



**A CLASSIFICATION OF
LATIN AMERICAN POLITICAL PARTIES**

Michael Coppedge

Working Paper #244 - November 1997

Michael Coppedge is a Fellow of the Kellogg Institute and Associate Professor in the Department of Government and International Studies at the University of Notre Dame. He is the author of *Strong Parties and Lame Ducks: Presidential Partyarchy and Factionalism in Venezuela* (Stanford University Press, 1994) and numerous articles on Venezuelan politics, Latin American political parties and democratic governance, and the measurement of democracy worldwide. His current research seeks to explain cleavages, fragmentation, and volatility in eleven twentieth-century Latin American party systems.

Funding for parts of this research came from the Friends of Colombia and from Princeton University Faculty Research Grant No. 285–2311 (spring 1995). The author is indebted to his research assistants since 1991—Pablo Abitbol, David Altman, Julie Clugage, Rafael de la Dehesa, Alejandra Grosse, Adrian Hurditch, Carlos Lozada, and Ronna Montgomery—and to many colleagues who provided hard-to-locate election returns. Among them were Andrés Mejía Acosta, John Carey, Brian Crisp, Carol Graham, Jonathan Hartlyn, Richard Katz, Joseph Klesner, Alonso Lujambio, Scott Mainwaring, Esperanza Palma, Timothy Power, Manuel Rojas Bolaños, and Steven L. Taylor. The author is also deeply indebted to Robert J. Alexander, Charles D. Ameringer, and Dieter Nohlen for their painstaking compilations of information on Latin American parties and elections.

Abstract

This working paper reports the percentage of the total valid vote won by various ideological blocs in twentieth-century Latin American elections. Those included are lower-chamber or constituent assembly elections for Argentina 1912–95, Bolivia 1956–93, Brazil 1945–94, Chile 1915–93, Colombia 1931–94, Costa Rica 1948–94, Ecuador 1947–94, Mexico 1961–94, Peru 1978–95, Uruguay 1917–94, and Venezuela 1947–93. The paper also provides detailed documentation for the classification of the 97 percent of the vote won by about 800 of the approximately 1,200 parties that contested these elections. Each party is classified as left, center-left, center, center-right, or right and Christian or secular; or as personalist, other, or unknown. Fifty-three country specialists provided the author with information and opinions to help improve the reliability of the coding.

Resumen

Este documento de trabajo registra los porcentajes del total de votos válidos obtenidos por varios bloques ideológicos en elecciones latinoamericanas en el Siglo XX. Se incluyen elecciones para la cámara baja o asambleas constituyentes en Argentina 1912–95, Bolivia 1956–93, Brazil 1945–94, Chile 1915–93, Colombia 1931–94, Costa Rica 1948–94, Ecuador 1947–94, Mexico 1961–94, Peru 1978–95, Uruguay 1917–94, y Venezuela 1947–93. El documento también provee información detallada para la clasificación del 97 por ciento de los votos obtenidos por cerca de ochocientos de los aproximadamente mil doscientos partidos que participaron de estas elecciones. Cada partido es clasificado como de izquierda, centro-izquierda, centro, centro-derecha o derecha y como cristiano o secular; o bien como personalista, otro o desconocido. Cincuenta y tres especialistas en cada uno de estos países proveyeron al autor información y opiniones para ayudar a mejorar la confiabilidad de la codificación.

In recent years political scientists have paid increasing attention to two characteristics of party systems—the number of parties (fragmentation) and rates of party-system change (volatility). Almost all use the most natural and obvious units of analysis—political parties themselves.ⁱ Both characteristics are fairly objective, simple to measure, and therefore travel well. Both have the virtue of breaking away from simplistic and static typologies that are unwieldy and misleading for the analysis of differences of degree and change over time. But studies of fragmentation and volatility require knowledge of nothing but the number and relative sizes of parties and tend to ignore other characteristics of party systems. This focus limits the analyst to a dissection of party systems that have been drained, gutted, and picked clean of the flesh and blood of politics—ideology, personalities, interests, ideas, platforms, slogans, images, issues—in short, the substance of political competition. This is not to say that the forms and mechanics of party systems do not matter. On the contrary, they can crucially affect the democratic process. But there are certain aspects of that process, such as alliances and coalitions, policy choices, and polarization, that cannot be understood well without considering the ideas, interests, and images of parties, in addition to their number and sizes.

In order to make it possible to carry out cross-national comparisons of Latin American parties and party systems involving the content of politics, I have classified as many parties as possible by their ideological tendencies. The parties in question are all those that contested lower-chamber or constituent assembly elections in reasonably fair twentieth-century elections in Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela, and Mexican parties since 1961.ⁱⁱ I then tally the percentage of the legislative vote won by each ideological bloc in each of these 166 elections.

The first step in the comparison of blocs is to define criteria for classifying parties into blocs and to classify as many of them as possible. Lumping parties together into comparable families is nothing new, but no one has ever produced a classification

ⁱ Political parties are not always the most natural and obvious units. In Uruguay and Colombia, as well as Italy, Japan, and a few other countries, it is sometimes argued that factions are the basic building blocks of the party system. But because well-defined factions do not exist in many Latin American countries, no cross-national analysis can meaningfully compare factions.

ⁱⁱ There are two important exceptions to these criteria. First, I have included Mexican elections since 1961 and Brazilian elections from the 1964–85 authoritarian period even though these elections were not completely fair. And second, the results for Peruvian elections before 1978 are based on presidential rather than legislative votes.

sufficiently comprehensive and exhaustive to support rigorous comparative analysis. Various studies have been published about Latin American communist (Alