONMENT

Selection procedures are as much a reflection of an individual party's values and interests as they are a reflection of its operating environment. Regulatory frameworks, social norms and the level of inter-party competition all help shape that environment

and may change over time. Thus, while the focus of this paper is the process internal to and controlled by parties themselves, a number of these factors deserve some attention.

Electoral System Design

Different countries use various electoral systems to translate votes into seats won by parties and candidates. The principal types include plurality/majority, proportional and mixed systems, with each variation rewarding or punishing certain political choices. As such, electoral system design has an important impact on the general development of political parties and, more specifically, how parties recruit and select candidates. For instance, since voters in First Past the Post (FPTP) systems cast their votes for individuals, this may create incentives for selecting candidates with strong links to their electoral districts. At the same time, many FPTP systems are characterized by party strongholds. As such, in certain districts, the elected representative may be predetermined by a party's choice of candidate. In heavily contested districts, on the other hand, a candidate's broader public appeal could make all the difference in an election result. In contrast, in proportional representation systems featuring closed lists, since voters do not have the option of picking individual candidates, parties may have greater flexibility in including candidates that are less well-known. Further, based on each party's analysis of its level of support, lists are often ordered with the assumption that a certain number of the top positions on the lists are "safe" or highly likely to be elected to office.

Electoral systems can also have other consequences for candidate selection. The Single Non-Transferable Vote system used in Japan prior to 1996 exacerbated factional divisions within the Liberal Democratic Party by pitting candidates from the same party against each other (Gallagher 1998). In Ireland's Single Transferable Vote system, parties must make a strategic choice as to the number of candidates to field in each electoral district: too many or too few candidates could cost a party elected positions. In France, legislative candidates are elected through a two-round system. As a result, after some initial screening, parties sometimes use the first round of legislative elections to determine which candidate is most likely to be successful and should thus be fielded as the "real" candidate in the runoff.

District magnitude (the number of candidates to be elected) and geographic size of electoral districts are also considerations. For instance, large district magnitudes – in many proportional representation systems, for example – make it easier for political parties to present a balanced ticket and facilitate representation of women and other marginalized groups. In contrast, for single-member districts, selectorates may be hesitant to pick a candidate who is perceived – rightly or wrongly – as "risky" due to gender, youth or other characteristics. In countries with geographically smaller electoral districts, local knowledge is likely to be an important factor in the election: local party branches and/or membership involvement in the selection process can help ensure that the nominee has the support required to carry the district. Conversely, in geographically large multi-member constituencies, given the degree of coordination required, it may be legitimate for central party organs to play a more influential role in compiling a party list. The potential impact of different electoral systems on candidate selection procedures is further discussed in Appendix 3.

State Regulation of Selection Procedures

The extent to which candidate selection procedures are regulated by law can also affect the options available to parties. In most cases, legal frameworks for candidate selection are either nonexistent or simply set broad guidelines. Exceptions include the United States, and, to lesser extent, Germany and Finland. In Ghana, for instance, there is only an indirect reference in Article 55 of the Constitution: "The internal organization of a political party shall conform to democratic principles." Turkey's 1965 Political Parties Law, on the other hand, allows national executive committees to select no more than five percent of their parties' candidates for National Assembly and requires that all others be selected by a direct vote of the dues-paying party members in each district. The Law also sets certain limits to party membership requirements. For example, there is a maximum entrance and monthly subscription fee.

In Norway, until 2002, under the Nomination Act of 1920, political parties could receive public funding to help cover the expenses of their nomination procedures if they met certain criteria. Nomination meetings consisting of delegates from all local units in the electoral district had to select candidates and

decide their ranking. The decision of these nomination meetings had to be final. Moreover, only dues-paying party members of voting age were permitted to participate in the conventions and in the local meetings that chose delegates for the conventions. In practice, most Norwegian parties tended to follow the procedures laid out in the Act except when selecting candidates for Oslo (Norway's national capital) and Akershus (Norway's second largest county). In those cities, parties were prepared to forgo public subsidies so that they could use a more centralized approach to reserve those candidacies for senior party officials (Valen et al. 2002).

Statutory Quotas and/or Incentives for Balanced Candidate Lists

Statutory quotas also have implications for candidate selection procedures: they may require parties to include a certain number or percentage of individuals from a particular gender or social group on their candidate lists. For instance, a mixed system was used for the 2006 legislative elections in the West Bank and Gaza. By law, each national party list had to contain a minimum of one woman in the first three names, a second woman in the next four names, and an additional woman for every five more names. Belgium's 2002 gender quota law requires all electoral lists to include equal numbers of male and female candidates. In addition, candidates of the same sex may not occupy the first two positions on any list. Elections administration officials reject lists that do not meet this requirement. Gender-neutral quotas that set a maximum or minimum for each gender are another variation. For example, the predecessor to Belgium's 2002 quota law simply stipulated that no more than two-thirds of an electoral list could consist of candidates of the same sex.

Some laws do not impose quotas but offer incentives for balanced tickets. Under France's gender parity law passed in 2000, parties that place one gender in less than 48 or more than 52 percent of their candidate slots nationwide are penalized with cuts in their public funding. A sliding scale is used to calculate the reduction: five percent for a gender difference of 10 percent; 30 percent for a difference of 60 percent; and a maximum 50 percent cut for a difference of 100 percent. In practice, political parties have sometimes been willing to pay the penalty for failing to achieve gender parity (Norris 2004).

In Mexico, under amendments to the electoral law in 2002, parties could not include any one gender in more than 70 percent of their main candidates. However, the law only applied to the next five elections (2003, 2006, 2009, 2012 and 2015) and waived the quota requirement if parties used a "direct vote" to select their candidates (Baldez 2004). A new electoral code enacted in January 2008 removed the time limit on the quotas and required that each gender account for no less than 40 percent of party candidate lists. As was the case in 2002, the 2008 law includes provisions for ordering of proportional representation lists and waives the quota requirement for majoritarian seats where candidates are selected by democratic processes consistent with the concerned party's statutes.

In some countries, seats are reserved for targeted groups. Procedures for filling these seats vary from one country to another and may not require or involve nomination by a political party. In Uganda, a special selectorate identifies the individuals who fill the reserved seats. In Tanzania, the seats reserved for women (at least 20 but no more than 30 percent of the total) are allocated to political parties in proportion to the number of seats they win at election. Arguably reserved seats could act as a disincentive for parties to ensure that the targeted groups are properly represented in candidate lists for "open seats."

Social Norms and Inter-Party Competition

Selection processes often reflect social norms. For instance, during the nineteenth century, Canadian political parties were primarily cliques of notables and loose local networks united by leading community figures. In the absence of formal party membership and national party structures, the idea that local networks should choose their own candidates took hold and remains an important principle in candidate selection to this date.

Many parties in established as well as nascent democracies are experiencing a general trend toward the increased democratization of candidate selection processes. In older democracies, explanations for this phenomenon include the "decline" of political parties as mass based organizations partly as the result of economic, social and technological developments that freed citizens from their dependency on political parties. Faced with weakening ties between them and the public, many parties broadened their selectorates in an attempt to attract members once again and to strengthen members' and voters'

sense of involvement in party affairs. In some cases, due to changing norms, selection procedures that were once considered sufficiently democratic – delegate conventions, for instance – were no longer viewed as adequate.

By their nature, parties are competitive and often consider the potential impact of any reforms on their public image and electoral prospects. Selection procedures may change in response to increasing degrees of inter-party competition. In Mexico's Institutional Revolutionary Party, candidate selection in the lead up to the 2000 elections changed as a result of two related developments: increased electoral competition and the growing influence of governors. Under less competitive elections, candidate selection had been concentrated at the national level. With automatic senate victories no longer guaranteed, the party increasingly depended on party governors to mobilize support for legislative candidates. As a result, party governors were in a position to demand that their allies be selected (Langston 2006).

In the United Kingdom, the Conservative Party recently reformed its procedures to increase the number of women and ethnic minority candidates fielded in “winnable” electoral districts. The efforts were just one part of a package of reforms designed to broaden the party's public appeal and improve its electoral prospects. In the lead up to Ghana's 2000 elections, media reports were rife with accounts of intra-party disputes over the National Democratic Congress' candidate selection process, including accusations of candidates being imposed on electoral districts. The reports not only contributed to a negative public image of the party, but the disputes also led voters in certain electoral districts to switch their support to independent candidates (some of them NDC members who lost the party nomination) or other parties. In the aftermath of its electoral defeat, the party embarked on efforts to reorganize and renew the organization and amended its rules to require the use of delegate conferences at the branch level to determine legislative candidates.

INTRA-PARTY DEMOCRACY

Political scientists often discuss party organization in terms of degrees of institutionalization, inclusiveness and decentralization: each refers to a sliding scale along which different parties' organizational structures and procedures may

be placed. Either extreme on each of these scales can pose certain dangers: too little institutionalization, inclusiveness or decentralization can threaten the transparency and legitimacy of selection processes while too much of all three can severely limit parties' abilities to adapt to fluid political environments and to enforce party loyalty and discipline.

Institutionalization

Political parties may choose to select candidates by formal or informal means. At the one extreme, selection procedures can be spelled out in significant detail in party rules. At the other, they may simply consist of a series of discussions involving a small group of individuals in the proverbial “smoke-filled room.” Overly informal or fluid systems can create confusion as well as opportunities for patronage and influence peddling; they also create breeding grounds for conflict. In some cases, institutionalization develops over time. In Ghana, the NDC experimented with different approaches before eventually spelling out its legislative candidate selection procedures in various party documents.

Whether spelled out in party rules or in other documents, or simply by established tradition, well-defined and publicized procedures make the rules of engagement clear. As such, to the extent that established procedures are followed, they can help encourage participation and minimize or manage conflict. Experts on participation by women and other marginalized groups have argued that institutionalization is more conducive to the participation of these groups because the rules of engagement are clearer and more transparent. That said, in some cases, selection procedures are institutionalized but concentrate power in the hands of a single individual or a small group of people, limiting participation.

Changes to certain types of party rules require a decision at a party congress and/or by a membership ballot. Overly institutionalized systems may therefore be more difficult to change, limiting parties' flexibility. In order to guarantee respect for certain fundamental principles while maintaining the flexibility to adapt procedures to changes in the political environment, parties may choose to embed certain rights, roles and responsibilities in their party constitutions or statutes, while leaving responsibility for the development of more detailed selection procedures to an identified body. This option offers

considerable flexibility since, in theory, the procedures could change every election cycle – depending on the political context – and differ for different levels of elections.

The statutes of Ireland’s Fine Gael simply mention that constituency branches will organize conventions to select candidates for the legislature in accordance with directives issued by the national executive. However, the statutes also specify that nominations will be determined by a membership vote at the branch level and subject to certain leadership controls. Similarly, in South Africa, the African National Congress’ (ANC) statutes indicate that candidate lists will be compiled in the manner determined by a list committee appointed by the National Executive Committee (NEC). (In practice however, the party’s list compilation process has remained largely the same over a number of election cycles.) In the case of the United Kingdom’s Liberal Democrats, a Candidates’ Committee is responsible for developing detailed procedures for candidate selection. However, the party’s federal statutes lay out extensive provisions that must be followed in developing more detailed regulations.

Regardless of the approach, in order to provide fair opportunity for participation, increase the legitimacy of the process and minimize disputes, parties should strive to establish clear rules well in advance of each contest.

Decentralization

Decentralization describes the extent to which power is devolved to party branches. At one extreme, candidate selection can be completely controlled by local party organs without input from central party organs. At the other end of the spectrum, a central party organ or perhaps even one individual

controls candidate selection. Most political parties fall somewhere between these two extremes. In general, increased decentralization allows for greater inclusiveness in candidate selection but does not guarantee full direct participation by members. For instance, a process could be decentralized but still only involve local party branch officials and not all members.

Decentralization can encourage aspiring candidates to court, and be more sensitive to the views of party officials at the branch level, promoting broader accountability than if aspiring candidates were simply beholden to a small central unit within the party. Further, branches play an important role in judging the political mood in their areas, helping spread the party’s message, and recruiting and mobilizing activists and fundraisers. They know their locality and the individuals in their area the best. Their significant involvement in candidate selection can help ensure that the person selected is well-known and well regarded in the area in which s/he is running. In proportional representation systems, branch involvement can also help ensure that a party’s full slate of candidates is diverse enough to secure support in diverse geographic regions. In South Africa’s ANC, a National List Committee compiles party’s lists for the National Assembly, drawing from lists compiled and ordered at the provincial level.

The most decentralized candidate selection systems allow branches to define their own procedures for selecting candidates. Under the 2002 constitution of South Africa’s Democratic Alliance (DA), for instance, provincial congresses could determine their own rules – subject to approval by the party’s Federal Council – for compiling candidate lists. In Canada, the Liberal Party’s provincial and territorial associations can adopt variations to the federal party’s selection rules. A slightly less permissive model used in Norway, allows branches to make

BOX 1: SAMPLE REQUIREMENTS FOR BRANCH INVOLVEMENT IN CANDIDATE SELECTION

In some parties, branches must meet certain requirements in order to participate in selection procedures. Some typical requirements include:

- Formal recognition as a party organization according to party statutes and/or other relevant party rules;
- Minimum membership threshold requirement (e.g. a specific number of members or a percentage of party vote in last election);
- Minimum collection of membership fees or other participation in fundraising;
- Minimum number of debates/meetings involving all candidates; and
- A waiting period.

their choices free from interference by the center as long as they use a set of procedures established by headquarters. This is also the case in Sweden's Social Democratic Party. This model guarantees some uniformity/consistency of approach but protects branches' right to choose freely without interference from the center. Where there are concerns about the potential for "instant" branches and/or to encourage branches to play an active role in party processes in between elections, parties can set requirements for the involvement of branches in selection procedures (see Box 1). In this way, decentralization also enhances prospects for the full involvement of branches in the campaign, not only improving prospects for success at the polls but also contributing to the development of these structures' organizational capacities in the long term.

A potential challenge in decentralization is the need to balance the interests of party branches against considerations of party discipline and perhaps even candidate electability. In some cases, branches or activists may be more extreme in their views than the electorate at large and may choose candidates without sufficient public appeal to win elections. In the case of the United Kingdom's Liberal Democrats, for instance, branches tended to favor the decriminalization of drugs, an idea strongly opposed by the general voting public. The party therefore ran the risk of fielding candidates who represented the views of some members but were unlikely to gather enough votes to win at election (Rose and O'Connell).

Differences among local party branches can also pose a threat to party cohesion. In the lead up to the 2003 elections for the Northern Ireland Assembly, candidate selection was handled by the various local branches of the Ulster Unionist Party. Since branches were divided on the peace process, the result was a split ticket for the party: half of the candidates selected supported the peace process, the other half opposed it. As a result of these divisions, the party was unable to issue a policy position on how it would deal with the peace agreement if elected (Rose and O'Connell).

The right of central party organs to veto candidates or to preapprove them can provide some safeguards. The right to veto, however, may be a slightly less attractive option than preapproval because of the likelihood of high levels of frustration among party branches whose candidates are rejected by the leadership. Any reorganization of the selection process due to a reversal by party leaders could have significant financial costs

and damage party morale or unity. Used carefully, however, such leadership powers can serve as a constructive deterrent to wayward branch behavior. Simply knowing that the party leadership has the right to veto and is prepared to use it could serve as a deterrent, encouraging branches to select candidates who meet both the needs of branches and the central party. Although critics argue that this creates loopholes for cronyism, it can also encourage dialogue and eventually lead to agreement on a slate of candidates that suits both sub-national and headquarters' needs. In Ireland's Fine Gael, the Executive Council issues guidelines for candidate selection in each electoral district. However, in practice, before the Executive Council issues its guidelines, pre-convention strategy committees are convened in each constituency. The committees assess their local political situation, the strengths and weaknesses of Fine Gael's potential candidates as well as those of the competition, identify potential candidates (where necessary) and make recommendations to the Executive Council on the timing of conventions, electoral strategy and the number of candidates. This consultative process has helped preempt disagreements between the national leadership and party branches.

The right of party leaders to directly appoint or select candidates for certain electoral districts or for specified positions on the party list is another option. In the Canadian Liberal Party, provincial or territorial branch rules may grant the Leader the authority to designate candidates without the need for the selection process otherwise described in the rules. Further, the Leader and the National Campaign Committee, in their absolute discretion, may decline to approve a candidate. In cases of electoral urgency – either in specific electoral districts or countrywide – the National Campaign Chair may alter the selection rules for any branch at his/her discretion. In the Liberation Front of Mozambique, the political commission can directly nominate 10 percent of the candidates. For the remainder of the list, district branches propose candidates to provincial committees that, in turn, develop and forward shortlists to the party's political commission (Sitoe et al. 2005).

Parties may choose to impose certain restrictions on central party organs' decision-making powers in order to preserve some measure of a balance of power in the selection process. Under the 2002 party statutes of South Africa's DA, provincial branches drafted the candidate lists for their electoral district but were required to keep certain positions on their lists blank.

Using the empty slots on the list, the party leader could move nominees further up the list, but could not demote or remove any individuals. Further by a two-thirds majority vote, the provincial branches could veto the Leader's changes. In Greece's Panhellenic Socialist Movement, or PASOK, branches are consulted in determining candidates for the 56 single and multi-member electoral districts but do not play a role in drawing up the national list. Box 2 outlines some options for balancing leadership and branch interests.

Inclusiveness

The most inclusive models allow every registered voter or even any interested individual a direct vote in candidate selection. Open primaries can provide some indication of the type of support potential candidates may receive at the polls. However, they can require aspirants to campaign for longer and to reach a larger number of voters, all fueling the phenomenon of the "perpetual" campaign and contributing to higher costs. Higher campaign costs can push candidates to turn to unsavory sources of funding or favor the participation of those who are independently wealthy, and therefore more able to bear the cost regardless of their leadership qualities.

Political parties that actively engage their members tend to be more naturally connected to voters in general and therefore more aware of the concerns of citizens. Inclusive models can encourage candidates, and eventually, elected representatives or party leaders to remain faithful to the broad interests of party members on whom their reelection and political future depends. Party members are more likely to be passionate in

their support of a candidate of their own choosing and, as such, can quickly become invaluable donors, fundraisers and organizers. One risk of unchecked participation by party members or the general public is the potential threat to party cohesion. In environments where the members (or the public) and not the party leadership decide, candidates may be tempted to place the views of the grassroots above party loyalty or unity.

Political parties can introduce a number of safeguards to minimize some of these risks. The first is to maintain good membership records as a general practice. Some parties take specific steps to publish their membership lists, allowing individuals to verify their information. In environments where there are concerns about multiple memberships, publishing such records—assuming this does not pose a security threat to the individuals listed—can also be helpful in identifying problems. In some parties, new members can only participate in selection procedures a specified number of days or months after joining the party. This can help limit prospects for aspiring candidates to influence selection outcomes by enrolling their personal contacts as party members. Other safeguards include limits on the number of new members any particular aspiring candidate may recruit and the requirement that all dues be directly paid into a party bank account, making it easier to identify instances of "bulk" membership. In some cases, national party leaders retain control over membership procedures, helping to prevent individuals who may have no real interest in the party from taking over local branches and preempting any attempts by local oligarchs to bar their challengers from joining the party.

In Ireland's Fine Gael, for instance, party statutes describe procedures for publishing the membership register annually as well as steps for rectifying the records. Only members who

BOX 2: BALANCING LEADERSHIP AND BRANCH INTERESTS IN CANDIDATE SELECTION

Below are some options for balancing leadership and branch involvement in candidate selection processes:

- Branches must choose candidates from a list of candidates preapproved by leadership or seek leadership endorsement of any other candidate.
- Leadership must accept branch choice as long as choice is on a list of candidates preapproved by leadership.
- Leadership may reject/veto a specific (but limited) number or percentage of branch choices.
- Leadership may reject branch choices only a specific number of times in each election cycle.
- Leadership may reject branch choices an unlimited number of times during a given election cycle.
- Leadership may reject branch's first choice but must then pick the runner-up in the branch race.
- Specific positions on candidate lists are determined by party leadership.
- Leadership changes may be vetoed by a certain percentage of delegate or membership votes.

appear on the last published register are allowed to vote in conventions. An Appeals Committee appointed by the party's executive from among its membership is responsible for resolving any disputes over the register. In addition, registered members are required to provide identification when receiving ballot papers.

Alternatively, thresholds may be deliberately set low in an attempt to attract new membership and to allay any concerns about discouraging participation. In Canada, candidate selection is often viewed, and used as an opportunity to recruit new members. As such, while the thresholds for participation are relatively low – in some cases as low as 30 days before the official date for the selection meeting – candidate nomination rules for both the Conservative and Liberal parties include guidelines for membership recruitment by aspirants.

Direct and Indirect Participation

In certain cases, allowing every member to participate directly in the selection of candidates may simply be impractical for reasons such as the sheer number of people involved. In proportional representation systems featuring closed lists for large electoral districts (such as an entire country), for example, the degree of coordination required to come up with a single list could be difficult to achieve using a one member one vote (OMOV) system. For this reason and others, parties may choose to maintain delegatory rather than direct participation in candidate selection based on tradition.

However, the role and use of delegates can be controversial for a number of reasons. One important question is how the delegates are selected. A related issue is whether delegates should be expected to cast their vote based on the preferences of the groups or individuals they represent or based on their own analysis of what may be in the best interests of the party and/or the people they represent. (Of course, in the event of secret balloting, there is no means of verifying a particular delegate's vote. Further, in some cases, delegates may be chosen before the final list of aspirants is known.) Some argue that delegates often have the experience and knowledge required to make informed choices between potential candidates. However, the smaller selectorates generated by delegate systems can increase the potential for influence peddling. Despite secret balloting by delegates in Ghana's NPP, concerns over the use of patronage

to influence delegate votes has led some party members to advocate for a full membership vote, a reform that has not yet been adopted by the party.

BOX 3: ONE MEMBER ONE VOTE

One Member One Vote (OMOV) usually describes candidate selection and other party decision-making processes that allow for direct participation by all members. It is often perceived as the purest form of “internal democracy,” the antithesis to the “smoke-filled room” model. However, studies suggest that the broader the selectorate, the more unlikely it is to produce balanced tickets in the absence of corrective measures. Parties concerned about balancing members' interests with party discipline may choose to establish safeguards such as party leadership preapproval of candidates or corrective measures such as weighted systems, quotas or targeted/reserved seats to ensure a balanced ticket. Some purists would argue that the introduction of such measures dilutes participation and democracy.

Delegates may also lose touch with member and voter sentiment. The United Kingdom's Labour Party's failure to involve ordinary members in policymaking and candidate selection was a major factor in its defeat in the 1983 general elections, the party's worst ever. Policy making and candidate selection had become dominated by parliamentarians, trade union leaders, and party activists at the branch level, who were increasingly out of touch with issues of concern to the general voting public. As part of the ensuing modernization process in the party, OMOV was introduced to help dilute the power of these interests.

Concerns may also arise if delegate votes are “diluted” either as the result of a weighted system or because of the proportion of ex-officio delegates. Depending on the history and ideological profile of each party, ex-officio delegates may include representatives of trade unions, sitting legislators or legislative candidates, and former party leaders. In South Africa's ANC, for example, 80 percent of voting delegates at Provincial List Conferences represent branches. The number of delegates for each branch is determined in proportion to the number of paid memberships. The remaining 20 percent of voting delegates are distributed among Provincial

Executive Committees, office bearers and the Youth and Women's Leagues.

RECRUITMENT AND ELIGIBILITY ISSUES

Who Is Eligible and Who Decides?

In addition to ensuring that potential candidates meet legally established eligibility criteria, parties may choose to formally define criteria for candidate slots. Such criteria can be helpful in discouraging unqualified persons from coming forward. When overly restrictive, however, they can discriminate against certain kinds of potential candidates, thus reducing participation in the process or even limiting the options available to the party in difficult races. Worse still, they can be so restrictive as to make broader participation in other aspects of the process meaningless.

In Mexico's Institutional Revolutionary Party, for example, party rules call for the selection of candidates to the senate by state nominating conventions. However, in many instances, these conventions simply voted to approve single options described as "candidates of unity." Typically, these "candidates of unity," although initially identified using a variety of factors including input from various factions and governors, were decided upon by the national party leadership and then presented to the conventions for approval. Candidate requirements established by the leadership in March 2000 were so restrictive that in some cases only one candidate met

the criteria. Moreover, a leadership commission had to ratify all the candidates before they were presented to the conventions for a final vote (Langston 2004).

Although political parties differ in their approaches, typically, party rules establish no or simply minimal conditions for eligibility, leaving the details to bodies such as recruitment panels and/or vetting/list committees. Even then, some parties avoid establishing specific criteria in order to maintain maximum flexibility. A common approach is the use of application forms that not only confirm that potential candidates meet legal eligibility criteria but also ask open-ended questions about the applicant's background.

The constitution of Ghana's NPP simply requires prospective legislative candidates to be: known and active members for at least two years; registered members and voters in the electoral district in which they hope to run (although the branch may issue exemptions); and of good character and standing. They must also pay a fee prescribed by the party; meet legal eligibility criteria; and sign a pledge. Fine Gael's statutes do not address the issue of candidate eligibility at all. (Box 4 outlines some of the typical criteria established by parties around the world while Box 5 provides examples of application form questions/topics.)

The ANC's guidelines for compiling the national proportional representation list include the following candidate eligibility criteria: experience or expertise likely to enhance legislative effectiveness; no criminal record (with the exception of political crimes before April 1994); no history of ill-discipline,

BOX 4: SAMPLE CANDIDATE REQUIREMENTS

Examples of party-defined eligibility criteria for legislative candidates include:

- Meet legal requirements for candidacy.
- Minimum period of membership.
- Minimum years of residency in the electoral district in which the applicant is considering running (where the party's requirements are more exigent than any legal requirements).
- No history of suspension from the party.
- Have paid all membership fees and met any other financial obligations to the party.
- Address or organize a minimum number of public and/or party meetings in his/her electoral district.
- Be supported by a minimum number of party members in good standing (e.g. collect a specified number signatures).
- Pre-approval by central party unit(s).
- Not be a member of any other political party.
- Be free of any criminal record and any pending cases already filed in court or under investigation.

BOX 5: SAMPLE CANDIDATE APPLICATION FORM TOPICS AND QUESTIONS

While some application forms ask direct, open-ended questions, others simply ask applicants to demonstrate their experience/skills in a number of areas. In some cases, vetting panels use a points system to rank applicants. Applicants might be disqualified if they do not meet certain specific criteria (e.g. minimum membership or legal requirements) and/or accumulate various points based on their ability to demonstrate the skills desired. The following topics are adapted from application packs used by British Labour National Parliamentary Panels in the past. The Panel is the body charged with developing the list of preapproved parliamentary candidates. Branches may nominate candidates for their electoral district from this list or propose others who must then be endorsed by the party's National Executive Committee.

- **Party Experience:** Demonstrate a record of relevant experience and/or commitment to the party.
- **Knowledge:** Demonstrate a knowledge and understanding of party policy, public policy issues and processes.
- **Other Life Experience:** Give evidence of other experience outside the party and demonstrate its relevance to the position for which you seek election. This might include experience in: the voluntary sector; public service; your profession; and international exposure.
- **Communication Skills:** Demonstrate the ability to communicate effectively both orally and in writing. For example, give evidence of your ability to give presentations, make speeches, negotiate, write reports etc.
- **Campaigning and Party Development Skills:** Demonstrate the ability to plan and effectively carry out a campaign and show knowledge and understanding of a range of campaigning methods. Give evidence of active involvement in and understanding of different ways of getting messages across to target audiences, membership recruitment and retention, etc.
- **Representational and Problem Solving Skills:** Demonstrate the ability to represent others and construct and present a case effectively – for example, taking up a case on behalf of another person, laying out options for solving the problem and keeping the person informed.
- **Interpersonal, Teamwork and Liaison Skills:** Demonstrate the ability to listen, communicate and relate well to others as well as the ability to work collaboratively with people from a wide range of backgrounds and communities – for example, evidence of your ability to deal with the public, to work with different public, private and community organizations, and to work collaboratively with colleagues – particularly in leadership positions.
- **Other Skills:** List any other relevant skills, which might include: media; delegation and management; planning and time management; and language abilities.
- **Personal Statement:** Address reasons for seeking selection.

corruption, or involvement in fostering divisions; and no breaches of the party code of conduct. Additional criteria set for overall lists require balanced representation of: geography; gender; the country's social composition; sitting members to ensure continuity and experience; age; persons with disabilities; and technical expertise to deal with the challenges of government. Finally, candidates must be prepared to give up all other forms of employment to devote themselves fully to party and legislative work.

Regardless of the approach, an important question is who decides who is eligible to seek the party's nomination. In the case of committees and panels, how are the members elected or appointed and who qualifies to be a member? In the English Liberal Democrats, the party Council elects the Chair of the Candidates Committee, the body responsible for developing

candidate selection rules and overseeing the compilation of lists of preapproved candidates. Other members of the Committee include the chairs of regional candidate committees elected by regional parties, five ordinary members elected by the party Council, the Chief Parliamentary Whip or a member of parliament (MP) appointed by her/him as well as a representative of the party's Parliamentary Candidates Association.

Recruitment Processes

In practice, the process of reducing the pool of eligible individuals down to the final list of candidates for a party's ticket is shaped by a combination of informal and formal factors that encourage or discourage particular individuals from

stepping forward. While political parties play a key role, in open societies, interest groups, civil society, the media and financial supporters can also play an important role.

In their attempts to find the right candidates, some parties use recruitment panels or committees charged with: drawing up a list of potential candidates; establishing their potential interest in running for office; and interviewing them. In the United Kingdom, the Conservatives and other parties continuously process applications from activists sponsored by leading party officials and branches. These potential candidates participate in events that offer training but also give them an opportunity to demonstrate their skills. Candidates rejected at this stage are encouraged to reapply. Those who make it through to the list but are not selected for a particular election remain in the pool from which candidates can be drawn in the future.

Common Considerations in Identifying Candidates

Whether defined formally or informally, parties typically consider factors such as: the individual's history of involvement in the party; political skills (e.g. communication and campaign skills); issues related to ethics; and public appeal. In some cases, the ability to raise funds is also important. These factors are discussed in greater detail below.

History of Active Involvement in the Party. Criteria tied to individuals' history of involvement in the party reward activists. They are designed to give priority to those who are most committed to and familiar with the party views and values. They also serve as a safeguard against those who may simply want to use the party as a vehicle to secure a position in elected office. Typically, they require potential candidates to have one or more of the following: a minimum length of service or membership in the party; all membership dues paid to date; and to have made contributions to the party as an officeholder or through other types of activism.

Decades ago, criteria in the Belgian Socialist Party included: membership of at least five years; minimum annual purchases from the Socialist co-op; regular subscriptions to the party newspaper; enrollment of the candidate's children in state schools; and the participation of the candidate's spouse and children in the appropriate party activities (Rahat and Hazan

2001). In Taiwan's Democratic Progress Party (DPP), potential candidates must have been dues-paying members for at least two years (Manikas and Thornton 2003).

One potential drawback is that these requirements may restrict party access to otherwise attractive candidates, whose successes may have primarily been achieved outside party life, or who meet other criteria that might appeal to the party and/or the voting public. For instance, a party committed to fielding more women, youth or ethnic minorities may choose to recruit candidates from these social groups even if their established history with the party is limited. Similarly, voter name recognition of a well respected member of a political dynasty or an individual with a distinguished military career or high-profile career in the entertainment industry can give campaigns a head start. Some parties therefore allow their leaders to waive minimum membership requirements. In Mexico's Party of the Democratic Revolution, the National Council can name external candidates in up to 20 percent of all slots and more if an increase is approved by a two-thirds majority vote of the Council. Party rules establish two sets of eligibility criteria for potential candidates: one for party members and another for external candidates.

Public Appeal. Voters' perceptions of candidates are shaped by a variety of factors ranging from the emotive to more objective nuanced positions on complex policy issues. Political parties face the challenge of identifying candidates who pass the dual tests of party and popular legitimacy/support. A number of parties use polls to assess public perceptions of various individuals as part of the screening process. In Taiwan, the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) and the KMT have selected candidates based on a combination of membership votes and public support as measured in public opinion polls. Both types of support were given the same weight and the individual with the highest scores won the nomination (Manikas and Thornton 2003). In Mexico, the Institutional Revolutionary Party has conducted opinion polls at the state level to determine which of the potential senate candidates was best known by the voters and which had the best image among potential voters. Greece's Panhellenic Socialist Movement or PASOK has also used polls to gauge the public support of aspiring nominees.

Political Skills. Good public speaking, political judgment, strategic planning and organizational skills are among the most

desirable qualities in a candidate. In the case of individuals who have held party positions, their performance in such positions may be able to provide some indication of their political skills.

The abilities of these potential candidates can also be tested through application forms, mock scenarios and participation in debates with other aspirants.

BOX 6: TIMELINES FOR CANDIDATE SELECTION

Parties can increase the chances of finding the right candidates by investing adequate time and other resources in the process. Parties that leave recruitment – a critical aspect – of the process until the last minute, risk a rush to “fill the ticket” in time for the election. For instance, an individual who initially appears suitable may turn out to have significant weaknesses that the party has no time to fix. Worse still, parties may be forced to run less than satisfactory candidates simply because of the limited choices available. Selecting candidates too early however, may draw out the campaign, forcing parties and/or candidates to incur additional costs. In closed political environments, extended campaigns may expose candidates to longer periods of harassment by autocratic regimes.

African National Congress. List compilation for National Assembly elections can take almost eight months. The 2003 List Process Guidelines laid out the following timetable:

Date	Event
May	Finalize List Process Guidelines and establish list structures
June	Review of incumbents
June - July	Regional party structures briefed on process
July - September	Branches submit nominations
September	Preparations for Provincial List Conferences
October	Provincial List Conferences held; preparations for National List Conference
November - December	National List Conference held; final appeals; lists finalized

British Labour Party. Candidate selection is conducted on a rolling basis. For the selection process beginning in 2006, for instance, selections for electoral districts not held by the Labour Party were held first, with selections for “winnable” electoral districts held last. The entire process, beginning with the opening of applications for inclusion on preapproved lists takes more than 18 months.

Date	Event
January - May 2006	Advertise for National Parliamentary Panel (NPP); applicants to apply by March 1 for interview by May; candidate slots to be filled June 2006
January - May 2006	Adjust to known changes in electoral district boundaries as appropriate
March 2006	Determine positive action procedures
January - May 2006	Interview new NPP applicants
January - June 2006	Training sessions and taster events for NPP applicants
June - December 2006	Selections in non-Labour held electoral districts
November 2006	Sitting MPs receive letters asking if they plan to contest next election; response requested by December 31, 2006
January 2007	Selection in electoral districts with sitting MPs begins
May 2007	Determine positive action for seats with retiring MPs
July 2007	Begin selections in “winnable” seats and those with retiring MPs
September 2008	All selections begin

Ethics. By fielding candidates of high moral standing, parties can demonstrate to the public their commitment to ethics in public office. In addition, ensuring that potential candidates meet certain minimum standards or divulge certain information to the party prior to running can help preempt scandals that could be potentially damaging to the party. In India for instance, as part of its campaign to promote better choices for the voting public, Lok Satta, a citizen movement, screened the backgrounds of various electoral candidates. As a result of their findings, the organization published the names of 45 candidates with criminal records, exposing the individuals as well as their parties to significant embarrassment and damaging public confidence in them. In the lead up to South Korea's April 2000 congressional elections, a civic movement – the Citizens' Alliance – “blackballed” 86 candidates as corrupt, unqualified or otherwise unsuited for office. Fifty-nine of them lost, suggesting that blackballing had significant impacts on both candidate vote shares and on candidates' chances of winning (Horowitz and Kim 2002). Similarly, in the lead up to Romania's 2004 elections, the Coalition for a Clean Parliament, a civic movement, released a list of over 200 candidates blacklisted as unsuitable legislators. Over a quarter of those candidates were eventually removed from party lists.

Parties may ask potential candidates to submit information about their past (prior to participating in candidate selection) and/or to commit to certain ethical standards, should they be chosen to represent the party at election. The Canadian Liberals conduct extensive background checks of potential candidates. In Taiwan, the KMT's regulations prevent individuals who have violated national laws in such areas as organized crime, money laundering, drugs and weapons from running, even if they are in the process of appealing prior convictions. The requirements go beyond the country's legal criteria for candidates. The Code of Conduct of Ireland's Fianna Fáil party prohibits candidates from accepting any contributions that could compromise their independence and requires candidates to forward donations over a certain amount to the party organization or headquarters.

Access to Funds. Political parties need money to fund their operations not only during the campaign but during non-election periods as well. Candidates with the resources necessary

to cover a significant portion of their campaign costs can be an attractive option for parties. Cash-strapped parties may be tempted to offer certain candidate slots to the most resourceful individuals. However, in the absence of other criteria, aspiring candidates may simply “buy” a candidacy either for a particular electoral district or to secure a desirable position on a list. This could undermine transparency and accountability not only within parties but in broader political processes as well, especially if such candidates are elected.

Depending on the selection process and local conditions, securing the nomination itself may cost aspirants significant amounts of money. For instance in 2006, ConservativeHome, an online community that describes itself as independent but supportive of the United Kingdom's Conservative Party, estimated that based on the experiences of 16 individuals, nomination campaigns could cost between £27,235 and £41,500 (including actual expenses as well as estimates of lost income). Concerned at the cost to aspirants, ConservativeHome suggested reducing the costs of attending a Parliamentary Assessment Board and establishing an emergency fund for candidates in financial crisis. In response, David Cameron noted that the party would continue its practice of reducing Parliamentary Assessment Board fees on a case by case basis and promised to explore the possibility of the emergency fund.

In most cases, contestants are expected to use a combination of personal resources and funds they raise to cover the expense of their nomination campaigns. Where the costs of securing the nomination (and/or the campaign costs, if largely born by the individuals) are perceived to be high, it could prevent otherwise qualified candidates who lack the necessary resources from participating. In certain cases, organizations independent of political parties as well as specialized party wings have provided financial support to candidates from historically marginalized groups during the nomination process as well as the campaign itself. Examples include Emily's List, which supports pro-choice Democratic women in the United States and the UK Ethnic Minority Liberal Democrats, which assists ethnic minority candidates with fundraising among other things.

Socioeconomic and Educational Background. Specific educational requirements can be controversial and could potentially discriminate against large segments of the population that may otherwise have important contributions to make to

BOX 7: EVALUATING ASPIRANTS IN SOUTH AFRICA'S DEMOCRATIC ALLIANCE

Politics, by nature, combines art as well as science. While clear rules and procedures play an important role in fostering transparency, encouraging participation and minimizing the potential for conflict, there is a legitimate case for allowing parties some flexibility to adapt to political factors. Moreover, given the inherently competitive nature of multiparty politics, it is only natural that political parties go to significant lengths to keep information about sensitive aspects of their selection process from their competitors. For these and other reasons, there are no easy answers to the question of how party leaders and members weigh different considerations in evaluating aspirants to the nomination. While some parties simply leave it to the individuals charged with screening applicants to use their own best judgment in determining the suitability of a particular applicant, others use formal scoring criteria. For instance, Article 7.3 of the nomination procedures for South Africa's Democratic Alliance (DA) states that evaluation of aspiring candidates "must, to the greatest extent possible, be done on the bases of objective criteria and in the terms of a standard system of scoring, which will be developed by the Federal Executive." The constitution also outlines the various components of the evaluation:

- Provincial executive official (or his/her nominee)'s written assessment of the individual's sustained contribution to the growth and development of the party;
- Provincial executive official (or his/her nominee)'s written assessment of the individual's contribution to and/or leadership role in his/her community or wider society;
- An assessment of relevant training undertaken by the individual; and
- In the case of incumbent or former elected representatives:
 - A written evaluation of their sustained contribution as a member of that body by the relevant leadership (typically the party leader and whip in the concerned body); as well as
 - For each year in office for the term immediately prior to selection, performance as assessed against any frameworks developed by the Federal Council.

Each individual receives a copy of their evaluation and, if satisfied, signs the documents. Individuals who have concerns about their evaluation may write to the chair of their selection panel to express their concerns. The evaluations are confidential and are only made available to the members of the selection panel.

the political process. On the other hand, arguably, a certain basic level of education is necessary in order to fully and effectively perform the full range of duties of a publicly elected official. Even where formally defined party criteria do not include educational requirements, potential candidates' socioeconomic and educational background may be an important factor for parties. As indicated earlier, one of the considerations in the ANC guidelines for compiling candidate lists for the national proportional representation system is achieving a mix of technical expertise required for effective government.

In electoral districts where a significant proportion of the voters belong to a particular economic or social class, political parties may be able to gain a competitive edge by fielding a candidate who is able to "connect" with the electorate. This is particularly the case in electoral systems featuring small district magnitudes. For instance, in an electoral district with significant concentrations of farmers or laborers, a candidate who is likely

to be perceived as "white collar" or "old money" may not be the best choice. Similarly, in largely farming or rural communities, voters may view a "city slicker" with suspicion.

Some studies suggest that in general, and perhaps subconsciously, political parties tend to choose legislative candidates whose incomes, educational levels and occupations are generally much higher than those of the general population. This could be explained by a number of factors. For instance, individuals with higher levels of education are more likely to have acquired the skills (public speaking, writing, understanding of economics, foreign policy etc.) that are most useful in winning the selection as well as the election campaign. In addition, professionals typically have more flexibility with their work hours and income than manual laborers, making it easier for them to devote the time necessary to secure the nomination and fight the campaign (Ranney 1981).

Incumbents. Determining the fate of incumbents often poses a challenge. Party leaders may be reluctant to replace

individuals who have not only served the party in elected office but proved, by their victory in the previous election, that they can deliver. Moreover, incumbency frequently comes with the advantages of name recognition and access to resources (e.g. branch or electoral district offices and staff). At the same time, automatically rerunning them could encourage cronyism, limit opportunities to inject new blood into the party, and decrease accountability to the membership. In some cases, an elected official may simply have failed to perform or even turned against the party while in office. As touched on previously, one of the ANC's objectives in developing national lists is to ensure continuity and experience by returning a reasonable number of incumbents. While the party has no formal quota for this purpose, its List Committee generally aims to return at least one third of incumbent national and provincial legislators to office by placing them in "safe" positions (International IDEA and EISA 2006).

One option is to provide for a formal assessment of incumbents by a panel of party officials. In 2000, based on an assessment of local councilors, South Africa's ANC decided to conduct regular assessments of the performance of the party's public representatives. As a result of the decision, a review of national and provincial legislators was conducted in the lead up to the 2004 general elections. The results of the review were submitted to national party officials and the National List Committee and played a role in the compilation of lists for the general election. From 1977 to 1984, the Israeli Labour Party used a two-stage process for incumbents. Sitting legislators who had served two terms or more were required to secure the support of 60 percent of the party's Central Committee in order to renew their candidacy. Only then could they present their candidacy to the party's nominating committee. Other aspiring candidates (non-incumbents or those who had only served a single term) were not required to go through this preselection stage (Barnea and Rahat 2007).

In the UK Labour Party, the leadership typically writes to all sitting MPs asking them whether they wish to stand again and informs them of the reselection procedures. This usually requires the MPs to secure support from a majority of party units and affiliated organizations within their electoral district. In the event that an MP fails in this regard, the candidate slot is declared open. However, the sitting MP is still entitled to

compete against any challengers who emerge. Parties who are concerned that such measures could restrict competition may choose to simply have incumbents go through the same process as new contestants but grant them automatic preapproval where relevant or appropriate.

BALANCING THE TICKET

Regardless of the candidate selection procedures they use, parties may decide that special arrangements are required to make their slate of candidates more representative in terms of gender, geography, persons with disabilities, youth, ethnicity, race or other marginalized groups. Depending on the history of a party, there may also be other "factional" interests to consider, for instance labor unions in the case of UK Labour and South Africa's ANC. Initiatives to "balance the ticket" are mostly used for ideological reasons or to strengthen the public image of the party and to attract votes from these particular groups. They can be loosely grouped into three types of efforts: rhetorical or informal strategies that simply involve reaffirmation of the need for balance without any specifics (e.g. in public statements or party documents); mandatory quotas; and other types of affirmative action such as weighted systems or specialized support, including training and funding, for target groups.

Rhetorical and Informal Strategies

Parties may simply choose to establish guidelines that require balanced representation of different interests in party structures and positions. In the ANC, input from provincial branches and additional guidelines for overall lists are designed to help balance the ticket. With the exception of women, none of the various interests are guaranteed quotas. This option affords party leaders the greatest flexibility. However, rhetoric alone may be insufficient to convince specific interest groups or the broader public of a party's commitment to a balanced ticket. It is also unlikely to induce change.

Quotas and Other Types of Affirmative Action

Advocates of affirmative action argue that it is necessary redress for systemic discrimination and helps compensate for barriers that prevent marginalized groups from getting their

BOX 8: SOME APPROACHES TO BALANCING THE TICKET

All-Women Shortlists and Twinned Electoral Districts: In the United Kingdom (UK), where legislative elections are based on the single-member plurality or First Past the Post system, the Labour Party has used two different types of outcome quotas. In selected electoral districts in England, party members were required to choose their candidates from all-women shortlists. For the first elections to the new Scottish Parliament, Welsh Assembly and Greater London Assembly, the party twinned constituencies with similar characteristics and asked members to select one male and one female candidate. This allowed the party to ensure that half of the candidates for those elections were women. Under this system, sub-national party selectors in the two constituencies came together to pick candidates. Each participant had two votes, one for a woman and one for a man (Norris 2004). This system was possible because of the lack of incumbents. The quota system used in England applied to half of the vacant seats. The party also uses procedural quotas to secure positions for women, blacks and ethnic minorities on candidate shortlists.

Incremental Quotas: Germany's Social Democrats introduced gender quotas incrementally, allowing the party to expand its cadre of qualified female candidates over time. The party set a target of 25 percent for the first two years, increasing to 33.3 percent for the next four years and reaching 40 percent by the sixth year (Davidson-Schmich 2006). Incremental approaches have the added advantage of allowing party officials and members to adjust to the idea of quotas.

Functional and Geographic Districts in Proportional Representation Systems: Under another approach, specific geographic areas or social groups select representatives who are guaranteed slots on the party list. For instance, in Israel, the Labour and Likud parties have set aside positions on their national proportional representation lists for certain geographic areas (Jerusalem, Tel Aviv, Haifa). Only party candidates and members resident in the targeted geographical district are allowed to run and vote in the selection process for those specific slots. Other slots have been set aside for social groups such as women, youth, Arabs and residents of cooperative or collective settlements. In this case, the reserved positions were only used as a safety net or guarantee. For example, if no female candidate won a high enough position in the primary to make it into a "safe" position on the list, the highest placed female candidate would be "promoted" to that position (Rahat and Hazan 2001).

"Zippering" or the "Zipper Principle": This usually refers to the requirement that male and female candidates be alternated over a list of candidates. In the case of proportional representation lists, for instance, zippering, combined with a quota of 30 percent women's representation would require that a female candidate be placed in every third position on the list. This would help ensure that women are included in the "safe" positions on the list. In some cases, the principle applies across lists or positions. For instance, in 1995, the Flemish Greens in Belgium introduced a party rule preventing multiple lists from being headed by candidates of the same sex (in the event of different elections being held simultaneously).

fair share of political leadership positions. It can provide individuals from marginalized groups improved and more equitable chances for success in seeking elected office. However, critics argue that affirmative action is undemocratic because it violates the principle of equal opportunity. Tensions may arise over the perception that quotas grant one social group unfair advantage over another. For instance, youth might argue that gender quotas make it more difficult for them to compete fairly for nominations. A dispute over selection procedures led to a legal challenge against the UK Labour Party's gender quota. While the petition was denied, the fact that it occurred at all is an indication of the controversy that quotas can engender.

Some opponents of affirmative action go as far as arguing that affirmative action can actually reinforce negative

stereotypes by creating the perception that the beneficiaries are incapable of competing on an equal footing. During the 2001 Liberal Democrats conference that rejected a motion calling for all-women shortlists, one female delegate argued, "The proposers are telling me that I cannot fulfill my dream of becoming an MP without this motion. They underestimate me" (Squires 2005). Quotas can also create a glass ceiling of sorts: minimum standards for the representation of women, for instance, may in practice become the target (and thus, a *de facto* maximum) that political parties set for themselves. At the same time, heavily decentralized and participatory selection procedures rarely produce balanced tickets in the absence of corrective measures.

Quotas and other types of affirmative action can be set at

different levels (e.g. 30 or 40 percent) and can be applied at different stages in candidate selection processes. While some aim to achieve a particular outcome in terms of candidates selected, others are simply procedural. In the case of the former, a party might commit to a specific percentage of its candidates being women, for example, while a procedural quota would only require that a specific percentage of women be shortlisted. The UK Liberal Democrats require that 30 percent of their candidate shortlists be filled by women.

Some electoral systems favor the use of party quotas more than others (Larsrud and Taphorn 2007). In systems featuring large district magnitudes, party officials and members have greater flexibility in distributing possible mandates among the various interests within their organization. Under one approach for this system, the representatives of the target group – women, or a particular ethnic group, for instance – compete against others for a slot, as usual. In the event that they fail to win the support required to secure a position, the individual(s) from the target group who secure(s) the highest level(s) of support is “promoted” onto the list or into a “safe” position. This has the advantage of encouraging the targeted groups to develop the skills necessary to compete on an equal footing while offering a safeguard in the event that they do not make the final cut based on their votes alone.

Under outcome quotas, in First Past the Post systems, however, branches may resent being required to pick from a particular social group – thus potentially sacrificing their own preferences – in the broader interests of the party. Nevertheless, as Box 8 shows, the UK Labour Party has used outcome quotas successfully.

Whether they apply to parties in proportional representation or plurality/majority systems, quotas and reserved positions are most effective when they address issues of placement. Quotas that set impressive targets on paper for the representation of women and other marginalized groups become a mockery when candidates from the targeted groups are mostly placed near the bottom of candidate lists or fielded in marginal seats. Labour’s electoral chances in each location formed part of the rationale for twinning and targeting electoral districts. Similarly, some parties in proportional representation systems have combined quotas with “zippering” or other guarantees of strategic placement on lists (see Box 8 for more information on zippering).

Regardless of the option selected, party quotas and other types of affirmative action for candidate selection are more likely to succeed when combined with initiatives that provide other opportunities for marginalized groups to hold internal party leadership positions. These experiences improve the pool of qualified candidates available to political parties. Setting time limits may help ensure that quotas are used only as temporary corrective measures that are designed to jumpstart participation by marginalized groups. In Denmark, for example, the gender quotas previously used by political parties have now been discontinued.

Specialized Support Systems

Parties that recognize that certain marginalized groups need special attention, but are reluctant to set aside specific candidacies for them, can establish special internal task forces to focus on marginalized groups. Such specialized units can, of course, also be used in combination with other types of affirmative action. The scope of units may vary, in line with the party’s level of commitment. In some cases, they simply offer moral support and networking opportunities, conduct outreach and monitor/advocate for improvements to party structures, processes and policies. In other situations, they offer specialized training and/or financial support.

Most political parties have wings that cater to groups such as women and youth. In general, the mandate of these groups is broad enough to include support to their target groups during candidate selection. In some cases, however, this may be a specifically defined objective of these organizations. In 2005, members of the UK Conservative Party launched Women2Win, an initiative designed to increase the number of Tory women MPs. According to the Ethnic-Minority Liberal Democrats (EMLD) website (www.ethnic-minority.libdems.org), the objectives of the EMLD, a special unit within the UK Liberal Democrats, are to: “encourage, guide and assist EMLD members to play a full role in the democratic processes of the party at all levels; and to work towards an equitable representation of members of ethnic minority communities on public bodies and to elected public office.” EMLD provides assistance to ethnic minority party members who are interested in seeking the candidacy of a particular electoral district over the medium to long term, and also supports candidates with training and

fundraising. All these activities are conducted with the approval of, and in partnership with, the relevant party branch.

MECHANISMS AND STRATEGIES FOR PRESERVING PARTY COHESION

Candidate selection involves an inescapable trade-off between competition and cohesion within political parties. Clear and transparent selection procedures that incorporate institutional safeguards designed to balance various considerations can enhance prospects for a competitive election process whose outcome will be respected by all. However, there are no guarantees of a smooth process. Violations of party rules in the heat of the intra-party campaign for the nomination and disagreements over the conduct or outcome of the process all have the potential to split a party and its support, damage its public image, divert energies away from more important tasks and threaten the chances of success at the polls.

While aggrieved aspirants deserve opportunities to seek redress, leadership should also have the option of sanctioning wayward members whose actions pose a threat to or undermine the party. In general, therefore, parties should consider a combination of measures that protect the party while addressing the potential needs and concerns of individual aspirants. In certain cases, political parties may have cause to undertake disciplinary measures against contestants for the nomination. In particularly egregious cases, such as unsuccessful contestants who run as independents or seek the nomination of another party, expulsion from the party is common. In less extreme cases, any sanctions should be proportionate to the scale of the offence.

As the old adage goes, “Prevention is better than cure.” Keeping the lines of communication open within the party can be helpful in preventing disputes further down the line. While some problems can be solved through informal means, parties should also consider establishing formal procedures for recording, filing, hearing and adjudicating any complaints that may arise as well as any disciplinary measures that may be taken.

Inspiring Confidence in Selection Processes

As is discussed in the section on institutionalization, selection procedures that are too rigidly defined may limit

the flexibility that political parties need to respond to fluid political environments. However, parties can enhance transparency, increase participation and preempt misunderstandings by establishing clear rules and ensuring compliance with them. Further, many parties incorporate provisions designed to limit the potential for conflicts of interests in selection procedures.

Procedural frameworks can only promote transparency, foster participation and mitigate conflict when parties abide by their own stated rules. Efforts to circumvent the rules increase the potential for conflict, leaving parties vulnerable to court actions (where the option exists) as well as to embarrassing negative press coverage. Voters and members may have legitimate concerns that a party that fails to respect its own rules is unlikely to follow due process if elected to office.

Parties using selection procedures that involve balloting may consider granting potential candidates the right to appoint agents to monitor the process. To further enhance transparency, some political parties have invited independent groups to either observe or help administer the process. In Kenya, for instance, well respected civic groups and the country’s Electoral Commission have served as observers or “selection administrators,” contributing to the credibility of voting and counting processes in internal party races. In South Africa’s ANC, provincial branches are required to contract independent agencies to administer voting and counting at list conferences.

Candidate Pledges and Codes of Conduct

Problems are less likely when everyone knows what is expected of them. Candidate pledges and codes of conduct can be helpful in establishing behavioral norms. In some cases parties do not require candidates to sign written contracts or codes but instead opt to include such guidelines in party rules and simply ask candidates to reaffirm their commitment to the regulations. Although the relevant topics vary from one party to the next, the commitments most commonly required of potential candidates are described in Box 9. Canada’s Conservative Party goes a step further, requiring aspiring candidates to pay a good conduct bond of \$1,000 that is reimbursable to those who are determined to have observed relevant party rules.

BOX 9: COMMON PROVISIONS OF CODES OF CONDUCT

Provisions related to *party discipline and cohesion* typically require potential candidates to accept the party's final decision and to support the winning candidate, should they lose the internal race. The obvious intent of such clauses is to discourage divisions that could either split the party and its vote or damage its public image.

Pledges or codes can also require potential candidates to confirm that they meet all the *legal eligibility* criteria to run for public office. Even in cases where parties lack the ability to verify that potential candidates are, in fact, legally eligible, such provisions allow political parties to perform a minimum amount of due diligence. This not only provides some minimal safeguards against wasting time and funds on the potential candidate but also limits possible embarrassment down the line.

In addition to ensuring that aspirants meet legal requirements, some parties may choose to set additional *moral or ethical standards* for their candidates. These can range from respect for the provisions of interparty codes of conduct (where they exist) to disclosure of personal business interests and financial information.

Codes of conduct may also establish *ground rules for the campaign for the nomination* addressing such issues as: confidentiality of membership lists provided or other aspects of the selection process, treatment of other contestants, and participation in aspirant debates.

Provisions related to *campaign finance* can help ensure that candidates keep proper records and inform party officials of the donations they receive. In some instances provisions may even stipulate that candidates contribute a certain percentage or donations above a particular amount to the party. Campaign finance provisions can provide safeguards against influence peddling by individual candidates, make it possible for parties to maintain proper financial records, and, where candidates are required to declare and or share funds raised, ensure that the central party also benefits from successful fundraising by its candidates. Provisions on campaign finance may also be particularly helpful in countries where financing of nomination campaigns is regulated by law.

Dispute Resolution

Parties may choose to have already existing party structures, a party ombudsman's office, for instance, hear and rule on any complaints or to establish bodies for the specific purpose of resolving disputes over selection procedures. This involves addressing such questions as the qualities for membership of such bodies and how the members are to be selected. Ensuring that the dispute resolution body is viewed as credible and has the authority to make real decisions is critical.

Dispute procedures that are too loosely defined risk leaving too much to the discretion of individuals charged with adjudicating complaints. On the other hand, overly complex dispute procedures can make it difficult for members to air their grievances. The possibility of appealing decisions by the dispute panel risks drawing out the process further but may help ensure that possibilities for resolving problems within the party are fully exhausted. Further, in most countries, state courts will only hear cases relating to internal party business when

plaintiffs can establish a case that their party's regulations may not have been fairly or properly applied. As such, dispute procedures should be speedy not only to prevent the public media from making a running story of internal party divisions but also to avoid using up valuable campaign time on resolving internal divisions.

In the case of the English Liberal Democrats, prospective candidates whose applications are turned down can request a reassessment by the Candidates Committee. If the rejection still stands, the individual may then submit a complaint to the Appeals Panel on the grounds that proper procedures were not applied. The Panel comprises members elected by the party's English Council as well as individuals appointed by regional structures in England.

Even in cases where formal dispute procedures exist, the scale and nature of conflict may demand special measures. In the aftermath of particularly contentious nomination processes in selected constituencies, Ghana's NPP established a special task force charged with mending damaged relationships in those areas.

SOME LOGISTICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Aside from resolving some of the issues discussed above – including how wide the electorate should be, the role of party branches, and how best to balance the ticket – parties must also identify practical ways to implement these decisions.

Meeting Formats

Different events – debates or informal social events, for instance – can create opportunities for party members to meet and/or hear from contestants for the nomination and to ask them questions about their experience and policy positions. In geographically large electoral districts, parties may need to consider travel distances and members' personal schedules when identifying locations, times and dates for such events. Time permitting, parties may choose to organize a variety of events over multiple dates. These events can strengthen party sentiment, help selectors cast an informed vote and serve as a public relations tool. Reports or footage of contestant debates and other informative materials can also be made available on party websites or through other media.

Most selection meetings follow the same basic format. Following opening remarks by a neutral party official, candidates may be given the opportunity to address the audience and take questions. They may also be required to publicly sign a pledge to respect the outcome of the process prior to the vote. In many cases, after the results are announced, concession speeches are also used to reaffirm support for the selected candidate.

Voting and Ratification Systems

Postal Ballots, Electronic Voting and Voting in Person. Assuming that postal services are reliable and/or that voting technology is user-friendly and readily available to most members, these options can vastly increase members' ability to participate in party decision-making processes. For instance, registering a vote on the party's website or putting a ballot in the mail requires significantly less effort than attending a meeting in a central location that may be farther away than the nearest post office or computer. Costs for either option may also be lower than certain types of meetings. However, both options carry various risks in terms

of the integrity/security of the vote and the potential for manipulation of the count.

Exhaustive Ballot. Where a significant degree of party unity is required, parties may opt for the "exhaustive ballot" as their selection method. Under this system, each selector casts a single vote for his/her favorite candidate. If no candidate receives an absolute majority of votes, the candidate with the fewest votes is eliminated and a further round of voting occurs. This process is repeated for as many rounds as necessary until one candidate has a majority or to produce a smaller list of options for subsequent vote by another or broader group. Since voters may have to cast votes several times, the exhaustive ballot may not be appropriate for large electorates. It can work well, however, as part of a multi-stage system. Despite the risk of a long, drawn-out procedure in the event of repeated votes, one advantage of the exhaustive ballot is that it forces a decision by absolute majority. The Alternative Vote system produces the same effect through multiple counts but without requiring selectors to cast votes over several rounds.

Multiple and Preferential Voting Systems. Where political parties are charged with identifying candidates for multi-member electoral districts and/or proportional representation systems, multiple and/or preferential voting systems can allow for broader participation in ranking/placing various candidates. These systems, if set up to mirror national electoral systems, may also provide some indication of a possible election result and/or serve as a civic education tool for members.

As indicated previously, during the 1980s, in their candidate selection procedures, three Irish parties used the Single Transferable Vote system that was also used in the general elections. Similarly, Israeli parties have used multiple voting to determine candidate rankings for the national proportional representation list system. In the lead up to the 1996 elections, central committees of the three constituent parties of the Meretz alliance in Israel drew up a shortlist of approved candidates. In a second step, all Meretz members were allocated several votes – more than the number of "safe" seats – and cast them in favor of different candidates. In a variation, the Israeli Labour Party gave each member only 11 to 15 votes; the party expected an estimated 20 "safe" seats. In both cases candidates were ranked according to the number of votes they received (Rahat and Hazan 2001). In some cases, parties reserve a specific number of list slots and/or positions that are not open to a vote. These

safe positions are usually reserved for individuals with high leadership value.

List Ratification Systems. “List ratification” offers political party leaders another approach for ensuring some buy-in for multiple candidates without opening up the whole process for discussion. Such limits may be necessary for practical reasons such as time or simply because of the coordination required for long lists. In many electoral districts in Belgium, party members were asked either to vote for a “model list” or to express their preferences regarding candidates. Preferential votes were only counted if more than 50 percent of party members did not ratify the “model list” (Rahat and Hazan 2001). A less permissive model involves simply presenting a list prepared by a committee for “ratification” by a slightly broader group such as a convention/congress.

Financing Candidate Selection Processes

While there is little information readily available on the costs of administering candidate selection processes, it is safe to assume that the funds required will vary significantly based on such factors as local conditions and the nature of the process itself. While the cost implications associated with various approaches should play a role in decisions about selection procedures, they are only one aspect of the plethora of factors to be considered. In some cases, the costs of certain options may outweigh the benefits; in others the reverse will be true.

However, reforms likely to cause drastic increases in the costs of administering candidate selection are likely to create dramatic waves in other aspects of party life. As such, parties that undertake sweeping changes in their selection procedures may want to consider phasing in the reforms over time to allow party structures sufficient time to lay the necessary groundwork including in the area of fundraising.

Some distribution of costs among the various stakeholders in the process may be feasible. Branches and members who are given reasonable and meaningful opportunity to participate in key areas of party life, including candidate selection, are more likely to be willing to help fund party operations. For instance, where members are entitled to a direct or indirect vote in selection procedures, paid-up membership is a reasonable and common prerequisite for participation. In Canada, for instance,

membership recruitment drives are an integral part of the nomination campaign.

Some parties impose nomination fees. These could be perceived as a legitimate means of testing aspiring nominees’ ability to mobilize funds for the party or their level of support. They could also deter spurious attempts to seek the nomination and help cover costs – such as extensive background checks – that may be associated with processing applications. Sufficient notice of any fees can increase transparency, allowing aspirants to make the necessary arrangements and compete under fair conditions. While such fees may be warranted in certain cases, excessively high requirements can impede participation in the process.

In Canada’s Liberal Party of Quebec, aspirants must pay a deposit of \$1,000 to obtain an application pack. The deposit is reimbursable 30 days following the contest or 30 days following notice of a decision not to seek the nomination. Completed nomination forms must be submitted with a non-refundable check for \$1,000. The Canadian Conservative Party requires aspiring nominees to pay a non-frivolous bond of \$1,000 that is reimbursable to individuals who fail to secure approval as contestants for the nomination or those who secure at least 10 percent of the first vote in the selection process. Both of Ghana’s largest political parties require aspirants to pay nomination fees.

In the United Kingdom’s Conservative Party, aspirants are levied a fee for their participation in a day-long Parliamentary Assessment Board (£250 in 2006). Further, all individuals placed on the approved list are asked to pay an annual subscription (£80 for 2006/2007) for the Approved Association of Conservative Candidates that is used to help fund networking events, subsidize training and cover administrative costs. As indicated previously, as part of a broader discussion about the funds required to campaign for the nomination, some groups have suggested that the Parliamentary Assessment Board fee should be reduced.

CANDIDATE SELECTION FOR COALITIONS

Under certain conditions, political parties may choose to contest elections through coalitions or alliances. For the purposes of this study, a coalition or alliance includes any arrangement that involves a union between two or more

political parties and/or groups for the purpose of gaining a greater chance of success at the polls than the individual members could hope to achieve on their own. Coalitions may offer political parties additional diversity and thus greater public appeal, increase votes (through the combined support of each member), and a broader range of knowledge and abilities. However, they require compromise and, as such, demand that each of the members relinquishes some measure of control to the broader group.

As difficult as it may be for individual parties to identify the right combination of features for their candidate selection procedures, the challenge can be made more daunting by the decision to contest elections as part of a coalition or alliance. In such cases, parties must find a middle ground that suits not only their internal and individual party interests but is also compatible with the goals and interests of its partners and the coalition or alliance as a whole. Depending on their objectives, coalitions may entail varying degrees of cooperation/partnership among their members. In terms of candidate selection, for instance, coalition members may decide that they will: publicly declare mutual support for each other's broad policy goals without necessarily fielding joint candidates; not compete for the same seats or in the same areas; or share/combine their resources to defeat another candidate, party or coalition. The implications of various degrees of cooperation are further described below.

Agreeing Not to Compete

For coalitions contesting legislative elections in countries featuring multiple electoral districts, one approach involves calculated negotiations among coalition members about their respective strongholds. On a case by case basis, to avoid splitting the vote and to maximize cost effectiveness, coalition members may decide to withdraw from the race in specific constituencies in favor of whichever party's candidate seems to have the greatest chance of winning. Where available, reliable polling data or information on past voting patterns can be helpful to coalition members in deciding which party is best placed to run in which electoral district. Where a party has already selected a candidate before eventually deciding to back another party's candidate, persuading party members to switch their vote and the selected candidate to

stand down may pose some difficulties. Disenchanted nominees forced to step down from the party ticket may choose to run as independent candidates, splitting the vote.

The "Back Door Primary" Option

Electoral systems featuring runoff options may offer political parties in coalition an easy way to gauge the respective strengths of their candidates. In France, for instance, legislative candidates who secure over 12.5 percent of the registered electorate in the first round can stand in the runoff. Whoever secures the highest number of votes in the second round wins the election. While many two-round systems are designed to produce an absolute majority in the runoff, in this case an absolute majority is not required. In some cases, political parties that have already agreed to an alliance use the first vote as a *de facto* or "back door" primary. All members of the alliance field candidates in the first round of the election, but agree to withdraw in favor of whichever candidate receives the most votes to avoid splitting the vote in the second round. Again, coalition members may choose to leave the decision among the various candidates of the constituent parties to the electorate. Since in most cases it is the two candidates with the most votes who go through to the second round, members of the coalition simply agree to support the candidate who makes it through to the runoff.

The "back door" option is attractive for its simplicity. First, it allows each member party to select its candidate in accordance with its own procedures. Because the results of the first round provide independent verification of each party's level of support, this approach also allows coalition and alliance partners to back the candidate who appears to have the greatest chance of winning at the polls. In such situations, coalition partners may be able to negotiate additional aspects of their agreement (e.g. seats in government) based on their respective support in the first round. For instance, a party securing 30 percent of the vote in the first round would be able to negotiate from a position of strength relative to other partners garnering a smaller share of the votes. The principal disadvantage of this option is the cost implication. Instead of pooling their resources behind a unified candidate for the first round, parties may be forced to spend considerable funds campaigning on

behalf of a candidate who fails to make it through to the second round.

Joint Candidate Selection

Where coalitions are determined before candidate selection occurs within individual coalition partners, joint selection of candidates can be attractive for many reasons. Reaching agreement on a unified selection process may allow coalitions to build trust and strengthen the relationship among members through a negotiated compromise and broaden support among constituent party members for the coalition. It can also provide their respective members a fair chance to compete against others for coalition seats, give their members or representatives a greater say in the final choice and allow them to pool resources not only for the selection procedure but also for the eventual campaign. On the other hand, parties with very different approaches to candidate selection may find it difficult to reach agreement on a unified system.

Since a unified process is often the result of extensive negotiations, coalition members may want to consider describing the process in greater written detail than may be desirable or necessary in individual parties. This would not only preempt any misunderstanding among coalition partners but would also serve as an important tool in ensuring that each partner properly explains the procedures to its members or representatives. Many of the same questions that individual parties face in designing their selection systems would apply. What selection procedure is best suited to the country's electoral

system? Who is qualified to run as a potential candidate? How wide should the electorate be? What role should the branches of the constituent members have?

In addition, coalition members may choose between egalitarian approaches and weighted systems. Under the former, all coalition members have the same number of votes and thus have equal opportunity to influence the final choice. While attractive for its egalitarianism, larger coalition partners may argue that all the partners are not equal and as such should not be able to influence the process to the same degree. Smaller coalition partners, on the other hand, may find that this system safeguards their ability to influence the process. Under weighted systems, the votes are distributed among coalition members based on an agreed formula designed to reflect the respective power of each partner. As such, a party perceived as the lead partner in the coalition would be granted the largest number of votes while smaller members would receive a smaller share.

South Africa's ANC contested the 1995 local elections in alliance with three other parties. Candidate lists for the alliance were compiled through list committees at three levels: local, district/regional and national. As the largest party in the alliance, the ANC had five members on each committee while other alliance partners had only two or one. Each alliance partner's influence was determined based on the size of its membership, the number of functioning branches, and past electoral performance (Rose and O'Connell). One rationale for this approach is that each coalition partner is rewarded in proportion to its ability to contribute to the coalition through possible

BOX 10: SOME OPTIONS FOR JOINT CANDIDATE SELECTION BY COALITIONS

Joint preselection involves the constituent members of the coalition working together to vet aspiring candidates before they are presented for final selection. In the case of proportional representation systems, for example, this could involve joint list committees. This is the approach used by the African National Congress and its Alliance partners. In plurality/majority systems, this would involve an approach similar to that used by the United Democratic Forces (UDF) in Belarus.

Another option involves *separate preselection*, whereby constituent members of the coalition are free to preselect potential candidates using their own procedures. In a second step, coalition members together decide among the various candidates. In proportional representation systems, this would involve finding a way to combine and rank the separate lists of constituent parties. This was the approach used by the Meretz alliance in Israel in 1996. In plurality/majority systems, this would involve a sort of run-off system (with the candidates of the different constituent parties competing against one another) to produce the final slate of candidates.

votes, funding and other resources. While it is likely to be attractive to larger coalition partners, smaller parties may feel that their ability to influence the process is minimized.

A third approach bypasses the issue of the respective weight of each partner's vote by establishing general criteria for direct participation in the process. In practice, whichever coalition partner is most successful in mobilizing the greatest number of persons meeting the established criteria to directly participate or able to put forward the candidates with broadest appeal would have the most influence over the process. In Belarus, the United Democratic Forces (UDF) used a series of conventions at the local and regional levels to nominate candidates. The local and regional meetings were open to the membership of coalition partners as well as nongovernmental organizations and others sympathetic to the UDF's program. For Israel's 1996 elections, the Meretz alliance used a two-round process to select candidates for the national proportional representation list system. First, each of the three central committees produced a shortlist of approved candidates. In the second round, all Meretz members ranked the various candidates by casting multiple votes (Rahat and Hazan 2001).

CONCLUSION

Political parties benefit from clear rules for the selection of legislative candidates. Transparent rules that are established well in advance of each contest can help channel healthy competition and minimize the potential for conflict. Selection rules may specify who is eligible to participate in the selection process, the qualifications required to contest the nomination, and the mechanisms by which candidates will eventually be determined.

When devising their selection rules, parties often respond to several conflicting pressures. In an effort to identify candidates who can claim the endorsement of a broad swathe of party supporters, in recent decades many parties in established democracies have granted members a meaningful role in selection procedures. Similar trends are evident in nascent party systems. Parties may also be legitimately concerned with safeguarding party cohesion and discipline by ensuring that all candidates agree with major party aims. Further, they may also be interested in ensuring that their candidates represent a cross-section of constituencies – geographic, ethnic, gender, for instance – within the party and the country at large. In short,

BOX 11: PRACTICAL QUESTIONS FOR CANDIDATE SELECTION

- Which process suits the electoral system and calendar?
- What system suits cultural norms?
- What system represents the stated values of the party?
- Which process best balances different internal interests or resolves competition fairly?
- Which is more important: fielding a candidate who advocates for a particular policy or ideal or a candidate who will appeal to a broader cross-section of the electorate?
- If working in coalition, what system would ensure that each group has a fair share of candidates standing in winnable seats or “safe” positions?
- If the party is committed to a balanced ticket, which system allows it to achieve this goal?
- Which system energizes party members?
- Which system could help increase public awareness of and participation in the party's activities?
- What is logistically realistic?
- What can the party afford to do?

as Box 11 illustrates, parties face a series of questions that require them to maximize chances of electoral success while balancing a variety of internal party interests.

In their efforts to balance these various considerations, political parties have a number of democratic safeguards at their disposal. For instance, parties concerned about “instant” members who join with the sole objective of influencing candidate selection can impose a waiting period for new members. Similarly, leadership preapproval of candidate lists can help ensure branch participation while preserving party identity. Quotas and other affirmative action devices can offer party leaders an opportunity to produce balanced party tickets. In many political parties, candidate selection includes multiple stages, each involving different safeguards. While overly complicated selection procedures can discourage participation, careful staging provides additional opportunities for balancing various interests. Rules for the internal adjudication of conflict may help create opportunities for addressing the concerns of aggrieved members, discouraging them from taking disputes to the courts or from exiting the party altogether.

Selection rules can only minimize conflict to the extent that

they are respected by party officials. Consequently, while it is important for parties to create mechanisms that allow for transparency, accountability and participation in candidate selection procedures, these systems must be designed in the context of what is realistic for the party in question. For instance, if, according to party rules, branches are to play a decisive role in candidate selection procedures do they have the capacity and/or resources to properly carry out these tasks? If all members are to be allowed to participate directly in the process, or candidates must be nominated by registered members, are the party's membership records maintained well enough to ensure the integrity of the process? What can the party realistically afford? Significant gaps between party rules and practice make a mockery of party rules in general and may undermine the legitimacy of the party.

Designing and/or reforming candidate selection procedures may require commitments to improve membership records, build the capacity of branches and raise any additional funds that may be required. Where significant investments are required to bring the organization up to the point where it can realistically implement new procedures, parties may choose to implement changes in various stages. In such cases, parties might approve changes to procedures but establish a "coming into force" date at a determined point in the future. The fixed date limits opportunities for procrastination but allows party structures some time to prepare for implementation.

Given these various considerations, as well as the diversity of electoral systems within which parties compete, there is no single best way for parties to choose candidates. Indeed, many parties frequently change their selection rules in response to the pressures described above.

CASE STUDIES

THE AFRICAN NATIONAL CONGRESS (SOUTH AFRICA)

Background

Brief Party History. The African National Congress (ANC) was formed in 1912. Its original purpose was to unite Africans in their struggle for land and freedom. As the United Kingdom relinquished its control over South Africa, the ANC's struggle continued against South African governments led by whites and the repressive apartheid system. The resistance continued to gather momentum through the decades. By 1961, the ANC was banned. Having reached the conclusion that peaceful resistance alone would not bring change, the ANC took up arms and was forced underground. Nevertheless, it survived amidst states of emergency, state persecution and the detention and exile of movement leaders. When the government ban on its activities was eventually lifted in 1990, the ANC began to transform itself into a political party. Negotiations resulted in a transitional government of national unity headed by ANC leader Nelson Mandela. The party won the country's first fully participatory elections in 1994 in a landslide, securing over 60 percent of the votes. It has continued to dominate South African politics in subsequent elections. Historically, the ANC is a party of the left.

Branches, the basic organizational unit of the party, feed up through regional and provincial levels to the national level. Given the significant role they played in the liberation struggle, the continuing strength of the party's Women's and Youth Leagues is no surprise. (Some of the party's most famous leaders including Nelson Mandela and Walter Sisulu were among the first leaders of the Youth League.) The ANC contests elections as part of an alliance that includes the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU), the South African Communist Party (SACP) and the South African National Civic Organization (SANCO).

South Africa's Electoral System. South Africa operates a republic headed by a president, with nine provinces headed by premiers. The president, elected by the National

CASE STUDY AT A GLANCE

Electoral System

- Proportional Representation (Closed Lists)

Main Features of the List Compilation Process

- Branches nominate candidate.
- Provincial and national delegate conventions vote on lists ranked according to nominees' popularity
- 50 percent quota for women (at least every other name on the list)
- Formal process for assessing incumbent performance
- Extensive appeals process at every stage

Assembly from among its membership, is usually the leader of the largest party and typically heads the party's list. Upon her/his election as president, an individual loses her/his National Assembly seat. The Constitution sets a two-term limit for presidents.

There are three spheres of elected government: national, provincial and local. The bicameral national legislature currently comprises a 400-member National Assembly and a 90-member National Council of Provinces (NCOP). While National Assembly members are elected directly by universal suffrage, NCOP members are elected by the provincial legislatures. This case study will focus on the process for compiling National Assembly lists.

A proportional representation system featuring closed lists is used to determine the composition of the National Assembly. Half of the seats are filled based on national party lists. The remaining 200 are distributed across the country by province. The provincial allocation, decided by the Electoral Commission, is reviewed prior to each election depending on the number of voters registered. Contesting parties are obliged to submit provincial lists, while national lists are optional. Where no national lists are submitted, all 400 seats are filled from provincial lists. The ANC typically submits a national list as well as the required nine provincial lists. Voters cast a single ballot in favor of the party of their choice for the national elections.

The National Assembly List Process

Candidate Eligibility. The ANC's selection rules establish the following requirements for its candidates they must:

- Be ANC members of good standing with a proven track record of commitment to and involvement in the democratic movement;
- Have the requisite experience or expertise to make a constructive contribution;
- Have no criminal record, excluding politically related crimes before April 1994; and
- Have no history of ill-discipline, corruption, involvement in fostering divisions or breaching the party code of conduct.

In addition, guidelines require that overall lists be balanced in terms of: geography; gender; race; and the different components of the Alliance. Further requirements include: a mix of people of different ages and skills, and the inclusion of persons with disabilities or "differently-abled" people. Finally, candidates must be prepared to give up all other forms of employment in order to devote themselves to parliamentary, party and constituency work. Historically, the ANC has operated a quota system. Initially, the requirement was that least every third name on every list must be a woman. Following discussions about increasing the quota to 50 percent, this higher target was used in compiling lists for the 2005/6 local elections. In December 2007, party rules were amended, making 50 percent and zipping a formal requirement for all candidate lists.

Procedures for Incumbents. In the lead up to the 2000 local elections, a review of all of sitting local councilors was carried out to assist the party in determining which elected representatives were performing most effectively. Based on that experience, a similar process was instituted to assess the performance of incumbent members of the National Assembly and provincial legislatures in the lead up to the 2004 elections. The process comprised a self evaluation by each legislator as well as assessments of each legislator's performance by the party's parliamentary leadership and provincial or regional party secretaries. The reports on each legislator were consolidated into a database, and the information was shared with party officials and the National List Committee.

Principal Steps in Compiling the Lists for National Assembly Elections. Following are the principal steps in the ANC's process for compiling lists for National Assembly elections.

1. *National Executive Committee (NEC) adopts List Process Guidelines and appoints a National List Committee* of five to nine people to administer the process. Using the Guidelines, branches are asked to compile two lists for National Assembly seats: one for the party's national list; and a second for the regional seats covering their area.
2. *Branches hold general meetings to make nominations and to select delegates for the Provincial List Conference.* These nominations are submitted to the provincial level. Alliance members participate in these meetings as ANC members in their respective branches. Nominees must provide a brief curriculum vitae, a signed undertaking to abide by the codes of conduct of the ANC and Parliament, and to accept the final lists as ratified by the NEC, the procedures for recall of MPs after elections and substitutions.
3. *Provincial List Committees, appointed by Provincial Executive Committees, screen nominations and each drafts a consolidated list that is subject to appeals/objections by party structures.* Only individuals who are nominated by five or more branches appear on the consolidated list.
4. *Provincial List Conferences vote on consolidated lists for their area and select delegates for the National List Conference.* Eighty percent of delegates represent branches – the remaining 20 percent are distributed among Alliance office holders, and members of provincial, regional and league executive committees. Based on the outcome, Provincial List Committees order the lists and submit them, along with the curricula vitae of the candidates, to the National List Committee.
5. *The National List Committee drafts the national list* by screening submissions from all the provinces to ensure that nominees are eligible and the lists meet party criteria. Candidates are listed in order of popularity. Incumbent ministers are usually in the top positions. Further, typically, the top 25 percent of each provincial list are automatically assigned safe positions. The rest of the national list is filled with individuals who fell within the top 150 percent of each provincial list. (For instance, if

100 people are required for a particular province's list, the 150 individuals who received the greatest support constitute the top 150 percent.) Changes are only made when there is a need to ensure that the criteria of gender equity, other types of representativeness and experience are met. The lists are also designed to ensure that at least one third of incumbents are returned to office.

6. *A National List Conference meets to vote on the draft national and regional lists.* Participants include NEC members, List Committee members, and delegates from the provinces, the Women's and Youth Leagues and Alliance partners. The list is presented and each position is approved by a vote. Although participants are allowed to make counter-nominations, a motion and a 60 percent vote are required for substitutions to be made. Provincial lists for the national assembly and provincial legislature lists are also presented for approval by the Conference. These are only changed if the provinces failed to meet the criteria established in party regulations.
7. *The provisional lists are then subject to appeals/objections by ANC structures within a defined period.* An Appeals Committee rules on any appeals/objections.
8. *The National List Committee finalizes the lists.* As indicated above, the ANC has contested the country's elections in coalition with the COSATU, the SACP and SANCO. Typically, Alliance members participate in the list compilation process through ANC branches (in the nomination phase) and through delegates on List Committees and at List Conferences at the provincial and national levels. For instance, in the lead up to the 1996 local elections, List Committees comprised: three ANC representatives; one representative each of COSATU, SACP and the ANC Youth and Women's Leagues, and two representatives of SANCO.

Strengths and Weaknesses of the Current System.

Although the party's list compilation process is managed by a central party agency, procedures allow for significant and transparent participation by party branches including built-in periods for appeals and objections at every stage in the process. Safeguards against excessive influence over the final list by the party's central leadership include provincial and Alliance delegate participation in approval of the final list through a position-by-position vote as well as a provision

that allows for replacement of individuals by delegates at the National List Conference. Box 12 describes some features of the process used by another South African party for purposes of comparison.

A variety of documents and statements by party structures or members shed some light on some of the discussions within the ANC about leadership and candidate selection processes. In the lead up to the 2002 National Conference, the party's National Working Committee issued "Through the Eye of the Needle," a discussion document that outlined the party's challenges internally and in government and described some of the leadership qualities required to meet them. (The National Working Committee comprises the President, Deputy President, National Chairperson, Secretary General, Deputy General Secretary and the Treasurer General.)

One of the challenges identified in terms of candidate and leadership selection was the need to ensure that only *bona fide* party members participated in delegate selection and nomination. Another was the selection of delegates "capable of influencing others, and at the same time, able to weigh various arguments and acting in the best interests of the movement." Further, the paper points out that "delegates are not voting fodder, mechanically and unthinkingly bound to lists and subject to the whip... While delegates should be guided by the broad mandate of their branches, regions or provinces, each individual delegate is expected to exercise his or her judgment on the basis of his or her assessment of the movement's interests." The paper also expresses concerns about companies who "identify ANC members that they can promote in ANC structures and into government, so that they can get contracts by hook or by crook. This is done through media networks to discredit other leaders, or even buying membership cards to set up branches that are ANC only in name." The paper calls upon members to discuss any potential nominations openly and using formal procedures.

BOX 12: THE DEMOCRATIC ALLIANCE'S LIST-COMPILATION PROCESS

The Democratic Alliance (DA) is South Africa's largest opposition party. It currently holds 50 National Assembly seats. The party's federal rules require that the party submit regional lists only, not a national list, for the National Assembly. Its list compilation process is significantly different from the ANC's.

Under the 2002 Constitution

Under the party's 2002 Constitution, provincial congresses were allowed to determine their own rules for selecting their candidates for national, provincial and local elections. The rules established by each provincial congress had to be approved by the Federal Council and meet certain requirements including the following.

- The National Party Leader had to be a member of each provincial electorate.
- Before ranking, the full list of aspirant nominees for positions on National Assembly lists had to be forwarded to the National Leader. The Leader was entitled to address the electorate and express any opinions about any potential nominees.
- The provincial electorate ranked the list but had to leave positions 3, 7, 14, 21 and every 7th position thereafter blank.
- The draft list (including the blanks) was submitted to the Leader who could promote nominees to the blank positions on the list. However, s/he could not demote or delete any nominees from the list.
- Further, by a two-thirds majority vote, the electorate could veto a decision of the Leader.

Under the 2007 Nomination Regulations and 2004 Constitution

Under more recent rules, the party's Federal Council adopts procedures for the selection of candidates. A Federal Candidates' Election Committee (FCEC), comprising the Chair of the Federal Council, the Chair of the Federal Legal Commission, the Chief Executive Officer, the party's representative to South Africa's Independent Election Commission, and a representative of the Association of DA Councilors, oversees selection procedures.

- Electoral colleges are elected at the provincial level and must interview all aspirants (nominated by a minimum number of individual members).
- Colleges then vote to elect pools of approved aspirants twice the size of the targeted number of seats. Unless the FCEC grants a waiver, members of the college cannot vote on pools unless they have attended all the interviews for the concerned applicants.
- Selection panels at the provincial level (nominated by provincial leaders subject to the approval of the federal leaders) interview and evaluate the approved aspirants and then rank them. National and provincial leaders may address the panels prior to ranking of aspirants.
- The provincial executive reviews the selection panel's list and by a two-thirds majority vote may move individuals higher or lower on the list or add others who may not have been included in the pool of approved aspirants in order to ensure a list that is balanced in terms of skills, gender, or race, or to provide redress for candidates who may have been "prejudiced by sectarian interests". However, the number of persons promoted or introduced cannot exceed 10 percent or one candidate (whichever is greater).
- The ranked list is returned to the college for further review and comment. The executive must consider any concerns expressed or comments made by the electoral college and may make further changes as appropriate within the limits described above before finalizing the list.

THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY (UNITED KINGDOM)

Background

Brief Party History. The Conservative Party traces its origins to the Tory Party, active in British politics between the late-seventeenth and the mid-nineteenth centuries. However, the term “Conservatives” was first widely used in the 1830s, and the first Conservative Party headquarters was established in 1832. Its ideological stance is right of center.

Since 1885, the Conservative Party has won the majority of general elections in the United Kingdom (UK). Its opponents have only held sizeable majorities six times since 1900: Liberals 1906 to 1910, Labour 1945 to 1950, 1966 to 1970, 1997 to 2001, 2001 to 2005, and 2005 to date. From 1979 the Conservatives won four successive general elections (1979, 1983, 1987 and 1992) but eventually suffered severe electoral defeat in 1997. Over the past 10 years, the Conservatives have been undergoing a process of self examination and change. The party has sought to resolve internal divisions, reform and revitalize its structures and broaden its appeal. In December 2005, the party elected David Cameron, MP for Whitney, Oxfordshire as its new leader. He campaigned on a platform of continued and fundamental internal party reform.

The party consists of three principal elements: the parliamentary party, which includes Conservative MPs; the National Convention, the membership organization for constituency organizations (largely organized along the same geographic lines as electoral district boundaries); and the Conservative Central Office, the professional arm of the party, which runs party headquarters and provides various services to the party as a whole, including the production of lists of approved candidates. According to the party website, “The [Party] Board is the ultimate decision making body of the Conservative Party. It is responsible for all operational matters including fundraising, membership and candidates. It meets once a month and works closely with Conservative Central Office, elected representatives and the voluntary membership.” The Board includes representatives from the three major elements of the party.

Elections to Westminster. The UK Parliament, or Westminster, is bicameral, comprising the House of Lords and

CASE STUDY AT A GLANCE

Electoral System

- First Past the Post

Main Features of the Selection Process

- Branches select from a central list of preapproved candidates that is regularly replenished (pre-assessment process is combined with training)
- Selection meetings at the branch level are based on one member one vote
- Recent experiments with ways to increase the number of women and ethnic minority candidates selected to contest “safe” and “target” electoral districts

the House of Commons. This case study will focus on selection procedures for candidates for the House of Commons. Its 646 members are directly elected using the First Past the Post (FPTP) system. Members of the House of Commons serve five-year terms. However, elections are called upon the dissolution of parliament, the timing of which is at the discretion of the sitting Prime Minister and can thus be used to political advantage. (The Monarch dissolves parliament at the Prime Minister’s request.)

In modern times, the Conservatives and the Labour Party have alternated in government, between them holding all but a tiny minority of the seats in the House of Commons. Since the 1970s, however, other parties have increased their share of seats at Westminster. These include the Liberal Democrats, who won 62 seats in the 2005 elections and regional parties like the Democratic Unionists, Plaid Cymru, the Scottish National Party and Sinn Féin.

The concept of safe and targeted seats is central to elections for Westminster. The majority of constituencies are safe seats for one party and hopeless seats for another, while marginal or targeted seats are contested electoral battlegrounds that one party hopes to win from another. The safer a seat is perceived to be, the more contested the nomination, since the candidate’s election to Westminster is more or less guaranteed. According to one study, “safe” Conservative seats attract anywhere from 200 to 300 hundred applicants, marginal seats 50 to 100 and “hopeless” seats 15 to 30 (Denver 1988).

Candidate Selection in Historical Perspective. Historically, although party headquarters defined the rules

and procedures for candidate selection, party officials or members at the electoral district level have been allowed considerable say in the final choice of candidate for their constituency. For decades, the Conservatives, like the other major parties in the United Kingdom, have used the same basic approach for selecting candidates: the central party unit draws up “Approved Lists” of pre-screened candidates from which Constituency Associations are encouraged or required to pick their candidates.

The Party Board appoints a Candidates Committee to manage the screening process at the national level. The Candidates Committee’s responsibilities include the establishment of Approved Lists. In addition, each Constituency Association establishes a Selection Committee charged with drawing up a preliminary shortlist for its electoral district. Typically, the Selection Committee comprises officers of the association and representatives of women’s, youth and other affiliated groups. Based on the Selection Committee’s suggestions, the Constituency Association votes to select its candidate.

Over time, there have been variations in, among other things, the procedures for reselection of incumbents, the requirements for securing a place on the Approved List, the central party’s powers to overturn or influence Constituency Associations’ choice, and the selectorate at the constituency level. For instance, in 2005, the Party Chairman proposed that the constitutional provisions for candidate selection be simplified to allow the party greater flexibility in adapting its procedures. The new rule would recognize Constituency Associations’ right to select their own candidates but require that they do so in accordance with guidelines published by the Party Board. In addition, he proposed that the Party Board be granted the power to prevent the nomination of a candidate “if his or her candidature would be contrary to the best interests of the party” and to suspend or remove candidates from the Approved Lists.

Similarly, until the selectorate was expanded to include ordinary members, Constituency Associations’ Executive Councils voted to choose the candidate, using an exhaustive ballot, and then recommended him or her to a general meeting of association members for formal endorsement. (Executive Councils are the governing bodies of the Constituency Associations. Typically, they comprise representatives of ward committees, women’s committees and other party structures or

affiliates. Their size varies from around 60 to 200 or more individuals, depending on the electoral district.) While Executive Councils had the option of presenting two shortlisted candidates to the general meeting for a final vote and, in theory, the general meeting could refuse to endorse the individual recommended by the Executive Council, both practices were rare (Denver 1988).

However, the basic system of Approved Lists drawn up by the central party unit has remained a key element of the process. The approach allows senior party officials who have members’ respect to screen out unsuitable candidates but also to encourage promising applicants to reapply at a later date. Some applicants only secure a place on the Approved List on their second or third attempt. Since elections may be called at any time, prescreening for the Approved Lists and candidate selection are conducted on a rolling basis. In some cases, candidates are selected years before the next election. Approved Lists are replenished regularly and typically contain significantly more individuals than the number of seats, allowing Constituency Associations a choice.

Recent Reforms. Within days his election as party leader, David Cameron announced dramatic changes designed to increase the number of women, black and other ethnic minority Conservative legislators. They included the introduction of a priority list of the “brightest and best” candidates, at least half of whom would be women and 10 percent ethnic minorities. Associations in Conservative-held and target electoral districts were expected to select their candidates from this list. Second, participation in the selection process would be broadened to include individuals outside the party. Constituency Associations could choose between establishing a community panel to comment on the relative strengths of each candidate or using primaries (open or closed) to make their final selection. The changes to candidate selection were just one element in a broader effort at party renewal. In addition, the party undertook efforts to expand party support in Northern England and to promote public participation in its policy development processes.

Current Selection Procedures for Westminster

Candidate Eligibility. Eligibility criteria for candidates are not formally defined in party rules. However, recent party literature (“How to Become a Conservative MP,” for example)

identifies seven key competencies that make for the most successful and effective candidates and MPs. They are:

- Communication Skills;
- Intellect (not necessarily meaning academically trained);
- Ability to Relate to People;
- Campaigning Skills;
- Leadership and Motivational Skills;
- Resilience and Drive; and
- Conviction (core beliefs and values).

Procedures for Incumbents. According to one study, up until the late 1970s, selection procedures in all parties in the United Kingdom favored the re-adoption of the incumbent MP who simply had to indicate his or her wish to remain (Denver 1988). A resolution was then put to a general meeting of the Constituency Association and almost invariably carried. However, according to the 2002 party rules, incumbents must submit a written application to the Executive Council of their Constituency Association. If they are rejected by the Executive Council, they have the right to request a postal ballot of the full membership or to be added to the shortlist of individuals drawn up by the Executive Council.

In 2005, the Party Chair proposed to introduce rules specifying that any MPs in receipt of the Conservative Whip would automatically be included on Approved Lists. (The Party Whip is responsible for enforcing discipline in the parliamentary party. MPs who meet the disciplinary requirements of the parliamentary party are said to be “in receipt of the Whip.”) In cases where the Whip was removed from a sitting MP, the Candidates Committee would consider whether they should remain on the approved list.

Principal Steps.

1. *Party Board establishes a Committee on Candidates responsible for preparing procedures and eventually establishing Approved Lists.*
2. *Interested individuals complete and submit an extensive application form to the Conservative Central Office.* On the form, applicants provide information about various experiences and list references. As a first step and prior to completing the application form, interested individuals are invited to meet with party officials who can discuss their options with them.

3. *The Committee on Candidates reviews applications and conducts further background checks.* Shortlisted candidates are invited to a Parliamentary Assessment Board (PAB).
4. *Shortlisted applicants are assessed during a day long PAB.* Each applicant invited to the PAB must pay a fee of £250.
5. *Applicants who pass the PAB are put on the party's Approved List of Parliamentary Candidates.* The party points out “not everyone passes the first time, some people do need some training or some more experience before trying again. Equally, sometimes we may decide that someone is not suitable to become a candidate.”
6. *Members of the Approved List can apply for priority certification, making them eligible to apply for Conservative-held and target seats.* Senior party members and MPs interview priority applicants, assessing them against a set of competencies and criteria. The party requires that at least 50 percent of the Priority List be women and 10 percent ethnic minorities.
7. *Candidate Selection Committees established by Constituency Executive Councils open the application process for candidate selection.* Members of the Approved List are notified by the Conservative Central Office of vacancies so that they can apply to Constituency Associations through their Candidate Selection Committees. Some candidates apply to more than one Constituency Association.
8. *Constituency Candidate Selection Committees review applications, invite the most appealing aspirants for an interview and prepare a preliminary shortlist of a minimum of three candidates for consideration by the Constituency Executive Council.*
9. *The Constituency Executive Council interviews individuals on the preliminary shortlist and draws up a final shortlist for vote.* Under the new rules introduced by David Cameron, in Conservative-held or target constituencies, Associations must choose between either creating a panel of local stakeholders who interview and share their perspectives on the relative strengths of each candidate before the final list is compiled or open up the vote on the final shortlist to all registered voters in their area.
10. *The final shortlist of candidates is presented for vote during a special constituency meeting.* The electorate in this final

stage may vary from one Constituency Association to another. Where community panels have already been consulted in drawing up the final shortlist, constituency executives can present the final shortlist for a simple membership vote at a special meeting. Otherwise, they must choose between a ballot open to individuals registered as Conservative supporters (even if they are not party members) or any registered voter in the constituency. Until the recent changes, prior to the vote, each candidate gave a brief presentation and took questions from the audience. Now, a designated moderator questions the candidates. In addition, the moderator may take questions from the floor. Prior to the meeting, each candidate is sent out to meet residents in selected streets. The interviews include questions about candidates' experiences canvassing door-to-door to provide the electorate with some indication of how they might approach constituency work.

The Impact of Recent Reforms. The recent changes to candidate selection have been controversial. Opponents have expressed concerns that the Priority List system constitutes undue interference from party headquarters and promotes the selection of candidates based on gender and ethnicity rather than merit. In January 2007, faced with concerns that the Priority List contained "too many carpetbaggers and lawyers from London," the Party Leader announced changes that would allow anyone on the Approved List to apply for any seat. The change was intended to make it easier for Associations to choose candidates with strong links to their area and to placate individuals on the Approved List who did not receive priority certification. Another round of changes granted constituencies two main options. First, as part of a "big event," each member could have four votes – two for women and two for men – to create a shortlist of four people, half of whom would be women. Constituency executives then conducted a thorough interview process and selected the final candidate. Under the second option, anyone on the electoral register in the constituency could vote on a shortlist which did not have to meet gender requirements. Later reforms required a 50 percent gender balance among the individuals being considered at each stage in the process, regardless of the approach chosen by the constituency. (Constituencies could still choose to interview only priority candidates or to open up the selection to all those

on the Approved List. They could also choose between the "big event" or the open primary.)

Proponents argue that despite certain problems, the policy has not only proved effective in increasing the number of women who are shortlisted and selected, but it has also helped broaden the party's appeal. Anne Jenkin, Treasurer of the party's Women2Win noted in a newspaper article, "The whole process is changing perceptions of both David Cameron and the Conservative Party. One poll this week put the Conservatives 12 points ahead [of Labour] with women voters" (*Express on Sunday*, November 12, 2006).

By January 2007, 43 of the 107 most winnable seats had nominated women candidates. However, only three of the first 96 Associations to select candidates opted for individuals from ethnic minorities. The then Deputy Chair for Candidates noted: "The nomination of priority candidates and the revision of constituency procedures have dramatically increased the number of women and black and minority ethnics being selected in target and Conservative held seats. I regret that this is hard on some of the hard-working and loyal men on the Candidates List who are not priority candidates, but we have made progress without changing the Constitution of the party and without compromising the right of Constituency Associations to make the ultimate choice about who shall be their candidate... Every woman candidate can be proud that she has been selected in competition with the best male candidates we have. This demonstrates attitudes in the party are genuinely being transformed, and this has contributed to the transformation of the party's standing amongst women. All-women shortlists have achieved no such transformation in the Labour Party" (Jenkin 2006).

BOX 13: THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY'S WOMEN2WIN

The Conservatives are the only party in the United Kingdom to have produced a woman Prime Minister (Margaret Thatcher). However, while women have played an active role at all levels of the party, their representation in the Conservative Parliamentary Party has remained low.

Historically, the party has rejected affirmative action, arguing that selection should be based on merit. Nevertheless, the party supported passage of the Sex Discrimination (Election Candidates) Act, legislation introduced by Labour that allows, but does not require, parties to use positive discrimination measures in candidate selection.

In 2005, a group of male and female Conservative members launched Women2Win, an initiative designed to: “increase the number of Conservative women MPs, by campaigning for more women to win nominations for winnable and Tory held seats, by pressing for any positive and radical reforms of the selection procedures for Conservative Parliamentary candidates short of compulsory all-women shortlists, and by providing support and advice to Conservative women who wish to enter Parliament.” A few weeks after the launch of Women2Win, David Cameron was elected Party Leader and new candidate selection procedures were announced.

Women2Win is playing an active role in recruiting new women members, and providing them with the training, mentoring and support they need to succeed within the party. For instance, between January and May 2006, a road show of Women2Win seminars in London, Birmingham and Manchester signed up 100 new women recruits who did not have previous political experience and encouraged them to become candidates or pursue other important roles in the party (as political advisers, for instance). Many of the women candidates selected thus far have received support from Women2Win.

For Women2Win the outreach to women is part of a strategy for electoral success. The organization's website argues:

“The Conservative Party used to be the party of the woman voter – and every election we have won since the war has been on the basis of a lead among female voters... We have yet to win back the female vote, and continuing failure to do so will mean continuing electoral failure... We will substantially increase our electoral support if we:

- Make a determined approach to ensure that the gender and ethnic mix of our candidates in winnable seats reflects modern Britain.
- Re-orientate our policy agenda around the things that really matter to people today – health, education, caring for children and the elderly, and crime.
- Adopt a more constructive and positive tone in Opposition, and become less confrontational and adversarial.”
(www.women2win.com)

FINE GAEL (IRELAND)

Background

Brief Party History. Fine Gael was created in 1933, upon the merger of three groups, the largest being *Cumann na nGaedheal*, which had governed Ireland from 1923 to 1932. The party traces its origins to the groups that supported the Anglo-Irish Treaty of 1921 during Ireland's independence movement. The Anglo-Irish Treaty was the agreement signed between Great Britain and Irish groups to conclude the Irish War of Independence. It established the Irish Free State within the British Empire and provided Northern Ireland the option of opting out of the Free State. Divisions among the Irish over the Treaty's provisions led to the Irish Civil War, eventually won by groups in favor of the Treaty.

Fine Gael has only held power for brief periods of time, always as the main party in coalition governments. Today, it is Ireland's second largest party in terms of the popular vote as well as representation in the national legislature and local councils. However, in 2004, the party won five of Ireland's 13 seats in the European Parliament. Fianna Fáil, the ruling party, secured only four seats. Fine Gael is a centrist party.

Initially established by parliamentary elites, the party developed grassroots organization and loose structures over time. Following heavy electoral defeat in 1977, Fine Gael embarked on a series of internal reforms. New systems were introduced to improve communication between the central and local party structures and to eliminate paper branches, a problem Fine Gael shared with other Irish parties. A subsequent renewal campaign in the early 1990s saw further reforms to improve party cohesion and increase membership participation.

Branches, the basic organizational unit of the party, feed up to the national level through district, constituency and regional levels. The Executive Council oversees the national operations of the party. It includes ex-officio members like the party leader as well as representatives of various party organs and other members elected at the party's annual congress (*Ard Fheis*).

Ireland's Electoral System. The Irish Parliament comprises an upper (*Seanad*) and lower house (*Dáil*). Irish voters also elect a president – whose role is largely ceremonial – by universal suffrage. There are 60 members in the *Seanad*: 11 are nominated

CASE STUDY AT A GLANCE

Electoral System

- Single Transferable Vote

Main Features of the Selection Process

- Simple nomination process with minimal prescreening of aspirants
- National executive determines the minimum and maximum number of candidates and may impose other requirements
- Strong safeguards against “paper” branches and “instant” memberships

by the Prime Minister; six are elected by the graduates of Trinity College, Dublin and National University of Ireland; and the remaining 43 are chosen by a special electorate comprising elected members of local government, members of the incoming lower house and outgoing upper house.

Elections to the 166-member *Dáil* are for multi-member constituencies, using the Single Transferable Vote (STV) system. Candidates appear on the ballot paper in alphabetical order. Voters are asked to indicate their preferences by writing the number one (1) next to their first choice. In addition, voters have the option of numbering subsequent preferences. In each electoral district, based on the number of valid ballot papers, the minimum number of votes required to secure a seat (a quota) is established. At the end of the first count, any candidate who receives the required minimum amount or more is elected. Any “surplus” votes are transferred to the remaining candidates according to voter preferences. Typically, the party with the largest number of seats in the *Dáil* forms the government, with its leader becoming Prime Minister. Members of the *Dáil* are elected to five-year terms. However, elections may be called at the discretion of the Prime Minister or when the government loses a confidence vote. This case study will focus on candidate selection for elections to the *Dáil*.

Candidate Selection in Historical Perspective.

Historically, candidates were selected by delegate conventions at the electoral district level. The number of delegates varied according to the characteristics of each area, but averaged around 320. While branches could issue instruction to their delegates, voting by secret ballot made the instructions unenforceable. In addition, delegate selection sometimes occurred before all the candidates were known. At

conventions, delegates voted using the STV, the same system used in elections.

In 1970, the Executive Council gained the right to appoint convention chairs, ratify candidates and add candidates to the lists selected by constituency level structures. In addition, during the reforms of the late 1970s, the central office began playing a more active role in party affairs at the local level, particularly in marginal seats. For instance, the central unit would try to identify strong potential candidates and, through informal means try to “smooth their path to selection.” In 1982, the executive also gained the power to request that nomination conventions take geographic considerations into account in their selections. In 1994, as part of a wave of reforms, Fine Gael adopted one member one vote (OMOV) for candidate selection. In contrast, Fianna Fáil has maintained delegate conventions. (Table 1 compares Fine Gael’s candidate selection practices to those of Fianna Fáil and the Irish Labour Party.)

Given Ireland’s electoral system, deciding how many candidates to field in each electoral district is an important aspect of the selection process. In Fine Gael, traditionally the national executive has established the minimum and maximum number of candidates. In practice, the two numbers are the same, requiring party structures to select a specific number of candidates.

Current Selection Procedures

Candidate Eligibility. The party rules do not establish eligibility criteria for candidates.

Procedures for Incumbents. There are no specific rules governing the reselection of incumbents: they undergo the same nomination procedures as other aspirants. However, historically, the reselection rates for incumbents have been high. Ireland’s voting system and political culture place constituency service at a premium: candidates who forge strong links with voters in their locality are likely to do well. In many cases, there are strong links between incumbents and the local constituency offices, the former depending on the latter to help maintain community links. This is one reason why reselection rates for incumbents has remained high.

Principal Steps.

1. *On the proposal of the Party Leader, the Executive Council establishes requirements for candidate selection at the*

constituency level. This includes the maximum and minimum number of candidates to be selected for each electoral district. In practice, the directive stipulates the actual number of candidates to be selected.

2. *Written nominations (by any two affiliated members) are submitted to the Constituency Secretary.*
3. *The Constituency Secretary convenes a candidate selection convention that votes to select candidates.* After the list of nominations is read, the two individuals who nominated particular candidates address the meeting. The different candidates also address the meeting and sign the party’s Candidate Pledge. Voting is in person and by STV. Any member within the concerned electoral district is permitted to cast a vote in the selection process as long as s/he listed in the last published register. The party rules lay out detailed requirements for branch and member registration, including publication and verification of lists. Membership registers are published once a year. Members must vote in person – there is no provision for postal ballots – and must present identification in order to receive a ballot.
4. *The Executive Council ratifies candidates.* Only the Leader is entitled to propose the ratifications, additions, deletions or substitutions on the lists selected by conventions. However, the Executive Council votes to accept or reject the proposals.

Strengths and Weaknesses of the Current System. Given the history of paper branches in Ireland’s political parties, Fine Gael has extensive rules and regulations including appeal processes for the affiliation of branches and the registration of individual members. These procedures help the party limit the risk of aspirants creating instant branches or members for purposes of securing the nomination.

The Executive Council’s prerogatives to issue specific guidelines for geographic considerations in candidate selection – something that constituency conventions are often keen to do anyway – and to add candidates also allow the central party unit to help ensure a balanced ticket. In some cases, the Executive Council has used gender as a requirement. The power to veto particular candidates, upon the recommendation of the party leader, while significant, is rarely used. As a result, despite various safeguards for national

TABLE 1: CANDIDATE SELECTION IN IRELAND'S THREE LARGEST PARTIES

	Fine Gael	Fianna Fail	Labour
<i>Leadership Involvement</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishment of maximum and minimum number of candidates to be selected in each electoral district (in practice, often the same number), on the proposal of the Leader of the parliamentary party. Option to impose geographical or other requirements. Addition, deletion and substitution of candidates on the proposal of the Leader of the parliamentary party. Ratification of candidates. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendation on number of candidates to be selected in each electoral district. Option to conduct the selection. Appointment of chairpersons of constituency selection meetings. Addition of candidates. Ratification of candidates. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishment of selection procedures. Recommendation on number of candidates to be selected in each electoral district. Option to impose gender requirements. Convening and organization of selection conventions. Addition of candidates by Party Leader and Party Chairperson. Ratification of candidates.
<i>Sub-National Involvement</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organization of constituency selection meetings. One member one vote (OMOV), but in person only, no provision for postal balloting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participation in constituency selection meetings. Delegate convention. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participation in constituency selection meetings. May make counter proposals to national leadership on number of candidates to be selected, and criteria but not on the specific individual(s) who should fill the additional slot(s). Voting by OMOV.

influence, there is strong local branch involvement in candidate selection.

In practice, before the Executive Council issues its guidelines, pre-convention strategy committees are convened in each constituency. The committees assess their local political situation, the strengths and weaknesses of Fine Gael's potential candidates as well as those of the competition, identify potential candidates (where necessary) and make recommendations to the Executive Council on the timing of conventions, electoral strategy and the number of candidates. This consultative process has helped preempt disagreements between the national leadership and party branches.

The signing of party pledges is not an unusual requirement. In Fine Gael, however, the practice of having the aspirants sign the pledge in public helps bring moral and peer pressure on the signatories to abide by their commitment to the party.

THE INSTITUTIONAL REVOLUTIONARY PARTY (MEXICO)

Background

Brief Party History. The Institutional Revolutionary Party (*Partido Revolucionario Institucional* or PRI) was established in 1929. Originally called the National Revolutionary Party (*Partido Nacional Revolucionario*) and then the Party of the Mexican Revolution (*Partido de la Revolución Mexicana*), the party adopted its current name in 1946. For the 70 years immediately following its establishment, the PRI dominated Mexican politics, winning all elections at state and federal levels under non-competitive conditions. In 1988, however, the PRI lost its two-thirds majority in the lower house of Mexico's Congress. A year later, the party lost a gubernatorial race for the first time. PRI's hold on power continued to slip into the 1990s: by the middle of the decade, Mexico found itself in economic crisis and former President Salinas and his brother were implicated in corruption scandals. The mid to late 1990s also saw efforts to increase political space, including improvements in the independent administration of elections and the introduction of public subsidies for political parties. As such, the PRI's defeat in the 2000 presidential elections marked the culmination of a period of increasingly competitive politics.

In the aftermath of this unprecedented defeat, the PRI embarked on a series of reforms to restructure the party and reshape its public image. In 2003, the party won the largest number of congressional seats. In 2006, however, the PRI came third in the presidential and legislative elections. Today (2008), the party holds 35 of the 128 Senate seats and 106 of the 500 seats in the Chamber of Deputies. In light of these election results, discussions continue within the party over a new wave of reforms.

Geographically, the basic party unit is the sectional committee, operating at the level of electoral districts for Congress. These feed up into party structures at the municipal level and on into state, then national-level structures.

The PRI is generally considered to be left of center. Traditionally, individual members were affiliated with the party through three groupings representing the labor, rural and popular sectors. These functional groupings still exist within the PRI. Historically, power was heavily centralized in the party president, but increased political competition and subsequent changes within the party have granted greater roles and powers

CASE STUDY AT A GLANCE

Electoral System

- Mixed Member Proportional: 300 First Past the Post seats, 200 from regional proportional representation lists
- Gender-neutral statutory quotas recently increased from a minimum of 30 to 40 percent of each gender. Includes provisions for ordering of proportional representation lists but waives the quota for single-member districts where parties select candidates using a "direct vote"

Main Features of the Selection Process

- National leaders determine proportional representation lists
- Options for selecting candidates for majoritarian seats include closed or open primaries and delegate conventions, with actual selection processes determined by the National Political Council
- Quotas for women (exceeds statutory requirement) and youth
- Steps taken to institutionalize procedures and broaden participation in the era of competitive elections.
- However, processes continue to reflect considerable national influence over local choice and are often controversial

to state-level units and officials. Much of this decentralization process resulted from the increased political independence of state governors.

Elections in Mexico. Mexico is a federal republic comprising 31 states and the Federal District of Mexico City. The President of Mexico is directly elected to a nonrenewable six-year term. The Federal Congress (*Congreso de Unión*) has two chambers. The Senate (*Cámara de Senadores*) has 128 members. For 96 of these seats, each of the 31 states and the Federal District serve as three-member electoral districts. In each electoral district, the party with the largest number of votes wins two seats, with the third seat going to the first runner-up. The remaining 32 seats are determined by proportional representation based on the national vote.

There are 500 seats in the Chamber of Deputies (*Cámara de Diputados*): 300 are elected to represent single-member districts using the First Past the Post system; and 200 are elected by proportional representation based on five multi-state regional lists. Elections are also held for executives and legislative assemblies in the various states and the Federal District as well

as for local government. This case study will focus on candidate selection for the federal Chamber of Deputies.

In 2002, amendments to the electoral law introduced a requirement that all parties “in no case will include more than 70 percent of main candidates of the same sex.” However, the law only applied to the next five federal elections and waived the quota requirement for majoritarian seats where parties used a “direct vote” to select their candidates. A new electoral code enacted in January 2008 removed the time limit on the quotas and required that each gender account for no less than 40 percent of party candidate lists. As was the case in 2002, the 2008 law includes provisions for ordering of proportional representation lists and waives the quota requirement for majoritarian seats where candidates are selected by democratic processes consistent with the concerned party’s statutes.

Candidate Selection in Historical Perspective. During the decades of non-competitive politics in Mexico, power within the PRI, including in matters of candidate selection, was heavily concentrated in the hands of the President of the Republic. While various party structures submitted preferences to the national leadership, to all intents and purposes, final decisions on candidate selection were generally made by the President of the Republic. Officially, the President of the National Executive Committee (*Comité Ejecutivo Nacional* or CEN) was the head of the party. However since the President of the Republic typically appointed a close friend or advisor to the position, the individual often acted as a proxy for the President of the Republic.

As elections became increasingly competitive, the party began to decentralize recruitment procedures, in part as an attempt to identify more candidates who would have broader appeal among the voting public. Initially, this meant, for example, allowing governors – on whom the party increasingly depended to mobilize voters – greater say in the candidates representing their state. However, despite efforts to reform party rules in 1990 to allow for selection by democratically elected conventions, the new changes were often ignored or circumvented by party leaders. The use of primaries for the selection of a presidential candidate in 2000 – a first for the PRI – marked just one development in a growing debate within the party about candidate selection.

The loss of the 2000 presidential elections left the PRI in a crisis. The party president resigned and finger-pointing over the electoral defeat ensued. Weak internal communications, a

financial crisis and the increasing empowerment of PRI governors without the counterweight of national leadership threatened to rip the party apart. During the ensuing intra-party debate, a broad range of issues was identified, including candidate selection procedures. Changes to the party statutes at the 2001 party congress included new procedures for the selection of candidate and party officials to be overseen by a new National Commission for Internal Processes (*Comisión Nacional de Procesos Internos* or CNPI).

Current Selection Procedures

Candidate Eligibility. Under Chapter Four, Section Three of the party rules, aspirants for nomination must:

- Be Mexican citizens;
- Be eligible under the relevant laws of the country;
- Be members and cadres, in good standing, who have shown public loyalty to the party’s principles;
- Be paid-up in terms of membership dues (subject to verification by the Party Secretariat for Administration and Finance);
- Promise to uphold the party’s code of ethics;
- Have been a member for at least five years (for youth candidates, the membership requirement is only three years or proof of participation in a youth structure of the party);
- Not have been a leader, candidate or other high profile member of a political party or association opposed to the PRI unless they have since been a PRI member for seven years;
- Prove their knowledge of the party’s basic documents (as supported by their participation in training sessions offered by the party training institute);
- Have demonstrable leadership qualities;
- Exhibit appropriate public conduct and must not have been convicted of any willful crime, including in a public function;
- Have lived in the federal entity – a state or the Federal District – which they seek to represent for at least three years (members of the CEN, party officials at the state level or in the Federal District and federal officials are exempt from this requirement); and
- Present a work plan.

TABLE 2: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF INSTITUTIONAL REVOLUTIONARY PARTY’S CPN AND CNPI

	National Political Council (<i>Consejo Político Nacional</i> or CPN)	National Commission for Internal Processes (<i>Comisión Nacional de Procesos Internos</i> or CNPI)
<i>Memberships</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · President of the CEN chairs the CPN · Secretary General of the CEN · Former CEN presidents · Representatives of PRI elected officials · Representatives of geographic and functional (women, youth, labor, rural, popular) party structures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Elected by the CPN, based on the proposals of the president of the CEN
<i>Roles and Responsibilities</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Final approval of selection procedures drafted by the CNPI · Approval of proportional representation lists drafted by National Executive Committee the CEN 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Drafts calls for nomination (<i>convocatoria</i>) for CPN approval · Administers selection procedures for majoritarian seats including receipt and review of applications

In addition, individuals holding party office (at the electoral district level or above) who intend to seek nomination for majoritarian seats must take a leave of absence from their party positions and any public office until the selection process has been completed.

Under Article 42 of the party’s selection rules, for majoritarian seats, no gender should account for more than 50 percent of candidates, except where candidates are selected by primary. Party rules also require that no single gender account for more than 50 percent of candidacies on proportional representation lists. Another quota sets aside 30 percent of candidacies for youth.

Selection Methods Outlined in Party Rules. Two party structures play pivotal roles in the candidate selection procedures: the National Political Council (*Consejo Político Nacional* or CPN) and the CNPI.

The CNPI is responsible for carrying out selection procedures for candidates and party officials. As illustrated below, party statutes provide general guidelines and options for candidate selection. Calls for nominations (or *convocatoria*) for specific elections and electoral districts are drafted by the CNPI for approval by the CPN. The procedures approved by the CPN must also have the support of 50 percent plus one of the political councils of the party’s federal entities. These procedures must be established at least six months before the deadline for the registration of election candidates.

The CNPI also receives, analyzes and rules upon nomination

applications and validates nominees once selection procedures are concluded. It may also make any other specific recommendations to the CEN on candidate and leadership selection issues.

The CPN includes the president and secretary general of the CEN, former CEN presidents, the presidents of PRI in each of the states and Mexico City, one municipal party president for each state, representatives of PRI elected officials as well as delegates elected by various party structures. Its total membership is several hundred. The CPN is chaired by the president of the CEN, and includes 10 vice presidents representing the leaders of: PRI caucuses in different legislative bodies; the three functional sectors; geographic structures and the women and youth wings. Its work is organized through various committees. Based on the proposals of the president of the CEN, the CPN elects the CNPI. (Table 2 summarizes the respective roles and responsibilities of the CPN and CNPI in candidate selection.)

Majoritarian Seats. PRI statutes provide two principal options for candidate selection for majoritarian seats:

- Primaries: The CPN may opt for either closed primaries (with registered members as the electorate) or an open primary (in which registered members and non-affiliated citizens may cast a vote); or
- Conventions: In the case of conventions, political advisors at the federal level and individuals elected to represent the three sectors and other party organizations account for 50 percent of delegates. The remaining delegates are elected to represent geographic districts. The rules for

selection of these delegates are established in the calls for nominations (*convocatoria*).

In some cases, the calls for nominations may include public opinion requirements and mandate the support of any one of the following: geographical structures; functional groups, women and youth wings; political councilors; and/or registered members. In the case of the latter, the threshold for the support of each group is set by the calls for nominations. However, under party statutes, the maximum thresholds of support that calls for nomination may set are: 25 percent of geographic structures; 25 percent of the functional groups, women and youth wings; 25 percent of political councilors; and/or 10 percent of registered party members.

Proportional Representation Lists. Under Article 194 of the party statutes, the CEN draws up lists for proportional representation seats for approval by the CPN.

The party statutes also require that individuals included in proportional representation lists:

- Bring prestige to the party;
- Be able to contribute to the party during elections and to organizational structures;
- Come from professional backgrounds that would enhance the party's legislative work (both in debate and committees);
- Represent a regional balance in terms of attracting votes across the country; and
- Reflect the different aspects and social causes of the party.

Strengths and Weaknesses of the Current System. In the era of increasingly competitive politics, the PRI has moved to institutionalize and broaden participation in its candidate selection procedures for majoritarian seats. Nevertheless, the party's procedures continue to reflect considerable national influence over local choice. The use of calls for nomination allows the party considerable flexibility in determining the appropriate selection procedures for different electoral districts around the country and from one election to the next.

However, the practice also leaves national leaders with the possibility of shaping processes in ways that are advantageous to their preferred candidates. Further, regardless of the selection procedures identified for a particular electoral district, the longstanding practice of registering "compromise" or "consensus" candidates, where only one individual is presented for approval, often leaves selectorates with no choice. Compilation of the lists for proportional representation seats

has remained centralized in the CEN under the close supervision of the party president.

Candidate selection procedures in Mexico remain frequently characterized by allegations of fraud and vote buying, a phenomenon not exclusive to the PRI. Candidate selection in the lead up to the 2003 legislative elections was contentious and divisive. PRI governors expressed frustrations over their lack of input to the compilation of proportional representation lists and younger party members complained of being passed over. As indicated above, in the aftermath of the 2006 elections, there have been further calls for internal reforms, including to candidate selection procedures. (Table 3 compares candidate selection procedures across Mexico's three largest political parties.)

TABLE 3: CANDIDATE SELECTION IN MEXICO'S LARGEST PARTIES

	Party of the Democratic Revolution (Partido de la Revolución Democrática or PRD)	Institutional Revolutionary Party (Partido Revolucionario Institucional or PRI)	National Action Party (Partido Acción Nacional or PAN)
<i>Single-Member Districts</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Open primaries <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Delegate conventions (if approved by two-thirds of the members of the National Council) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Primaries (closed or open) <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Delegate conventions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Membership vote
<i>Proportional Representation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Half of the list (uneven numbers) to be determined by convention · Half of the lists (even numbers) directly elected by the National Council 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Determined by national party leaders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · State delegate conventions <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · National Executive Committee (which fills positions 1, 2, and 3) · Formula used to determine order of lists and distribution of seats across states in each electoral district
<i>Quotas</i> <i>(As indicated above, a new electoral code enacted in January 2008 required candidate lists to include at least 40 percent of each gender. Party rules available as of this writing had not yet been updated to reflect the revised law.)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · For proportional representation lists: at least one youth (30 years or younger) in every set of five candidates; and no gender should account for more than 70 percent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 30 percent youth for single-member districts and proportional lists · No gender should account for more than 50 percent of candidates for single-member districts and proportional lists · For single-member districts, the quota requirement is waived where candidates are selected by primary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · For proportional representation lists: at least one list must be headed by a woman; and there should be at least one member of each gender in every set of three candidates
<i>Powers of Central Party Leaders to Override Usual Selection Rules</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The National Council can name external candidates in up to 20 percent of all candidacies that the party submits to each state body except if two-thirds of the members present decide to increase the percentage · The National Council chooses the external candidates for federal elections, but also has the option of allowing non-members to compete against members for the party's nomination 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · In exceptional circumstances, the presidents of the National Commission for Internal Processes and the National Executive Committee can take urgent measures in the interests of party unity and strength (Article 48, selection rules) · When the party enters into an electoral coalition or alliance (a decision that must be approved by the CPN), the usual selection rules can be overridden 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · In special cases, and where the relevant party organ does not reach a decision, the National Executive Committee, having consulted the relevant state leadership, can determine candidates for federal elections (Article 43, party rules) · The National Executive Committee decides on the party's participation in federal elections and the terms of its participation (Article 47, party rules)

THE KUOMINTANG (TAIWAN)

Background

Brief Party History. The Kuomintang (KMT) or the Chinese Nationalist Party was created in 1894 during the Sino-Japanese War. The party, originally created to revitalize and unite a divided China, ruled mainland China for several decades. In 1949, the KMT lost power to the Communist Party and its leaders sought refuge on the island of Taiwan.

The KMT imposed martial law, ruling Taiwan for almost 40 years without regular national elections. Martial law gave the party sweeping powers to restrict political competition and there was little, if any, separation between the KMT and the state. The late 1980s saw dramatic changes in Taiwan's politics. Although opposition political parties were still illegal at that time, in 1986 various groups seeking an alternative to the KMT came together to form the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP). A year later, the KMT lifted martial law. In 1991, the government restored full constitutional rule, holding multiparty legislative elections in 1992. The first multiparty presidential elections were held in 1996. Although the KMT won in 1996, it lost subsequent presidential elections (in 2000 and 2004) to the DPP and its coalition partners. The 2004 loss was by a razor thin margin of 0.22 percent.

In the December 2004 legislative elections, the KMT and members of its Pan-Blue Coalition secured a total of 114 to the DPP/Pan-Green Coalition's 101 seats. In January 2008, however, the KMT and its allies significantly widened their majority in the legislature: under a new electoral system, they secured 86 of 113 seats and went on to win the March 2008 presidential elections with 58 percent of the popular vote.

Arriving in Taiwan in the late 1940s, KMT leaders had to rebuild party grassroots structures. In the modern day party, at the grassroots level, members are organized into precinct units that feed up into county or city and then national-level structures. The supreme party organ is the National Congress of party delegates, which meets every two years. The Central Committee, comprising 210 members elected by the National Congress, meets yearly and oversees implementation of Congress decisions. Day-to-day party affairs are managed by the 31-member Central Standing Committee elected by Congress from among members of the Central Committee. Ideologically, the KMT is a center-right party.

Elections in Taiwan. Since the 1991 return to

CASE STUDY AT A GLANCE

Electoral System

- Parallel (since 2008)
- Gender quota (50 percent) for national electoral district

Main Features of the Selection Process

- Extensive nomination criteria to guard against candidates associated with criminal activity
- Combination of membership votes and public opinion polling (weighted 30 and 70 percent respectively)

constitutional rule, Taiwan has undergone a number of constitutional and electoral reforms. For instance, constitutional amendments in 2000 modified the powers of the two legislative chambers (the Legislative Yuan (LY) and the National Assembly). The National Assembly became a non-standing body whose sole powers were to amend the constitution and alter national territory upon the proposal of the LY. The Assembly was eventually abolished in 2005.

Prior to the 2008 elections, the Single Non-Transferable Vote (SNTV) system was used to determine 168 seats for 21 multi-member constituencies. In addition, where candidates represented political parties, each political party's votes were derived by nationally aggregating the votes of all its candidates. Forty-one seats were proportionally distributed among parties who received at least five percent of the total votes nationwide. Finally, Taiwan's aboriginal population and overseas constituencies each elected eight members. The 2004 elections were the last to be held under this system.

Under reforms approved in 2005, the number of LY seats has been reduced from 225 to 113 and legislative terms increased from three to four years. A dual-ballot system was also introduced: one ballot for district candidates, and one for party lists. A FPTP system is now used to determine 73 seats representing single-member districts. An additional 34 seats are allocated using proportional representation based on the vote shares for the party list ballots. Under a new requirement, 50 percent of the party lists must be women. The remaining six seats are set aside for the aboriginal population.

Candidate Selection in Historical Perspective. Since a number of elections were held under one-party rule, candidate selection in the KMT predates the return to constitutional

rule. In the absence of grassroots structures, between 1950 and 1957, candidate selection in the KMT largely involved identifying and granting party support to appropriate individuals. As the party rebuilt its organizational structures, the central unit imposed greater control over candidate selection. Local party branches conducted informal assessments of members' views of various candidates, sharing this information with party leaders at the national level. National leaders made the final decision and were under no obligation to take into account the opinions of party branches. Similar practices continued through the late 1980s with exceptions in the Taipei Municipality, where local branches were allowed greater say.

In 1989, as one-party rule came to an end and competitive electoral politics emerged, the KMT turned to party primaries. Party officials saw the reforms as a way to decentralize selection procedures and improve the party's image while strengthening party unity. However, party cadres did not remain neutral in the process and internal competition exacerbated divisions within the party. Critics argued that the reforms led to higher campaign costs and that since participants in the primaries were largely unrepresentative of Taiwan's population, the candidates they chose could not attract the votes necessary to win. Although the KMT won a majority in the LY in 1989, it did so with fewer votes and seats, allowing critics of the reforms to blame the primary system. For 1992, a weighted system was introduced: members' votes and cadre evaluations each accounted for 50 percent. In addition, local branches had the option of canceling primaries and making recommendations directly to party headquarters. Subsequent modifications allowed branches to choose party member opinion responses, primaries, cadre evaluations and polls but these remained advisory since party leaders still assessed branch proposals.

In 2000, the KMT lost the presidential elections and embarked on a comprehensive reform program. As a result, candidate selection procedures were revised once gain. Candidates for the multi-member seats are now determined by a combination of party primaries and public opinion surveys of the general voting public.

Current Selection Procedures

Candidate Eligibility. Candidate selection rules lay out the following eligibility criteria:

- Must have been with the party (or returned to it) for at least four months;
- Must have an unblemished party record;
- Be paid-up on their membership dues four months before the primary date; and
- Be a member in good standing.

Aspirants for LY candidacy must submit the following documents and information to the party branch:

- Completed registration form;
- Receipts demonstrating membership registration and payment of party dues;
- Recommendation letters from senior party officials;
- Personal biography;
- Electoral strategy;
- Election affidavit/declarations;
- Internal nomination fee;
- Current (i.e. no older than four months) government registration information (in Taiwan, the government maintains a register of all residents); and
- A photograph.

Further, the rules also require applicants to provide educational, professional and other information so that the necessary background checks can be conducted by the party. Individuals found guilty of any of the following crimes (either in Taiwan or elsewhere) are disqualified:

- Organized crime including drug trafficking, money laundering and corruption;
- Violation of public officeholder recall laws, bribery (including vote buying) and inciting the public to violence;
- Sexual harassment or involvement in the child sex trade; or
- Murder, assault, robbery, kidnapping or fraud.

Such individuals are barred from seeking the party's nomination and may not be nominated by the party. Where charges are pending or suspected, even in the absence of a verdict, individuals must disclose the charges they may be under so that party Evaluation and Discipline Committees at the county level may assess the potential damage to the party, the public and society at large.

Principal Steps.

Proportional Representation Lists. A nine-member committee comprising the party chairman, five vice chairmen, the secretary

general and two additional members appointed by the chairman determine the list. Various party units (e.g. the women's wing) forward proposals, from which the committee compiles the list.

Majoritarian Seats.

1. *Interested individuals submit applications to party branches at the electoral district level.* Applications are reviewed, the necessary background checks conducted and a shortlist is drawn up. Applicants are prohibited from:
 - Damaging the party's reputation or maliciously harming/accusing other party members;
 - Using bribery or other methods to secure support; and
 - Using protests or mobs to influence the nomination process.
2. *Public opinion polls are conducted to assess the public appeal of shortlisted individuals.* The public opinion polls must be conducted no more than three weeks before and no later than the date for the membership vote. Under the selection rules, these polls must be independent and completely separate from membership discussions or votes to ensure an accurate measure of each individual's public appeal.
3. *Party members vote on the shortlist.* Any individual who is 18 years or older, has been a member (or has returned to the party) for at least four months, is paid-up on her/his membership dues and is a member in good standing can participate in the vote. The public opinion poll accounts for 70 percent of each contender's score and the membership vote 30 percent. Whoever wins by more than three percent of the aggregated score secures the branch nomination.
4. *A second round of opinion polling and membership vote is held if necessary.* If a candidate does not obtain more than 30 percent support in either the membership vote or the public opinion poll, or in the event that the margin between two candidates is three percent or less, the selection rules encourage the two to confer and reach an agreement. Where such an agreement cannot be reached, a second round of membership voting and public opinion polling is held among the two leading contenders, with the highest vote-getter securing the nomination.
5. *Branches forward the names of their nominees and a report on the selection process to the Central Nomination*

Examination and Verification Committee (CNEVC) for review. The CNEVC, which is appointed by the party chairman, reviews the information submitted by the branches to ensure that the relevant party procedures have been followed.

6. *The CNEVC forwards branch nominations to the Central Standing Committee for final review, ratification and an eventual public announcement on the nomination.*

Strengths and Weaknesses of the Current System. Most analysis of the 2000 presidential elections conclude that the KMT lost because of a split in its support and the fact that corruption became a major election issue, with the opposition DPP portraying itself as a cleaner and reform-minded political alternative. During the ensuing internal discussions about reform, the KMT identified two main weaknesses in past selection procedures: first, a widening gap between party members and leaders and second, the nomination of individuals – some of whom were tainted by allegations of corruption – with insufficient public appeal.

Beginning in 2001, reforms shifted responsibility for candidate selection for SNTV seats from party leaders to members. Drawing upon the system used by the DPP, the KMT introduced a combination of party membership votes and public opinion surveys as the new way of selecting candidates. Leaders hoped that the reforms would: eliminate the old practice whereby party leaders would grant nominations in exchange for favors; bridge the gap between party leaders and the membership; help renew party structures through a more engaged membership; and produce candidates who met the dual tests of party legitimacy and public appeal. In addition, party regulations were revised to include extensive ethical criteria, disqualifying corrupt individuals. These provisions go beyond statutory requirements.

THE LABOUR PARTY (UNITED KINGDOM)

Background

Brief Party History. The Labour Party was established in 1900 to ensure adequate representation of workers, trade unionists and socialists in British politics. Membership in the initial structure, called the Labour Representation Committee, was through affiliate organizations – such as trade unions – rather than on an individual basis. Labour formed its first government in 1924 and experienced electoral success between 1945 and 1951 as well as from 1964 to 1970.

Heavy electoral defeat in 1979 ushered in a period of soul-searching, internal reflection and considerable fighting between intra-party factions. In opposition for the next 18 years, Labour undertook a series of reforms to expand its membership base, reduce the influence of trade unions, increase membership participation and develop more centrist policy proposals that would appeal to a broader public. In 1994, the party elected Tony Blair as its new Leader. Under Blair's leadership, the party revised Clause IV of its constitution, marking a formal break with its historical support for nationalization. (In practice, Labour policies had begun moving towards the center before the 1995 constitutional reform.) Labour returned to power in 1997 with its greatest ever electoral victory, a margin of 179 seats. In 2005, although Labour's margin declined to 67 seats, it won its first ever third consecutive term in office.

The basic organizational unit of the party is the branch, based on the ward boundaries for local elections. Branches feed up to the Constituency Labour Party (CLP), corresponding to electoral districts for Westminster. In addition local branches of affiliated bodies, such as trade unions, have representative and voting rights at CLP level. CLPs feed up to the national level through the Annual Conference and a number of institutions such as the National Policy Forum. The National Executive Committee (NEC) oversees the national operations of the party. It includes representatives from government, Members of Parliament (MPs), Members of the European Parliament, councilors, trade unions, socialist societies and CLPs. Members vote for their CLP representatives on the NEC annually.

Elections to Westminster. The United Kingdom Parliament or Westminster is bicameral, comprising the House of Lords and the House of Commons. This case study will focus on

CASE STUDY AT A GLANCE

Electoral System

- First Past the Post

Main Features of the Selection Process

- Branches may select from a list of pre-approved candidates or consider other aspirants
- If selected, unscreened nominees are subject to national executive endorsement
- Selection meetings at the branch level are based on one member one vote
- Postal ballots are often decisive
- National executive has the option of imposing positive discrimination measures favoring women and ethnic minorities (e.g. all-women shortlists or 50 percent gender quotas used in selected electoral districts)

selection procedures for candidates for the House of Commons. Its 646 members are directly elected using the FPTP System. Members of the House of Commons serve five-year terms. However, elections are called upon the dissolution of parliament, the timing of which is at the discretion of the sitting Prime Minister and can thus be used to political advantage. (The Monarch dissolves parliament at the request of the Prime Minister.)

In modern times, the Conservatives and the Labour Party have alternated in government, between them holding all but a tiny minority of the seats in the House of Commons. Since the 1970s, however, other parties have increased their share of seats at Westminster. These include the Liberal Democrats (who won 62 seats in 2005) and regional parties like the Democratic Unionists, Plaid Cymru, the Scottish National Party, and Sinn Féin.

The concept of safe and targeted seats is central to elections for Westminster. The majority of constituencies are safe seats for one party and hopeless seats for another, while marginal or targeted seats are contested electoral battlegrounds that one party hopes to win from another. The safer a seat is perceived to be, the more contested the nomination, since the candidate's election to Westminster is more or less guaranteed.

Candidate Selection in Historical Perspective. Until late into the twentieth century, candidate selection, like other decision-making processes within the party, was based on delegatory democracy. The national party organization drew

up lists of potential candidates, but the CLPs made the final choice and had the option of choosing individuals not on the national list. Constituency executives drew up shortlists for vote by members of the constituency general management committees. The general management committees comprised delegates from party branches and affiliate organizations. However, organizations could not instruct their delegates to vote for a particular candidate.

Beginning in the 1980s, the party underwent a series of reforms, ostensibly to increase membership participation in not only candidate selection but policy development as well. Party and trade union representatives at the constituency level, accused of selecting candidates who did not represent members' views, were increasingly marginalized. For instance, in 1989 the party introduced new measures requiring branches to seek NEC endorsement of their nominees. Beginning in 1988, a new electoral college system limited trade unions and other affiliated organizations to 40 percent of the vote in each constituency while individual member votes accounted for the remaining 60 percent. Finally, in 1993, the party introduced one member one vote, completely eliminating the block vote previously held by trade unions and other affiliated organizations and granting each individual member an equal vote.

Current Selection Procedures for Westminster

Candidate Eligibility. In addition to statutory criteria, the Labour Party Rule Book outlines the following eligibility requirements for seeking the party's nomination for any public office:

- Continuous membership in the party for at least 12 months; and
- Membership of a trade union recognized by the party and contribution to the fund of that union.

The NEC may approve exceptions to these criteria. Individuals disqualified as candidates for local government are ineligible. In addition, party rules allow the use of positive action measures to ensure the selection of increased numbers of women and ethnic minority candidates.

Procedures for Incumbents. Until 1980, candidate selection in the Labour Party heavily favored incumbents. In CLPs wishing to replace their MPs, the General

Management Committee had to convene a special meeting to start procedures and then cast a vote of no confidence in the incumbent at a subsequent meeting. MPs had the right to appeal to the NEC and most incumbents were reelected. Although the party introduced new rules requiring all MPs to undergo reselection in 1980, incumbent retention rates remained high. Under current rules, incumbents must obtain affirmative nominations from a majority of the party units and affiliates in their electoral district. MPs who fail this trigger ballot still have the right to be placed on the shortlist to compete against others for the nomination.

Principal Steps.

1. *NEC issues procedural guidelines, application form and timetable for prescreening.* The form used for the latest round of selections asks applicants to provide basic biographical information and to outline their background in curriculum vitae format under the following headings:

- Labour Party experience;
- Other life experience;
- Knowledge;
- Communication skills;
- Campaigning skills;
- Representational and problem solving skills;
- Interpersonal, teamwork and liaison skills; and
- Other skills.

Applicants are also asked to include a personal statement (which may include their reasons for seeking selection and a political statement). They must also sign a code of conduct and indicate the region in which they intend to seek nomination. Application for inclusion on the National Parliamentary Panel (NPP) of aspirants preapproved by the central party leadership is optional but encouraged by the NEC. Nationally affiliated organizations like trade unions also have the right to recommend candidates as well. When trade unions recommend candidates, they often commit to covering the individual's campaign costs. This can make them attractive options to CLPs.

2. *Regional Assessment Teams endorsed by the NEC review written applications and conduct trainings and interviews. Those who pass the interview are placed on the NPP.* All applicants are interviewed. They are also

BOX 14: POSITIVE DISCRIMINATION MECHANISMS FOR WOMEN IN THE LABOUR PARTY

During the 1980s and early 1990s Britain continued to lag behind most European Union countries in the representation of women. In 1987 the Labour Party introduced short-listing quotas, by insisting that only women would be selected in identified constituencies. In an attempt to speed change, the fall 1993 Labour conference approved a policy requiring all-women shortlists in half of the party's 'inheritor' seats (where a Labour MP retires), and half of the party's 'strong challenger' seats (defined in the conference motion as Labor's 'most winnable' seats). Under the new rule, although local party members in targeted electoral districts could still vote to nominate candidates, they were obliged to consider only women applicants.

After decades of modest progress, at best, the proportion of women at Westminster doubled overnight: the June 1997 election saw the entry of 120 women members into the House of Commons (18 percent), double the number elected in 1992 (9.2 percent). This trend forms part of a larger phenomenon evident in the United Kingdom (UK) during the late-1990s where growing numbers of women entered other legislative bodies. Some claim that the change experienced in Britain represents part of a larger shift in cultural attitudes towards the political and social roles of women that has been sweeping through many postindustrial societies. Nevertheless, the increase in the number of female Labour MPs played an important role.

The all-women shortlists policy was a controversial one, however, and generated some opposition. It was officially dropped in January 1996, following legal challenges brought by two aggrieved male aspirants at an Industrial Tribunal held in Leeds. The Tribunal accepted the argument that selection procedures facilitate access to employment and are therefore subject to the UK Sex Discrimination Act. However, the party's quota applied during candidate selection for the 1997 elections and was credited with a 10 percentage point increase in female Labour MPs in those elections.

Following the abandonment of the women-only shortlists policy, Labour returned to measures similar to those used between 1987 and 1992. For the 1997-2001 rounds of parliamentary selections, the party insisted on equal numbers of men and women (and at least two of each) on candidate shortlists. This policy resulted in very few female MPs being selected. Only 10.3 percent of women were selected for vacancies in Labour held seats in 2001.

New legislation signed into law in 2002 recognizes parties' right to introduce positive measures, such as quotas, when selecting candidates for Parliament, local government and the devolved assemblies, without risk of legal challenge. It does not indemnify parties from prosecution under European law. The bill received cross-party support in Parliament.

Labour subsequently reintroduced all-women shortlists in candidate selection for selected electoral districts. In 2005, 22 new Labour women MPs were elected. Over time, the number of Labour women candidates and MPs could increase further; the party is aiming for 40 percent representation in Parliament following the next election.

offered training, which most aspirants accept. Specialist training sessions are held for women and ethnic minorities. Individuals who fail this stage are provided with an explanation and have the right to petition the party's Appeals Committee, a structure that is independent of the selection process. At this point, individuals have not yet been selected by constituencies as potential candidates.

3. *CLPs advertise that the selection process is open and post a timetable.* Potential candidates contact the local party and express an interest: they are asked to send in a

curriculum vitae which is circulated. Candidates can then canvass members and are also invited to events – such as an all member meeting – to meet with party members.

4. *Local branches and other party units hold meetings to nominate individuals and forward their names to the constituency level.* Branches and other units can nominate any individual who is on the NPP or who meets the eligibility criteria established in the party rules. Any individual whose membership fees are paid-up for at least one year and is also a member of an affiliated trade union can apply to a branch for

nomination even if s/he does not go through the NPP process. However, if s/he succeeds in securing the nomination of a constituency party, s/he is called before the NEC for an endorsement interview.

5. *Constituency General Committees consider branch and affiliated organizations' nominations, conduct interviews and draw up shortlists.* Branches must nominate a woman, a man and a Black, Asian, or Minority Ethnic (BAME) candidate if one or more of each group seeks nomination. Affiliates need only make one nomination. The shortlist is decided by vote and must include an equal number of men and women. Where one or more BAME aspirants apply at least one must be shortlisted. Certain vacant constituencies may be required to draw up all-women shortlists. Regional directors validate shortlists to ensure that they meet relevant criteria.
6. *Shortlists are submitted to a membership vote.* Any individual with a minimum of six months continuous party membership and residing in the electoral district concerned is entitled to participate in the vote. During selection meetings, typically, prior to the vote, each aspirant addresses the gathering and takes questions from the audience. Members unable to attend in person can apply to cast their vote by postal ballot. The postal ballot, accounting for a large portion of the vote, is often decisive.
7. *CLPs submit their nominees to the NEC for endorsement.* All potential nominees must undergo endorsement interviews before they are recommended to the NEC. Nominations are not considered official or final until endorsed by the NEC.

The Impact of the Reforms. Opinions of the impact of the reforms to Labour's candidate selection procedures are divided. Some observers describe the changes (in combination with other reforms) as an effective strategy in boosting party membership and electoral support and allowing for meaningful membership participation in decision-making. They also provide important checks and balances to ensure Labour party candidates reflect the communities they represent. Others emphasize that central party leaders have successfully built a significant number of controls into the process, allowing themselves even greater

influence over selections than in the past, particularly through the requirement that the NEC endorse all candidates selected by the Constituency Parties. Some even argue that the changes were part of a conscious strategy by national party leaders to marginalize "activists" at the constituency level whom they perceived to be unrepresentative and too leftist (compared to ordinary members and other voters) in their views. Following a dramatic increase during party renewal, membership of the Labour Party has significantly fallen in recent times. Some members feel that the party has abandoned too many of its traditional values. In the meantime, the Conservatives, Labour's primary rival, have sought to broaden their support through renewal efforts of their own. Table 4 compares candidate selection across the UK's largest parties.

TABLE 4: CANDIDATE SELECTION IN THE UNITED KINGDOM'S THREE LARGEST PARTIES

	Labor	Conservatives	Liberal Democrats
<i>Authority to Define Selection Rules</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The party rule book lays out fundamental principles and guidelines but allows the national executive to modify rules and issue further guidance. · Step by step procedures are usually developed by national party officials and are issued prior to each selection cycle. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The party constitution recognizes fundamental principles and the right of Constituency Associations to choose, but allows the Party Board to define procedures. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Detailed step by step procedures including internal reporting requirements, procedures for shortlisting, length of shortlist, advertising selections etc. are attached to the English party constitution.
<i>Eligibility Criteria</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Twelve month party membership, membership of an affiliated trade union (or one recognized by the party's national executive) and financial contributions to said trade union. National executive may approve exceptions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · No specific eligibility criteria. · Focus on individuals possessing key competencies like communication interpersonal skills, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Party membership.
<i>Use of Approved List</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Constituencies have the option of choosing from the national approved list, from trade union or other affiliate lists, or from other sources. · If an individual not on the national approved list wins the nomination, s/he must undergo an endorsement interview with national party leaders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Constituencies must choose from nationally-approved list. Within the approved list, there is a priority list of the "best and brightest" candidates. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Constituencies must choose from nationally-approved list.
<i>Reselection of Incumbents</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · If incumbent secures affirmative nominations from a majority of the Labour Party units and affiliated organizations within her/his electoral district, s/he is automatically reselected subject to NEC endorsement. If incumbent loses trigger ballot, s/he is automatically included on the shortlist to compete against others for the nomination. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Incumbents must seek the approval of their association's executive council in order to stand for office again. If approval is granted, incumbent is presented as sole candidate for adoption by membership meeting. Where this approval is denied, MP has the right to seek postal ballot of full membership or be automatically added to the shortlist. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The incumbent is reselected if the majority of members attending a local party meeting endorse her/him. The incumbent has the option of requesting a ballot of all local members if the resolution is defeated.
<i>Criteria for Members to Vote in the Selection Process</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Continuous membership for at least six months and residency in the concerned electoral district. The National executive may approve exceptions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Membership of at least three months prior to the selection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Membership of the party at the time selection process begins in the electoral district.

TABLE 4 (CONTINUED): CANDIDATE SELECTION IN THE UNITED KINGDOM'S THREE LARGEST PARTIES

	Labor	Conservatives	Liberal Democrats
<i>Central Unit Oversight/Control of Local Selection Process</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The national executive must endorse candidates selected by the constituency. The national executive has the right to withhold endorsement from individuals considered to be in breach of party rules. · The national executive may also dispense with normal procedure in cases of emergency or in the broader interests of the party. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The national executive has the power to establish mandatory rules but no specific veto rights. · The national executive appoints a returning officer to oversee the selection process in each electoral district. Her/his primary responsibilities are to ensure due process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · State Candidates Committees have the right to remove individuals from the approved list for: unsuitable behavior; no longer supporting the fundamental values or objectives of the party; being in poor health; or for any other reason.
<i>Positive Discrimination Measures</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The rule book notes that “the party will take positive action to ensure that considerably more women and ethnic minority candidates are selected.” · Branches must nominate a woman, a man and a Black, Asian, or Minority Ethnic (BAME) candidate if one or more of each group seeks nomination. · For each selection cycle, the national executive identifies particular electoral districts – typically where the incumbent is not standing once again – that are required to draw up all-women shortlists. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · New changes in 2005 required 50 percent of the priority list, the “best and brightest” of the nationally-approved list, to be female. · There are no outcome quotas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Party rules set procedural gender quotas for shortlisting “subject to there being a sufficient number of applicants of each sex,” but there are no outcome quotas. However, the party sets targets for increasing the number of female candidates and female MPs.

THE LIBERAL PARTY (CANADA)

Background

Brief Party History. The Liberal Party traces its roots to the self-determination movement of the 1800s in what is now Canada. During the first 30 years of confederation, the Liberals remained in opposition with the exception of one brief term in government (1873 to 1878). However, since the Great Depression, the Liberals have spent more time in government than any other Canadian Party.

By 1957, the Liberals had been in power for 22 years. General elections that year resulted in a Conservative minority government. The Liberals suffered one of their heaviest ever defeats during general elections the following year. Over the next few years, and under the leadership of Lester Pearson, the Liberals developed new policies, and recruited new headquarters' staff. They won the 1963 general elections but failed to secure a majority in parliament. Eventually, the Liberals would remain in power uninterrupted until 1984, with the exception of a short-lived Progressive Conservative Government led by Joe Clark. The Progressive Conservatives won a resounding victory in the 1984 elections: 211 seats to the Liberals' 40.

In 1982, the Liberals had established an internal Committee on Reform to consult party members and recommend a comprehensive package of reforms. Electoral defeat in 1984 gave further impetus for renewal. In 1985, the party convened a Reform Conference, approving various changes to the party constitution to modernize the party and increase participation by women, youth and aboriginal Canadians. The reforms also helped to inform revised party policies. In 1990, with the Liberals still in opposition, a Reform Commission was mandated to review the party constitution and recommend changes to improve democracy, equity and transparency within the party. The Commission Report, "Road Map to Reform," shaped constitutional amendments in 1992.

The Liberals returned to power in 1993, eventually securing four consecutive general election victories. Three years after the merger of the Progressive Conservatives and Canadian Alliance, the new Conservative Party went on to form a minority government in 2006. With the dissolution of the Progressive Conservative Party, the Liberal Party is now the oldest party operating at the federal level in Canada.

CASE STUDY AT A GLANCE

Electoral System

- First Past the Post
- Extensive federal regulation of campaign finance including spending limits for the nomination process

Main Features of the Selection Process

- Federal party selection rules with the option of variations by provincial branches
- Built-in measures for direct appointment of candidates at the Leader's discretion
- Membership drives an integral part of the nomination process

As is typical in Canada, the basic organizational unit of the Liberal Party is the Electoral District Association (EDA). As the name suggests, EDAs operate at the level of electoral districts for the House of Commons. They feed up into Provincial and Territorial Associations (PTAs) and on into the national level. Like Canada itself, the party operates a federal structure that combines considerable degrees of decentralization to PTAs with measures for coherence and discipline at the national level. For instance, while the central party unit determines selection procedures, PTAs may adopt some modifications.

Elections in Canada. Canada is a federal parliamentary democracy that comprises 10 provinces and three territories. The federal parliament comprises a Senate (the upper house) and a House of Commons (the lower house). The country is also a constitutional monarchy: on the advice of the Canadian Prime Minister, the Crown appoints a Governor General to carry out day-to-day duties in Canada on its behalf. On the recommendation of the Prime Minister, the Governor General appoints the 105 members of the Senate. The 308 members of the House of Commons are elected to represent single-member electoral districts – referred to as ridings – using the FPTP system. As is common in parliamentary democracies, the leader of the party with the largest number of seats in the House of Commons forms the government. Members of the House of Commons are elected to four-year terms. However, if the government loses a vote of confidence before the expiration of the four-year term, or if the prime minister requests the dissolution of parliament, early elections are called. This case study will focus on candidate selection for elections to the

House of Commons. Canada has extensive campaign finance regulations and in 2003, introduced spending limits for nomination campaigns.

Candidate Selection in Historical Perspective. During the nineteenth century, Canadian political parties were primarily cliques of notables and loose local networks tied to political parties through leading community figures. In the absence of formal party membership and national party structures, the idea that local networks should choose their own candidates took hold and remains an important principle in candidate selection to this date. In the early decades of Confederation, legislative candidates were typically selected by local delegate conventions. In the first half of the twentieth century however, regional party bosses increasingly played an influential role in selection procedures, sometimes verging on the autocratic.

By the 1970s, political parties had become more institutionalized and new intra-party and statutory regulations had been put in place. In the lead up to the 1972 federal election, new amendments to the Canada Elections Act provided for the listing of candidates' party affiliation on ballot papers. To avoid any disputes over candidates' affiliation, a new provision required party leaders to sign candidate registration documents, thus confirming them as official party candidates.

Nevertheless, a cross-party study of candidate selection for the 1988 elections found that in only a handful of the sample electoral districts did party agencies at the national level decide the nominees. In fact, the national Liberal leadership was forced to back down from its efforts to reserve three districts in Quebec for particular candidates. The same study found that in over 90 percent of cases, selections were decided by membership vote (Erickson and Carty 1991). Since the early 1990s, however, there are reports of increasing national influence over candidate selection in the Liberal Party.

Candidate Selection

Eligibility Criteria. The Liberal Party's national candidate selection procedures for 2007 spelled out the following eligibility criteria:

- Current membership (must also be in good standing);
- Full and truthful completion of relevant forms;
- Eligibility under the laws of Canada;

- Satisfaction of any debts to the party and its constituent elements;
- Compliance with federal and relevant PTA rules;
- The signatures of 25 members in good standing;
- Willingness to undergo background checks or face sanctions; and
- Approval of the provincial or territorial chair to be a qualified contestant. (This approval may be revoked by the Leader in his/her sole discretion at any time.)

Provincial or territorial campaign chairs may waive or vary some of these requirements. Further, the selection rules include campaign finance requirements imposed by law.

In recent years, the party has taken steps to increase the number of women candidates. However, no formal quota is in place.

Principal Steps. Following are the principal steps laid out in the national party rules.

1. *The National Election Readiness Committee (NERC) establishes candidate selection procedures.* The NERC comprises the National President and two National Campaign Co-Chairs appointed by the Leader in consultation with the National President. In addition, Provincial or Territorial Rules may grant the Leader the authority to designate candidates without the normal selection procedure. Provincial or Territorial Campaign Committees may also determine that no search is required. Further, in situations of electoral urgency (either across the country or in specific EDAs) as determined by a National Campaign Chair, s/he may alter the selection rules for any EDA at his/her discretion.
2. *PTA Campaign Committees adopt variations to the national rules, as appropriate.* Any variations are developed in consultation with PTA executives and must be consistent with the national rules. Table 5 compares the procedures for the Liberal Parties of Quebec and Ontario to illustrate some of the variations.
3. *Interested individuals apply, using national and/or PTA forms for their area.* In Canada, applicants seeking parties' nomination are expected to recruit new members as part of their campaign. As a result, application packs include the forms that interested individuals must fill as well as new membership forms. On the nomination forms, applicants provide background information about

themselves and sign a document allowing the party to conduct background checks. Individuals who refuse to sign the document allowing the party to conduct background checks are liable to sanction. In addition, some PTAs require a deposit or impose a fee. Due to Canada's campaign finance regulations, applicants are required to appoint financial agents for their nomination campaign.

4. *Applications are reviewed at the national and appropriate PTA level.* The national Leader's approval is required for any applicant to proceed to the next stage.
5. *EDA selection meetings are called when necessary.* A National Campaign Chair must approve the calling of EDA selection meetings. EDAs must show that they have conducted an acceptable search or that no meeting is required. Subject to the rules of the Provincial or PTA, the Election Readiness Coordinator (who is appointed by the Leader) appoints a returning officer who must remain nonpartisan until 72 hours after the selection has concluded.
6. *EDAs hold selection meetings to choose a nominee.* The selectorate includes all members in good standing who were members at least seven days before the selection meeting was called. PTAs have the option of establishing their own requirements for membership participation. Members may only vote in person. An absolute majority of the votes cast is required to secure the nomination. EDAs have the option of using traditional ballots (with provisions for runoffs) or single preferential ballots.
7. *Nominee is approved by the National Campaign Committee or the Leader.* Under Article 49 of the Constitution, the National Campaign Committee or the Leader may decline to approve a person to be candidate. Their decision is final.

Strengths and Weaknesses of the System. The Liberal Party's selection procedures reflect considerable decentralization to PTAs but include built-in measures for national influence. The latter includes the Leader's power to directly appoint candidates. While these prerogatives allow national party leaders to balance the ticket (thereby helping to accommodate various groups within Canadian society), the trade-off is the loss of the concerned EDA's ability to influence the selection of their candidate. As Table 6 illustrates, the Conservative Party also

allows for significant participation by EDAs but makes no provision for variations in the rules by provincial parties.

In recent elections, the Liberal Party Leader has used his powers to secure nominations for high-profile candidates and to increase the number of women nominees. In other cases, Provincial Campaign Chairs appointed by the central party have discouraged individuals from seeking the nomination, arguing that they would be unacceptable to the party and should not risk the public embarrassment of having their application or nomination rejected. Many nominations, especially those with incumbents seeking reselection, are uncontested.

As indicated above, membership recruitment drives are an integral part of the candidate nomination procedures and routinely bring in new members. In addition to procedures governing access to membership application forms, the party establishes specific guidelines to help ensure that each new member does, indeed, have the intent to join the party and pays his or her own membership dues. Nevertheless, concerns remain over abuse of recruitment processes. Many individuals appear to join parties simply to participate in the selection procedures. In recent years, the membership recruitment drives tied to nominations have become increasingly controversial. All political parties are under pressure from some of their longtime activists to reform nomination rules to make these types of mobilization efforts more difficult.

Despite the importance of membership drives, a relatively small portion of general election voters participate in selection procedures. As such, the selection procedures may not necessarily provide any meaningful indication of who is more likely to attract the broadest appeal in the general election. Further, party membership requirements are often quite lenient. The result is that recruitment drives often register new members who do not have the right to vote in Canadian elections (immigrant communities, for instance).

TABLE 5: EXAMPLES OF VARIATIONS IN LIBERAL PROVINCIAL AND TERRITORIAL ASSOCIATION (PTA) SELECTION PROCEDURES

	Quebec	Ontario
<i>Who determines the PTA Selection Rules?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The constitution empowers the General Council to adopt selection rules. However, the 2005 rules were adopted by the convention and can be amended either by the General Council or a convention. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Ontario Campaign Committee.
<i>Who administers the selection process?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The party Election Commission co-chaired by the President of the Liberal Party of Quebec and the Leader, who appoint additional members. The Commission appoints the chair and the secretary of selection meetings. The chair decides how to run the meeting and voting procedures. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Campaign Chair appoints chairs and returning officers for selection meetings upon consultation with constituency executive. The Campaign Chair also fixes the date, location and voting hours for selection meetings.
<i>Are there eligibility criteria in addition to those in the national rules?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Membership of the Liberal Party of Quebec. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No
<i>What is the threshold for an EDA to hold a selection meeting?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A minimum membership of 500 members in good standing is required for a constituency association to hold selection meeting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A minimum membership of 400 or two percent of the Liberal vote in the last federal election, whichever is lower, is required. Must show satisfactory search.
<i>Are there variations to the national application process?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A \$1000 deposit is required to obtain the nomination application pack. The deposit is reimbursable 30 days following the contest or 30 days after notice of decision not to file. Prospective applicants may only complete and sign their forms after receiving authorization from the election commission. Completed papers must be submitted along with a non-refundable check of \$1000. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No.
<i>What are the rules for membership recruitment during nomination campaigns?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aspiring nominees may receive no more than 250 membership application forms with their application pack. They may obtain an additional 250 membership application forms after the first 250 forms have been filled. No contestant may receive more than 500 application forms. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On request, approved nomination contestants may receive 300 forms. For every completed form submitted with the payment of membership dues, approved nomination contestants may obtain two additional forms.
<i>What is the threshold for membership participation in the selection process?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members in good standing. New members of at least 30 days prior to the official date for holding of the meeting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New members must have signed their own membership form or completed an online application form no later than three months before the date of the call of the meeting. Individuals whose membership has lapsed for no longer than three months can renew their membership prior to or at the meeting.
<i>What are the voting procedures at the selection meeting?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More than 50 percent required to secure nomination. If a winner is not determined in first round, the individual with the least number of votes is eliminated. If there are more than three contestants, individuals must secure at least 10 percent of the vote in order to participate in subsequent rounds. If there are two consecutive draws, the final decision is determined by lots. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where there are more than two contestants for the nomination, preferential ballots are used.

TABLE 6: CANDIDATE SELECTION IN THE CANADIAN CONSERVATIVE AND LIBERAL PARTIES

	Conservative Party	Liberal Party
<i>Who defines the rules?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The National Council. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The National Election Readiness Committee, with option of variations by Provincial and Territorial Associations (PTAs).
<i>Who administers the process at the national level?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The National Candidate Selection Committee (NCSC) of the National Council, in partnership with Candidate Nomination Committees at the electoral district level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The National Campaign Committee, in partnership with relevant PTA and Electoral District Association (EDA).
<i>Who administers the process at a sub-national level?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The Candidate Nomination Committee (CNC) appointed by EDA executive. · The CNC members must sign and pledge not to seek nomination and to remain impartial in the selection process for their EDA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · PTA officials in partnership with EDA.
<i>What is the national leadership involvement?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Only the NCSC may disallow an application. · The NCSC may disallow an individual's candidacy at any time before or after nomination by the EDA. · The national campaign chair may alter rules at his/her discretion for any EDA in case of electoral urgency. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The national leader must approve all nomination contestants. · The national campaign chair must approve calling of EDA selection meeting. · The national leader may designate a candidate without a selection process. · The national campaign chair may alter rules in case of electoral urgency.
<i>What is the threshold for EDA participation?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · At least two-thirds of the highest membership since the creation of the party in 2003. · A bank balance of at least 50 percent of the total spent by the candidate for the last general election. · The submission of campaign, budget and fundraising plans. · Evidence of conduct of a reasonable search. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Evidence of conduct of a reasonable search. · Variations by PTA, e.g. minimum membership requirement.
<i>What are the eligibility criteria?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Minimum six month membership. · Must not have been an unsuccessful candidate in both of the two prior federal elections. · Both of the above criteria may be waived by the director of political operations in consultation with the president of National Council. · Nomination petition signed by at least 25 members. · Incumbents in good standing automatically qualify to contest the nomination unless they submit written notification of intent to withdraw. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Party membership. · Nomination petition signed by at least 25 members. · Settlement of any debts to the party. · Any other requirements established by National Election Readiness Committee.
<i>Are bonds or deposits required?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Good conduct bond of \$1000, reimbursable if not accepted as a nomination contestant and determined to have observed rule to that point; if accepted as nomination contestant upon completion of federal election; or upon obtaining the nomination. · Non-frivolous bond of \$1000, reimbursable if not accepted as nomination contestant or if accepted as nomination contestant and received either nomination or at least 10 percent of first vote. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · None required at the national level. · Variations by PTA.
<i>What is the threshold for membership participation?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Members in good standing at least 21 days prior to the nomination event. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Members in good standing at least seven days prior to the call of the selection meeting with option of variation by PTA.
<i>What are the guidelines for membership drives?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Guidelines require that each individual pays his or her own dues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Variations by PTA, e.g. number of blank membership forms per candidate. · Guidelines require that each individual pays his or her own dues unless for family members.

THE NEW PATRIOTIC PARTY (GHANA)

Background

Brief Party History. More than 50 years after Ghana secured its independence from Britain (in 1957), politics in the country continues to be defined by the ideologies of the parties that were in the forefront of the struggle for self-determination. The United Gold Coast Convention (UGCC), registered in 1947 as the then colony's first party laid the foundation for market-oriented political parties. The policies of the Convention People's Party and its leader, the country's first president, Kwame Nkrumah, set the tone for political parties with more leftist leanings. Over time (and given periods of military or one-party rule as well as fragmentation), while the names and composition of Ghanaian parties have changed, and parties have moved closer to the ideological center, most of them continue to trace their roots or affiliations back to these two traditions. As such, although the New Patriotic Party (NPP) was formally registered as a political party in 1992 (upon Ghana's return to constitutional multiparty democracy under the fourth republic), it traces its roots to predecessor parties of the UGCC tradition.

Upon losing the first presidential election under the fourth republic in 1992, the NPP, citing concerns over the administration of the process boycotted legislative elections later that year. The party contested and lost the 1996 presidential and legislative elections, but defeated the then ruling National Democratic Congress (NDC) in 2000 to secure the presidency as well as a majority of the seats in parliament. The 2004 elections returned President Kufuor (with 52.45 percent of the vote) and maintained the NPP's majority in parliament (128 of 230 seats).

The basic organizational unit of the party is at the constituency level, corresponding to electoral districts. Within each constituency, there are various polling station areas, each of which is usually a party official. Constituency organizations report to party headquarters through regional offices.

Elections in Ghana. National elections are held every four years with voters casting their ballots for legislators and national president on the same day. Legislators are elected to represent single-member electoral districts under the First Past the Post system. Since the return to multiparty politics, the NPP and

CASE STUDY AT A GLANCE

Electoral System

- First Past the Post

Main Features of the Selection Process

- Selection by delegate conventions at the branch level
- Concerns over the use of money to influence delegate choices

NDC have, between them, held all but a small minority of the seats in parliament. Two other parties and one independent currently hold eight of the 230 seats. The NPP and the NDC each have their respective strongholds while certain areas are considered "swing" electoral districts.

Candidate Selection Procedures

Candidate Eligibility. According to Article 11(4) of the party constitution, in order to seek the party's nomination, an individual must:

- Be a known and active member of at least two years;
- Be a registered member and voter in the constituency which he or she seeks to represent;
- Be of good character;
- Be of good standing;
- Qualify under the country's electoral laws;
- Pay the fee prescribed by the party's National Executive Council (NEC); and
- Sign "Undertaking of Parliamentary Candidates."

The NEC is authorized to waive the membership requirements in consultation with the party's regional and constituency executives. Political parties in Ghana routinely require prospective candidates to pay nomination fees. In some cases, there are two separate fees: one for the application form and a second for filing the application with the party. In 2007/2008, NPP nomination fees were the equivalent of approximately 500 USD.

Procedures for Incumbents. Party rules make no specific provisions for incumbents. However, there are reports of attempts by party headquarters to encourage the reselection of sitting MPs. For instance, in the lead up to the 2000 elections, the Secretary General and other party officials made public

BOX 15: REFORMING CANDIDATE SELECTION IN GHANA'S NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS

In the lead up to the 1992 elections, the first after Ghana's return to multiparty democracy, candidate selection in the National Democratic Congress (NDC) was somewhat *ad hoc* and chaotic, partly due to the short timeframe between the official registration of political parties and the start of the campaign period. For the 1996 elections, the process was better defined, and was largely based on the use of electoral district congresses.

New procedures approved at the party's 1998 Congress involved a series of informal consultations at local, regional and national levels to assess the performance of incumbent MPs and to recruit new candidates where necessary but gave the NEC final authority to decide. Some party officials justified this apparent shift of power back towards the center by arguing the need for internal party discipline. In the lead up to the elections, media reports were rife with reports of divisions within the party over the process (including accusations of candidates being imposed on electoral districts). They not only contributed to a negative public image of the party but also led voters to switch their support to independent candidates (some of them NDC members who lost the party nomination) or other parties. In the aftermath of its defeat, the party embarked on efforts to reorganize and renew the organization. Candidate selection procedures were revised during the 2002 Congress. As a result, the party rules were amended to require the use of electoral district delegate conferences in legislative candidate selection. Later, further instructions were issued in "Guidelines for the Election of NDC Parliamentary Candidates for the 2004 Elections."

In contrast, Ghana's New Patriotic Party, which won the 2000 elections, has used the same candidate selection system – as spelled out in its rules – since the return to multiparty politics in 1992. Some argue that since the NPP is based on previous party structures and has in its ranks many people with previous party organizing experience, it may have had less of a need to experiment than the NDC, a party that arose out of a military regime and various populist structures (Öhman 2004).

statements in support of the reselection of incumbents. They argued that it "would be in the supreme interest of the party if all its 61 sitting MPs are allowed to contest the year 2000 elections without going through primaries" so that the MPs could "continue investing their monies and resources towards the reorganization of their respective constituencies, instead of using resources only to get nominated" (Öhman 2004).

Party officials' reasons for encouraging the reselection of incumbents included the financial costs of organizing constituency conventions and concerns over the potential for divisive intra-party competition. According to one study, while these party officials had no formal means of imposing incumbents on the constituencies, there were cases of informal pressure to ensure the reselection of incumbents. However, pressure from party leaders was not always sufficient to prevent de-selection of an incumbent. In the Bekwai electoral district, for instance, despite appeals from senior party officials (in writing and in person) a delegates' convention was eventually held and the incumbent lost. In electoral districts in the Ashanti region, on the other hand, a regional party official claimed that various contestants were dissuaded from filing applications, leaving incumbents throughout the region to seek the party's nomination uncontested. In a separate interview, the party's national

chair confirmed that party leadership discouraged potential aspirants so that incumbents could run unopposed (Öhman 2004). In the lead up to the 2000 elections, the reselection rate for incumbents was 90 percent. Further, in the lead up to candidate selection for the 2008 elections, party leaders made public statements suggesting that special procedures would be introduced for selection in NPP-held seats. As reported in a local newspaper article (*Chronicle*, June 15, 2007), in addition, they reminded applicants that the party had the right to reject qualified aspirants for "strategic reasons."

Principal Steps

1. *Upon instruction from the NEC, Constituency Executive Committees invite applications for nomination.* The party constitution requires that a notice be posted in "a conspicuous place in the party's constituency office." The constitution requires that selection takes place no later than 12 months before the general election.
2. *National-level party officials travel to the regions to vet applicants.* The NEC gives final approval for the list of individuals going on to the next stage.
3. *Constituency Executive Committees convene extraordinary Constituency Delegates Conferences to choose a candidate.* Delegates include members of the constituency executive

committee and the chairperson of each polling station executive committee. (The number of delegates varies but is typically around 100.) Delegates vote by secret ballot and an absolute majority is required to secure the nomination. In the event that no aspirant secures an absolute majority in the first round of voting, a second ballot is held between the two candidates securing the highest number of votes.

Strengths and Weaknesses of the Current System. Overall, selection by delegates has proved effective in allowing branch participation in selection processes. As Box 15 shows, the NPP's candidate selection procedures have been more institutionalized, more decentralized and more stable than those of its principal competitor, the NDC. While polling station and constituency officials are elected by party members, these individuals are ex-officio delegates in selection conferences. In other words, delegates to the selection convention are not directly elected for that purpose. While there are some reports of delegates consulting with members, they are under no formal obligation to consider the opinions of members in casting their vote.

In addition, although the voting process at the delegates' conference itself is relatively formal and by secret ballot, concerns have been expressed over the role of patronage in selection processes. A survey of campaign spending among Ghanaian MPs found that "the National Patriotic Party (NPP) also had to go through primaries and many of them testified that even in these intra-party races patronage played a significant role" (Lindberg 2003). Other parties are also affected by similar concerns.

THE PANHELLENIC SOCIALIST MOVEMENT (GREECE)

Background

Brief Party History. The Panhellenic Socialist Movement, better known as PASOK, was established when Greece returned to democracy in 1974 after 10 years of military rule. After coming third (with 13.5 percent of the vote and only 15 seats out of 300) in the November 1974 elections, the party quickly expanded its voter base. By the 1977 elections, PASOK had doubled its share of the vote, securing 92 seats and becoming the official opposition. In the 1981 elections, the party won 173 seats and formed the government. In the late 1980s, however, PASOK suffered electoral defeat, but quickly recovered, coming back to power in 1993.

By 2004, the party had been in power for 19 of the preceding 22 years. Lackluster economic performance and widespread perceptions of the party as corrupt posed a threat to electoral success. In the months leading up to the March 2004 legislative elections, opinion polls put the party 10 points behind New Democracy (ND), its primary competitor. Meanwhile, spurred by increasing disillusionment with the political system, a reform movement had begun to emerge within the party. Costas Simitis resigned as party leader, calling upon party members to back his Foreign Minister, George Papandreou as his replacement.

In the past, a powerful 180-member Central Committee elected the party president. Capitalizing on demands for internal reforms, Papandreou supported efforts to introduce a more participatory and direct system of formally selecting a party leader. As a result of changes to party rules, Papandreou was elected party president by a universal, direct vote of registered party members as well as PASOK sympathizers. While Papandreou ran unopposed, this election of a party president by a vote open to the general public marked a first in Greek politics. Over one million people voted in the selection process. Although the party's support began to improve in the aftermath of Papandreou's selection, ND eventually won the 2004 elections by five percent margin of the national vote.

Under Papandreou's leadership, PASOK has undertaken additional reforms to diversify leadership, improve party discipline, broaden and strengthen membership and increase

CASE STUDY AT A GLANCE

Electoral System

- List Proportional Representation: 56 single and multi-member districts; one national list; 40-seat bonus for party with largest number of votes.

Main Features of the Selection Process

- Through membership meetings, branches are consulted in determining candidate lists for 56 electoral districts.
- Final list of candidates for the 56 districts determined by the internal election commission after consulting reports of branch meetings.
- The national list is drafted by the party president and approved by the national executive.

transparency and internal communication. For instance, a new gender quota for leadership and delegate positions has been established and party membership has been opened up to immigrants. PASOK has also established a training institute and an ombudsman's office, the latter to investigate membership complaints and resolve problems or issues.

Under the reforms led by Papandreou, party structures have been streamlined: whereas in the past, multiple units could operate in one locality, these various bodies have now been consolidated, leaving one party unit per municipality. Branches catering to different professional groups have been abolished, as have the action committees that used to coordinate the party's relations with trade unions and agricultural and cooperative movements.

Despite these reforms, a scandal over the management of state pension funds and some criticism of the government's response to widespread fires over the summer, the ND was re-elected in 2007 by a three-and-one-half margin of the national vote. However, both the ruling party and PASOK lost votes to Greece's smaller parties and were left with 152 and 102 seats respectively.

Elections in Greece. Members of the Greek Parliament are elected to the 300-seat parliament for four-year terms. In order to participate in parliament, each contesting party must secure at least three percent of the nationwide vote. Two hundred and forty-eight (248) seats are allocated among 56 electoral districts. (These include single and multi-member constituencies). Using

BOX 16: PASOK'S MAROUSSI EXPERIMENT: CANDIDATE SELECTION BY DELIBERATIVE POLLING

In the lead up to the 2006 mayoral elections for the Greek town of Maroussi, PASOK used an innovative and experimental method for selecting its candidate: deliberative polling, a method developed by the Center of Deliberative Democracy at Stanford University. Deliberative polling is a process in which a scientific random sample answers questions before and after it has had a chance to deliberate. A group of international experts conducted the polling on the party's behalf. Initially, 15 individuals applied for the party's nomination. Screening by party officials reduced the number of qualified applicants to six. A randomly selected group of 160 citizens of Maroussi were asked to choose among the final six through deliberative polling. All of the participants in the exercise received briefing materials on a broad range of issues affecting their city as well as the positions of each aspirant. Over 10 hours in plenary and break out sessions, participants discussed the various issues and questioned the aspirants directly. The first secret ballot produced two leading aspirants. In the run-off, Panagiotis Alexandris secured the required absolute majority and was declared the party's candidate. Although Alexandris eventually lost the mayoral election, PASOK maintains that it was a successful experience. The party is considering expanding the use of deliberative polling in candidate selection and other party activities.

Advocates of the use of deliberative polling in this way argue that it provides for a more informed choice than the soundbites that are typical of mass primaries. A comparison of participant views before and after the deliberative exercise shows that the discussions did influence citizens' views. For instance, Alexandris was the least known of the candidates before the exercise but managed to secure the nomination. In addition, after the exercise, citizens were much more concerned about certain local issues – budgets for education, the main town shopping area and public accountability of elected officials, for instance – and less concerned about others – unemployment, for example. It appears that participants also found the process helpful: on a scale of zero to 10, with 10 being extremely valuable, 94 percent of them rated the process at seven or above. Nevertheless, the costs associated might be prohibitive for certain parties and the deliberative polling process could make for more extended selection processes.

national lists, another 12 seats are distributed among political parties in proportion to their total national vote. Finally, under electoral reforms approved in 2004, the most popular vote winner at the national level receives a “bonus” of 40 seats. Parliament elects the president.

Candidate Selection in Historical Perspective. Historically, candidate selection in PASOK was heavily centralized in the hands of the party leaders. However, as part of a package of reforms under Papandreou's leadership, approved at a 2004 congress, party rules were amended to introduce primaries as the selection mode for local elections. In a further break from the past, authority to select legislative candidates was transferred to a committee whose members would be elected by the party's National Council.

Candidate Selection Procedures

Candidate Eligibility. There are no formal eligibility requirements for legislative candidates. However party rules require that elected officials – mayors, for instance – complete

their current mandates before seeking nomination for legislative office. In addition, political advisors can only seek office if they resign from their position at least two years before they seek nomination. Although the party has a 40 percent quota for women's representation, meeting this requirement has proven difficult for single-member electoral districts.

Procedures for Incumbents. There are no special provisions for incumbents. However, performance in the legislature is taken into account during the National Electoral Committee's review of aspiring candidates.

Principal Steps

For Multi-Member and Single-Member Electoral Districts:

1. Interested individuals submit their curriculum vitae and tax declaration to prefectural branches. (The tax declaration is an internal party requirement and is not mandatory for registering candidates with the election commission.)
2. Prefectural branch officials review all applications and may recruit or add other individuals of interest.
3. A public branch meeting is held where the various applicants are discussed. Branch officials prepare a report and send

this to the National Electoral Committee along with the full list of applicants and any recommendations. In some cases public opinion polls are used to gauge the public appeal of aspiring nominees.

4. *The party's National Electoral Committee, whose members are elected at party congresses, review reports from the branches and makes final decisions on candidate lists.* The party president is also a member of the National Electoral Committee and can thus make recommendations on any additions to candidate lists. This prerogative is typically applied in picking or adding candidates for politically sensitive or multi-member electoral districts.

For the National List:

The party president drafts the list and submits it to the party's Presidium for approval. Typically, the list includes individuals who are more strategically fielded through the national list rather than in specific electoral districts. For instance, given regulations regarding equitable media access for example, it would be difficult for a party secretary general or public relations officer to compete for one of the 288 seats: any media coverage would count towards their share of airtime. The national list is also often used to field personalities and symbolic figures and, more generally, to balance out the party's full slate of candidates.

Strengths and Weaknesses of the Current System. For now, candidate selection for legislative elections remains relatively centralized. However, the recent reforms represent a break from the even more centralized approaches of the past. In 2006, Papandreou stated, "Among the many innovations we have introduced into our Charter, we have undertaken a radical democratization of decision-making procedures. For the first time – both for PASOK and for Greek society as a whole – candidates will not be selected by a committee appointed by the party leader, but by a completely independent committee elected by our movement's National Council."

In certain ways, PASOK remains a party that is still in transition. Papandreou and other officials have noted that the party plans to experiment with a number of pilot projects before making sweeping changes. For instance, while the use of deliberative polling for candidate selection was for a municipal rather than a legislative election, party officials made it clear that it was an experiment which, if successful, might be replicated to select candidates for other elections (see Box 16).

In the immediate aftermath of the 2007 parliamentary elections Papandreou survived a hard fought challenge for leadership of the party, rallying in the final stages of the race to secure almost 55 percent of the vote. Much of the criticism leveled at Papandreou during the leadership contest focused on the legislative election result but also included concerns over Papandreou's wavering over policy positions and internal party reforms. According to one press report, Papandreou said he had been wrong not to "confront head-on the practices, people and ideas which represented negative aspects of our policy" (*Athens News*, September 28, 2007). The renewal of Papandreou's leadership could set the stage for more extensive reforms in policy development as well as other areas, including candidate selection.

THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY (BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA)

Background

Brief Party History. The Social Democratic Party of Bosnia-Herzegovina (SDP BiH) describes itself as a modern, left-oriented party of workers and their dependants. Although founded in 1991, the party traces its roots to the original SDP, established in 1909 to meet the political needs of the working class and to combat interethnic polarization and confrontation.

During the BiH war and the subsequent Dayton Accords, the party stood for the establishment of a democratic state based on social justice, quality, solidarity and responsibility towards others. With the introduction of political pluralism, SDP won and has continued to maintain seats in the federal legislature. It is also represented in legislative bodies at all other levels. The SDP participated in the coalition of moderate parties that formed BiH's government from 2000 to 2002 and is now a leading opposition party. In 2006, the party won five of 42 seats in the Parliamentary Assembly of the BiH House of Representatives. One of BiH's three presidential mandates is held by a member of the SDP.

SDP BiH is active and has organizational structures throughout BiH and has approximately 50,000 members. Party units at the local community level feed up through municipal and cantonal structures to the state level. Functional units within the party include organizations for women, youth, trade and pensioners. The Main Board, whose members are elected at congresses, is the highest political decision-making body of the party between two congresses. Similar boards, also elected, exist at sub-national levels.

Elections to the House of Representatives. Bosnia-Herzegovina (BiH) is a complex state consisting of two entities – the Federation of Bosnia-Herzegovina (or the Federation BiH) and the Republika Srpska (or the RS) – and the District of Brcko. The bicameral Parliamentary Assembly of BiH – the legislature for the entire state – comprises a House of Peoples, whose members are selected by the legislatures of the two entities, and a House of Representatives, directly elected by voters in the two entities.

CASE STUDY AT A GLANCE

Electoral System

- List Proportional Representation.
- Statutory quota: gender neutral, for one in every three positions.

Main Features of the Selection Process

- Party branches and functional units (e.g. women's youth, trade and pensioners' wings) nominate potential candidates.
- Party executives at the municipal, cantonal and national levels consolidate and determine the final lists.
- Internal party quotas for women and youth (35 percent each) percent quotas for women.
- Efforts to ensure multiethnic representation.
- Ongoing discussions about the possible introduction of delegate conventions.

This case study will focus on candidate selection for elections to the House of Representatives.

There are 42 seats in the House of Representatives. Twenty-eight (28) members are elected by voters in the Federation BiH, the remaining 14 by voters in the RS. Approximately two-thirds of the members for each territory are elected from proportional representation lists to represent multi-member electoral districts. The remaining seats are allocated as compensatory mandates. So for instance, 21 of the Federation BiH members represent constituencies, while the remaining seven serve compensatory mandates. Only candidates or lists obtaining more than three percent of the valid ballots in a particular electoral district are eligible for seats allocation.

BiH's electoral law sets gender-neutral quotas for candidate lists for all elections. Candidates from the least represented gender must account for at least one-third of all lists and should occupy at least one of the first two, two of the first five, three of the first eight and so on.

Candidate Selection Procedures

Eligibility Criteria. There are no eligibility criteria in the party statutes. However, under Article 85 of the SDP's Statutes, the Main Party Board adopts candidate selection rules in the lead up to every election and these may include criteria for specific elections.

Article II.2 of the procedures for 2006 simply state that candidates must:

- Possess the ability to propose parliamentary projects in accordance with the party's general goals and electoral platform;
- Significantly contribute to the party's reputation and electoral success;
- Possess expertise;
- Be creative;
- Have teamwork and management skills;
- Have proof of paid-up membership and resolution of any other party debts; and
- Fulfill moral and credibility criteria.

Individuals must indicate a willingness to act in accordance with SDP programs and policies and that, upon nomination, they would be willing to sign a statement to resign their mandate if so requested by SDP or upon dismissal from the party.

Further guidelines require that party lists:

- Be multiethnic and reflect the ethnic structure of the population according to the 1991 census and SDP membership in the given electoral district;
- Include each gender in a minimum of 35 percent of the positions (at least every third candidate must belong to a less represented gender in accordance with the BiH Election Law);
- Include youth (individuals younger than 35) in at least 35 percent of the positions and these individuals must be equally dispersed throughout the list;
- Reflect the social structure of the population;
- Consist of individuals from diverse professional backgrounds that allow adequate coverage of the different functions of legislative bodies; and
- Are geographically representative, while bearing in mind previous election results and the size of the electorate.

Incumbents. There are no specific or special procedures for incumbents. However, under the party's selection procedures, the cantonal and main party boards must consider reports submitted by party caucuses. Caucus reports include evaluations of the contributions and performance of sitting or past legislators. As such, past performance can be taken into account during the selection process.

Principal Steps in the Process

1. *The Main Party Board, whose members are elected at*

party congresses, adopts selection procedures for that particular election.

2. *Grassroots party units – including branches at the most basic level, women's, youth, trade and pensioners' organizations of the party – nominate candidates and forward their proposals to the municipal level.* Individuals may also nominate themselves.
3. *Municipal party boards vote on a shortlist.* Based on the proposal of the municipal-level party leader, municipal party boards appoint Personnel Commissions. These municipal-level Personnel Commissions receive the nominations and make proposals to the municipal party board. The municipal-level party board casts a secret vote to determine the shortlist. The resulting list, which must be consistent with party quotas and guidelines, is forwarded to the cantonal level.
4. *Cantonal party boards vote on consolidated shortlists.* Based on the proposals of the cantonal-level party leader, cantonal party boards appoint Personnel Commissions. These Commissions review the shortlists submitted by municipal structures and draw up a consolidated shortlist based on a secret vote of the cantonal-level party board. The cantonal shortlists, which must also reflect party quotas and other guidelines, are submitted to the Main Party Board at headquarters.
5. *The Main Party Board, comprising approximately 90 individuals, votes to determine the final consolidated list.* At party headquarters, upon the proposals of the Personnel Commission appointed by the Main Party Board, and in accordance with the selection procedures, the Presidency draws up a list of candidates that includes a third more than requested for each electoral district. The Main Party Board discusses all nominations and casts a secret vote on the final list. As appropriate, the Personnel Commission subsequently adjusts the list to ensure compliance with election law and party criteria. The revised list is then submitted to an open vote by the Main Party Board.
6. *Selected candidates are required to sign a pledge committing to resign their position should the party request that they do so or should they be dismissed from the party.* In compliance with BiH's election law, the party President and one other senior official (a Vice President or Secretary General

authorized by the President) sign the final lists. The President may make final corrections to the list if the election law, the party election strategy or party rules are breached.

Strengths and Weaknesses. The SDP's current selection procedures allow party units at all levels to participate in candidate selection procedures and include measures to ensure ethnic and other balances in a country recovering from war where nationalist (ethnic-based) parties continue to operate. In recent years however, there has been increased discussion within the party about expanding the electorate. One of the options under consideration is the use of delegates, rather than party board members, to determine the lists at each stage in the process (municipal, cantonal and state). The delegate model is considered as a future model of candidate selection by a number of political parties in BiH. Another potential reform would be the introduction of formal nomination or application forms for aspiring nominees. Currently, nominees simply have to submit their curriculum vitae.

APPENDICES

ACRONYMS

ANC	African National Congress
BAME	Black, Asian or Minority Ethnic
BiH	Bosnia-Herzegovina
CEN	National Executive Committee (<i>Comité Ejecutivo Nacional</i>)
CLP	Constituency Labour Party
CNC	Candidate Nomination Committee
CNEVC	Central Nomination Examination and Verification Committee
CNPI	National Commission for Internal Processes (<i>Comisión Nacional de Procesos Internos</i>)
COSATU	Congress of South African Trade Unions
CPN	National Political Council (<i>Consejo Político Nacional</i>)
DA	Democratic Alliance
DPP	Democratic Progressive Party
EDA	Electoral District Association
FCEC	Federal Candidates' Election Committee
KMT	Kuomintang
LY	Legislative Yuan
MP	Member of Parliament
ND	New Democracy
NDC	National Democratic Congress
NEC	National Executive Committee
NERC	National Election Readiness Committee
NPP	New Patriotic Party
NCSC	National Candidate Selection Committee
OMOV	One Member One Vote
PAN	National Action Party (<i>Partido Acción Popular</i>)
PASOK	Panhellenic Socialist Movement
PRD	Party of the Democratic Revolution (<i>Partido de la Revolución Democrática</i>)
PRI	Institutional Revolutionary Party (<i>Partido Revolucionario Institucional</i>)
PTA	Provincial and Territorial Association
SACP	South African Communist Party
SDP	Social Democratic Party
SNTV	Single Non-Transferable Vote
STV	Single Transferable Vote

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Balancing the ticket or ticket balance refers to attempts by political parties to bring more widespread appeal to their campaigns by ensuring adequate representation of targeted social groups of voters as defined by gender, geography, ethnicity, religion or other means.

Candidacy addresses the question of who can present him or herself to be chosen as the party's representative for an internal party office or in an election at a particular point in time. The restrictions applied to potential candidates are often classified on a continuum according to the level of inclusiveness or exclusiveness. At the inclusive end, any voter can stand as a party candidate. At the exclusive end there is a series of conditions (see Box 4, page 13) with varying degrees of restriction.

Candidate selection methods or procedures are the internal processes or mechanisms by which political parties choose their candidates for presidential, legislative, local or other elections for public office.

Conventions or congresses are typically political party meetings to select party candidates or officials, often at the national, regional or provincial level which involve delegates representing branches and/or other interest groups within the party. The meetings may also often be used to decide other party business such as approving changes to party rules or approving policy documents.

Decentralization is most commonly used to describe the extent of *territorial* decentralization or the level of control granted to party branches. With regards to candidate selection, decentralization refers to the level or degree to which selection processes are controlled by party officials at the branch level. At one end of the continuum (decentralized), candidate selection processes are controlled by local party organs or constituencies without input from the central party organ. At the opposite (centralized) end, a central party organ, or even one individual, controls candidate selection. Although this paper uses the territorial interpretation of the term, in some cases,

decentralization also refers to the extent to which power is devolved to *functional* groups within a party. For instance, some parties establish sectarian or social group districts, whereby the candidates and the selectors are all members of the same sector or social group (e.g. religious). Another example is the reserved place mechanism, which guarantees a minimal position on the list (or a minimal number of safe seats in the case of single-member districts).

Inclusiveness refers to the level or degree of openness of the selectorate. At the inclusive end of the continuum, the entire electorate participates in the process. At the opposite (exclusive) end, the selectorate (or rather the selector) comprises a single party leader.

Institutionalization refers to the degree of the formalization (and transparency) of candidate selection procedures. On the institutionalized end of the continuum, such procedures are anchored in the party's constitution or rules in great detail. On the opposite (un-institutionalized) end of the spectrum, such procedures are determined *ad hoc* in "smoke-filled rooms."

One Member One Vote (OMOV) usually describes candidate selection and other party decision-making processes that allow for direct participation by all members. It is often perceived as the purest form of "internal democracy," an antithesis to candidate selection in the proverbial "smoke-filled rooms" by party leaders.

Party rules refer to the codified fundamental regulations and principles by which a party is governed and/or operates. Depending on the party and country, they may also be referred to as statutes, constitutions or bylaws. In most cases, parties have additional regulations that define, in further details, issues that are not fully spelled out in their fundamental statutes. These may also be referred to as rules.

Party branches refer to the sub-national offices of a political party. They usually represent a specified geographic area such as the constituency (electoral district), municipality, regional or provincial level.

Quotas involve the use of numerical targets or requirements to ensure the participation of targeted groups. They are typically used as an affirmative action tool to ensure wider representation in terms of gender, geography, persons with disabilities, youth, ethnicity, race or other marginalized groups. The use of quotas and other forms of affirmative action is often highly controversial (see page 19). For examples of the use of quotas see Box 8 on page 20.

The selectorate refers to the person(s) who directly participate(s) in candidate selection procedures by casting a vote or expressing a preference for one candidate or another. It can be composed of one person or several, up to the entire electorate of a given nation. Selectorates are often described in terms of their degree of inclusiveness or exclusiveness (see the definition of ‘inclusiveness’).

Zippering usually refers to the requirement that male and female candidates be alternated over a list of candidates. In the case of proportional representation lists, for instance, zippering, combined with a quota of 30 percent women’s representation would require that a female candidate be placed in every third position on the list. This would help ensure that women are included in the “safe” positions on the list.

ELECTORAL SYSTEMS AND SOME CONSEQUENCES FOR CANDIDATE SELECTION

Electoral systems are usually grouped into three broad families: proportional; plurality/majority; and mixed. In general, under proportional systems, a block of legislative seats is distributed among competing parties and/or candidates in proportion to their share of votes cast. In plurality/majority systems, on the other hand, only parties and candidates garnering the most votes secure seats. As the name suggests, mixed systems combine elements of proportional representation and plurality/majority systems. Within each of these families, additional variations include whether the electorate is asked to choose among candidates or among parties and the number of choices/preferences each voter may express. Following is an overview of some electoral systems and their potential impact on candidate selection. (For more detailed information on various electoral systems see Reynolds et al. 2005.)

Proportional Systems

List Proportional Representation, used in Benin and South Africa, among other places, requires parties or groupings to present a list of candidates for multi-member electoral districts. Electors vote for a party or grouping. Lists are allocated seats in proportion to their share of the total votes cast. In most systems with “closed” lists, seats are allocated to candidates in the order of their position on the lists filed by party officials. (In an unusual variation in Guyana, seats are only assigned to individuals once the election result is known. Parties simply publish their lists in alphabetical order and leaders have considerable scope in assigning actual seats in ways that reward loyalty or punish independence.) Closed List Proportional Representation systems can facilitate balanced tickets because of the coordination required, the flexibility provided by multiple mandates and the fact that voters do not have the option of choosing individual candidates.

The process for ranking positions on the list is a key consideration in candidate selection. Some parties use membership or delegate votes to determine each individual’s

ranking on the list. In others, compiled lists are presented for ratification by a membership or delegate vote. In South Africa’s African National Congress and Mexico’s Party of the Democratic Revolution, branches submit draft lists to a central body that is charged with compiling a unified list. Party selection rules include clear guidelines for how the central unit ranks the lists.

In “open” or “free” systems, voters in the election can influence the order of the candidates by marking individual preferences. Name recognition of particular candidates may therefore be as important as party labels, requiring parties to place greater emphasis on recruiting candidates with the personal profiles likely to attract votes. Parties may also consider taking steps to ensure coordination and preempt divisive campaigning among their candidates and/or issuing strategic voting instructions to their supporters. Depending on how seats are allocated, parties may have to determine the optimal number of candidates to field in a particular electoral district; too many or too few candidates could cost a party elected positions.

Under the *Single Transferable Vote*, voters in multi-member electoral districts rank candidates in order of preference. Candidates who receive a specified quota of first-preference votes are elected. In subsequent counts, votes from the least successful candidates are redistributed according to voters’ next preference and votes “surplus” to the quota of already elected candidates are redistributed until all the available seats have been filled.

Plurality/Majority Systems

Under *First Past the Post* electors in single-member electoral districts cast a single vote for the candidate of their choosing. Countries using this system include Canada, India, Kenya, and the United Kingdom (UK). Since voters choose a particular individual on the ballot, the individual candidate’s appeal may be as important as the party label. Parties may therefore want to consider what type of candidate is likely to appeal to the population in each particular electoral district. Significant involvement of party units in the electoral district is one way to achieve this. Since only a single mandate is available in each electoral district, efforts to produce a balanced slate of candidates that require

certain branches to choose their nominee from a particular social group could be more controversial than in systems with larger district magnitudes. However, the UK Labour Party has successfully used all-women shortlists and twinning of electoral districts (see Box 16, page 65).

The *Two-Round System* – a variation of First Past the Post – requires candidates to secure an absolute majority. In the event that no candidate secures an absolute majority in the first round, some candidates may be eliminated before a second vote. Although this is more typical for presidential elections (in Benin and Peru, for instance), this approach is used for legislative elections in France. After initial winnowing by political parties, the system can be strategically used to float different candidates for a particular party or coalition during the first round.

Block Vote grants electors in multi-member electoral districts as many votes as there are candidates to be elected. For example, if five seats are to be filled, each voter chooses five candidates on the ballot. In the past, it has been used in Jordan, Mongolia, the Philippines, and Thailand. Candidates with the highest vote totals win the seats. (In the case of five seats, the top five candidates would be elected to the legislature.)

Selection procedures must produce a strategic number of candidates who have broad appeal. With too few candidates, the party may “lose” votes to other parties; on the other hand, with too many candidates, the party’s support could be split too thinly leading to fewer seats. As a result of controversial candidate selection procedures, the West Bank and Gaza’s Fateh movement fielded multiple candidates (more than the number of seats) in several electoral districts during the 2006 legislative elections. The resulting split in the Fateh vote cost the movement seats in the Palestinian Legislative Council. Parties may also consider taking steps to preempt a divisive campaign among their candidates.

Under the *Party Block Vote* system, electors in multi-member districts cast a single vote between party lists of candidates. As such, the risk of splitting a party’s vote is minimized. In Djibouti and Singapore, legislation requires parties to present lists that include a mix of candidates from different ethnic groups. Even where there are no such requirements, the list approach can facilitate the presentation of balanced tickets.

Alternative Vote, also called *Preferential Voting* or the *Instant Runoff*, allows voters to rank candidates in order of choice. It is usually applied for elections in single-member districts. Whichever candidate secures an absolute majority of first choice votes is elected. If no candidate secures an absolute majority of first choice votes, the candidate with the lowest number of first preferences is eliminated and his/her ballots are reallocated to each voter’s second preference and so on until a candidate secures the required majority.

Unlike the Single Transferable Vote, the system is based on “topping up” first choice votes with second or third preferences until an absolute majority is secured rather than transferring “surplus” votes left over to other candidates who need them. It is used in Australia, Fiji, Papua New Guinea, and for presidential elections in Ireland. Since the system encourages candidates to seek voters’ first as well as second preferences, name recognition and broad public appeal are important. Political parties may want to consider steps to ensure a coordinated campaign or issuing strategic voting instructions to their supporters.

Under *Single Non-Transferable Vote* voters in multi-member electoral districts cast one vote for a candidate of their choosing. Candidates with the highest vote counts secure seats. The system is currently used in Afghanistan, for elections to the Second Chamber in Indonesia, in Jordan, and in Thailand. Since parties field multiple candidates, in the absence of a unified or coordinated campaign and effective strategic voting instructions, divisive campaigning may occur among individuals from the same party.

REFERENCES AND OTHER SOURCES

- African National Congress. (2007). *ANC Constitution*, as amended and adopted at the 52nd National Conference in December, 2007.
- African National Congress. *A History of the African National Congress*. Available at: <http://www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/about/umzabalazo.html>. Accessed on April 26, 2008.
- African National Congress. (2003). *List Process Guidelines*, as adopted by the National Executive Committee on May 22-24, 2003.
- African National Congress. (2003). *National List Conference*, statement issued by the ANC on November 19, 2003.
- African National Congress. (2006). *Statement of the ANC National Executive Committee*. May 29, 2006. Available at: <http://www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/pr/2006/pr0529.html>. Accessed on April 26, 2008.
- African National Congress. (2007). Through the Eye of a Needle? Choosing the Best Cadres to Lead Transformation. *Umbalo No. 11*. Available at: <http://www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/pubs/umrabelo/umrabelo11d.html>. Accessed on April 26, 2008.
- Baldez, Lisa. (2004). *Obedecieron y Cumplieron? The Impact of the Gender Quota Law in Mexico*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association. Chicago: Hilton Chicago and the Palmer House Hilton. September 2, 2004.
- Barnea, Shlomit and Gideon Rahat. (2007). Reforming Candidate Selection Methods: A Three-Level Approach. *Party Politics*, 13 (3). London: Sage Publications. pp. 375-394.
- Bille, Lars. (2001). Democratizing a Democratic Procedure: Myth or Reality? Candidate Selection in Western European Parties, 1960-1990. *Party Politics*, 7 (3). London: Sage Publications. pp. 363-380.
- Carty, R.K. and Donald E. Blake. (1999). The Adoption of Membership Votes for Choosing Party Leaders – The Experience of Canadian Parties. *Party Politics*, 5(2). London: Sage Publications. pp. 211-224.
- Cheng, Tun-jen. (2006). Strategizing Party Adaptation. The Case of the Kuomintang. *Party Politics* 12(3). London: Sage Publications. Pp.367-394.
- Conservative Party of Canada. (2006). *Candidate Nomination Rules and Procedures*, as adopted and revised by the National Council in October, 2006.
- Conservative Party of Canada. (2005). *Constitution*, as amended on March 19, 2005.
- Conservative Party (UK). (2002). *Constitution of the Conservative Party*, as amended July 2002.
- Conservative Party (UK). (2005). *A 21st Century Party: A Consultation Paper Setting Out Proposals to Reform the Conservative Party's Organisation*. Winchester, Hampshire: Culverlands Press Ltd.
- Conservative Party (UK). (2006). *How to Become a Conservative MP*.
- Courtney, John C. (1995). *Do Conventions Matter? Choosing National Party Leaders in Canada*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Cross, William. (2004). *Political Parties*. Canada: UBC Press.
- Davidson-Schmich, Louise K. (2006). Implementation of Political Party Gender Quotas: Evidence from the German Länder 1990-2000. *Party Politics* 12(2). London: Sage Publications. pp.211-232.
- Democratic Alliance. (2004). *Federal Constitution*, as adopted by the Federal Congress on April 13, 2002 and amended by the Federal Congress on November 21, 2004.
- Democratic Alliance. (2007). *Federal Constitution*, as adopted by the Federal Congress on April 13, 2002 and amended by the Federal Congress on November 21, 2004 and on May 5, 2007.
- Democratic Alliance. (2007). *Regulations for the Nomination of Candidates*, as amended and approved by the Federal Council on July 30, 2006 and on February 11, 2007 and October 27, 2007.
- Democratic Revolutionary Party. (2005). *Estatuto del Partido de la Revolución Democrática, Reformas Aprobadas Por el IX Congreso Nacional Del Partido De la Revolución Democrática*. (Statutes of the Democratic Revolutionary Party, as amended by the 9th Congress).
- Denver, David. (1988). "Britain: Centralized Parties with Decentralized Selection." In Gallagher, Michael and Michael Marsh (Ed.), *Candidate Selection in Comparative Perspective: The Secret Garden of Politics* (pp. 47-71). London: Sage Publications.
- Erickson, Lynda and R. K. Carty. (1991). Parties and Candidate Selection in the 1988 Canadian General Election. *Canadian*

- Journal of Political Science*, 24(2). Ottawa: Canadian Political Science Association. pp. 331-349.
- Farrell, David M. (1994). "Ireland: Centralization, Professionalization and Competitive Pressures." In Katz, Richard S. and Peter Mair (Ed.). *How Parties Organize*. pp. 216-241. London: Sage Publications.
- Faull, Jonathan. *Floor Crossing is Bad News for Democracy*. (2005). Pretoria/Cape Town: Institute for Democracy in South Africa (IDASA).
- Fianna Fáil. (2003). *Constitution and Revised Rules 2003*.
- Fianna Fáil. (2000). *Standards in Public Life. Mandatory Code for Officeholders and Candidates*.
- Fine Gael. (2003). *Constitution and Rules 2003*.
- Fine Gael. (2000.) *Party Pledge*.
- Fisher, Justin. (1996). *British Political Parties*. Great Britain: Prentice Hall Europe.
- Gallagher, Michael. (1980). Candidate Selection in Ireland: The Impact of Localism and the Electoral System. *British Journal of Political Science*, 10(4). Essex: University of Essex. pp. 489-503.
- Gallagher, Michael (1988). "Introduction." In Gallagher, Michael and Michael Marsh (Ed.), *Candidate Selection in Comparative Perspective: The Secret Garden of Politics* (pp. 1-19). London: Sage Publications.
- Gallagher, Michael (1988). "Ireland: The Increasing Role of the Centre." In Gallagher, Michael and Michael Marsh (Ed.), *Candidate Selection in Comparative Perspective: The Secret Garden of Politics* (pp. 119-144). London: Sage Publications.
- Gallagher, Michael (1988). "Conclusion." In Gallagher, Michael and Michael Marsh (Ed.), *Candidate Selection in Comparative Perspective: The Secret Garden of Politics* (pp. 236-283). London: Sage Publications.
- Gallagher, Michael. (1988). The Political Impact of Electoral System Change in Japan and New Zealand, 1996. *Party Politics* 1998; 4. London: Sage Publications. pp. 203-228.
- Gallagher, Michael and Michael Marsh. (2004). Party Membership in Ireland: The Members of Fine Gael. *Party Politics*, 10(4). London: Sage Publications. pp. 407-425.
- Hopkin, Jonathan. (2001). Bringing the Members Back in?: Democratizing Candidate Selection in Britain and Spain. *Party Politics*, 7(3). London: Sage Publications. pp. 343-361.
- Horowitz, Shale and Sunwoong Kim. (2002). Public Interest 'Blackballing' in South Korea's Elections. *Party Politics*, 8(5). London: Sage Publications. pp. 541-562.
- Institute for Democracy in South Africa (IDASA). (2004). *Floor Crossing at a Glance*. Pretoria/Cape Town: (IDASA). Available at: http://www.idasa.org.za/index.asp?page=output_details.asp%3FRID%3D132%26PID%3D10%26OTID%3D2. Accessed May 15, 2008.
- Institute of Statistics of the Athens University of Economics and Business and the Center for Deliberative Democracy of Stanford University. (2006). *Joint Press Release: First Deliberative Polling for Candidate Selection in Maroussi, Greece*. Ithakis: Athens University of Economics and Business Department of Statistics. Available at http://www.aueb.gr/statistical-institute/deliberative-polling/index_en.htm. Accessed May 15, 2008.
- Institutional Revolutionary Party. *Estatutos del Partido Revolucionario Institucional, aprobados en la XIX Asamblea Nacional* (Statutes of the Institutional Revolutionary Party), as adopted by the 19th National Assembly.
- Institutional Revolutionary Party. (2005). *Partido Revolucionario Institucional: Reglamento Para La Elección de Dirigentes y Postulación de Candidatos*, 12 Julio de 2005 (Candidate and Leadership Selection Rules, as adopted July 12, 2005).
- International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance and the Electoral Institute of Southern Africa. (2006). *South Africa Country Report Based on Research and Dialogue with Political Parties*. Stockholm: International Institute for Democracy and Election Assistance.
- Jenkin, Bernard. (2006). *Letter to David Cameron*. Personal Correspondence. Available at: http://conservativehome.blogs.com/goldlist/2006/11/will_associatio.html. Accessed May 13, 2008.
- Katz, Richard S. (2001). The Problem of Candidate Selection and Models of Party Democracy. *Party Politics*, 7(3). London: Sage Publications. pp. 277-296.
- Kuomintang. (2007). *Candidate Nomination Rules*, as amended July 18, 2007.
- Kuomintang. (2005). *Party Charter*, as amended August 2005.
- Labour Party (Ireland). (2005). *Constitution of the Labour Party*, as amended May 2005.
- Labour Party (UK). (2003). *The Labour Party Rule Book 2003*.
- Labour Party (UK). (2007). *The Labour Party Rule Book 2007*.
- Labour Party (UK). (2003). *National Parliamentary Panel Application Pack*.

- Labour Party (UK). (2007). *National Parliamentary Panel Application Form*.
- Labour Party (UK). (2006). *National Executive Committee Guidelines for Selection of Parliament Candidates 2006*.
- Langston, Joy. (2004). "Legislative Recruitment in Mexico." In Morgenstern, Scott and Peter M. Siavelis (Ed.), *Political Recruitment and Candidate Selection in Latin America*. University Park (PA): Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Langston, Joy. (2006). The Changing Party of the Institutional Revolution: Electoral Competition and Decentralized Candidate Selection. *Party Politics*, 12(3). London: Sage Publications. pp. 395-413.
- Larserud, Stina and Rita Taphorn. (2007). *Designing for Equality: Best-fit, Medium-Fit and Non-Favorable Combinations of Electoral Systems and Gender Quotas*. Stockholm: International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance.
- LeDuc, Lawrence. (2001). Democratizing Party Leadership Selection. *Party Politics*, 7(3). London: Sage Publications. pp. 323-341.
- Liberal Democrats. (2006). *The Constitution of the Liberal Democrats*.
- Liberal Party of Canada. (2006). *Constitution*, as adopted and amended at the Biennial Convention on November 30-December 1, 2006.
- Liberal Party of Canada. (2006). *National Rules for the Selection of Candidates for the Liberal Party of Canada*, as adopted by the National Campaign Committee on September 29, 2006.
- Liberal Party of Canada. (2007). *National Rules for the Selection of Candidates for the Liberal Party of Canada*, as adopted by the National Election Readiness Committee, February 5, 2007 and amended April 17, 2007.
- Liberal Party of Canada (Québec). (2005). *Rules for Choosing Candidates at an Election of the Liberal Party of Canada (Québec)*, as adopted at the 2005 Biennial Convention.
- Liberal Party of Canada (Ontario). (2006). *Rules for the Province of Ontario for the Selection of Candidates for the Liberal Party of Canada*.
- Lindberg, Stefan I. (2003). It's our Time to 'Chop': Do Elections in Africa Feed Neo-Patrimonial Rather than Counter-Act It? *Democratization*, 10(2). New York: Routledge. pp. 121-140.
- Lovenduski, Joni and Pippa Norris. (1995). *Political Recruitment—Gender, Race and Class in the British Parliament*. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.
- Mancuso, Maureen, Richard Price and Ronald Wagenberg (Ed.). (1994). *Leaders and Leadership in Canada*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Manikas, Peter and Laura Thornton (Ed.). (2003). *Political Parties in Asia*. Washington: National Democratic Institute.
- McSweeney, D. (1999). Changing the Rules Changed the Game. *Party Politics*, 5(4). London: Sage Publications. pp. 471-483.
- National Action Party. *Partido Acción Nacional: Reforma de los Estatutos Generales del PAN Aprobada por la XVI Asamblea Nacional Extraordinaria* (General Statutes of the PAN), as amended by the 16th Extraordinary National Congress.
- National Action Party. (2002). *Partido Acción Nacional: Reglamento de Elección de Candidatos a Cargos de Elección Popular* (Candidate Selection Regulations), as approved by the National Executive Committee, November 8, 2002.
- National Democratic Institute. (2008). *Minimum Standards for the Democratic Functioning of Political Parties*. Washington: National Democratic Institute.
- New Patriotic Party. (1998). *Constitution of the New Patriotic Party*, as amended August 1998.
- Norris, Pippa. (1996). "Legislative Recruitment." In LeDuc, Lawrence, Richard Niemi, and Pippa Norris (Ed.), *Comparing Democracies* (pp. 184-216). London: Sage Publications.
- Norris, Pippa. (2004). *Building Political Parties: Reforming Legal Regulations and Internal Rules*. Stockholm: International Institute for Democracy and Election Assistance.
- Öhman, Magnus. (2004). *The Heart and Soul of the Party: Candidate Selection in Ghana and Africa*. Uppsala: Uppsala University Press.
- Panaretos, John and George Papandreou. (2006). *Press Conference on Procedures for Selecting Mayoral Candidates: Q & A*. April 5, 2006. Available at http://www.aueb.gr/statistical-institute/deliberative-polling/index_en.htm. Accessed May 15, 2008.
- Papandreou, George A. (2006). *Procedures for Selecting Mayoral and Prefectorial Candidates*, Athens. Press Statement. April 5, 2006. Available at http://www.aueb.gr/statistical-institute/deliberative-polling/index_en.htm. Accessed May 15, 2008.

- Party of the Democratic Revolution. (2005). *Estatuto del Partido de la Revolución Democrática, Reformas Aprobadas por el IX Congreso Nacional* (Statutes of the Party of the Democratic Revolution), as amended by the 9th National Party Congress.
- Pennings, Paul and Reuven Y. Hazan. (2001). Democratizing Candidate Selection: Causes and Consequences. *Party Politics*, 7(3). London: Sage Publications. pp. 267-275.
- Peschard-Sverdrup, Armand. (2003). *Mexico Alert, July 6, 2003 Midterm Elections, Pre-election Analysis*. Washington, DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies.
- Rahat, Gideon. (2007). Candidate Selection: The Choice Before the Choice. *Journal of Democracy*, 18(1). Washington: National Endowment for Democracy and the Johns Hopkins University Press. pp. 157-170.
- Rahat, Gideon and Reuven Y. Hazan. (2001). Candidate Selection Methods. *Party Politics*, 7(3). London: Sage Publications. pp. 297-322.
- Ranney, Austin. (1981). "Candidate Selection." In Butler, David, Howard R. Penniman, and Austin Ranney (Ed.), *Democracy at the Polls: A Competitive Study of Competitive Elections* (pp. 75-106). Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute.
- Reynolds, Andrew, Ben Reilly and Andrew Ellis. (2005). *Electoral System Design: The New International IDEA Handbook*. Stockholm: International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance.
- Rori, Lamprini. (2005). *Electoral Defeat as Stimulus for Party Change : The Consolidation of PASOK's Internal Change Process from the Extraordinary to the 7th Congress*. Paper presented at the 2nd PhD LSE Symposium on Modern Greece. London: London School of Economics. June 10, 2005.
- Rose, David and Shannon O'Connell. *Candidate Selection Processes: An Options Paper*. Unpublished. National Democratic Institute-West Bank and Gaza.
- Scarrow, Susan. (2005). *Political Parties and Democracy in Theoretical and Practical Perspectives: Implementing Intra-Party Democracy*. Washington, DC: National Democratic Institute.
- Seyd, Patrick. (1999). New Parties/New Politics? A Case Study of the British Labour Party. *Party Politics*, 5(3). London: Sage Publications. pp. 383-405.
- Sitoe, Eduardo J., Zefanias Matsimbe and Amilcar F. Pereira. (2005). *Parties and Political Development in Mozambique*. Johannesburg: Electoral Institute for Southern Africa.
- Social Democratic Party of Bosnia and Herzegovina. (2006.) *The Rules on Criteria for the Nomination and Selection of SDP BiH Candidates for the 2006 General Election*. Sarajevo: SDP Number 002-04-428-1/05, as informally translated by National Democratic Institute Bosnia and Herzegovina staff.
- Spourdalakis, Michalis and Christantos Tassis. (2006). Party Change in Greece and the Vanguard Role of PASOK. *South European Society & Politics*, 11(3-4). London: Routledge. pp. 497-512.
- Squires, Judith. (2005). *The Implementation of Gender Quotas in Britain*. Bristol: International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance.
- Valen, Henry, Hanne Marthe Narud and Audun Skare. (2002). "Norway: Party Dominance and Decentralized Decision-Making." In Narud, Hanne Marthe, Mogens N. Pedersen and Henry Valen (Ed.), *Party Sovereignty and Citizen Control: Selecting Candidates for Parliamentary Elections in Denmark, Finland, Iceland and Norway*, (pp. 169-214). Odense: Odense University Press.
- Webb, Paul D. (1994). "Party Organizational Change in Britain: The Iron Law of Centralization?" In Katz, Richard S. and Peter Mair (Ed.), *How Parties Organize: Change and Adaptation in Party Organizations and in Western Democracies*. Great Britain: Sage Publications.
- Wu, Chung-li. (2001). The Transformation of the Kuomintang's Candidate Selection System. *Party Politics*, 7(1). London: Sage Publications. pp.103-118.
- Wuhs, Steven T. (2003). *Candidate Selection, Participation and Democratic Consolidation in Mexico*. Paper presented at the Challenges to Mexico's Democratic Consolidation Conference sponsored by American University, United States Agency for International Development and the Center for Democracy and Election Management. Washington, DC. November 13-14, 2003.
- Young, Lisa and William Cross. (2002). The Rise of Plebiscitary Democracy in Canadian Political Parties. *Party Politics*, 8(6). London: Sage Publications. pp. 673-699.
- Zutic, Elvis. (Undated). Political Party Practices in Selection of Candidates and Leaders: The Degree of Centralization in Comparative Perspective. National Democratic Institute-Bosnia-Herzegovina. Unpublished.

NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTE
2030 M STREET, NW
FIFTH FLOOR
WASHINGTON, DC 20036
TELEPHONE: 202-728-5500
FAX: 202-728-5520
WEBSITE: WWW.NDI.ORG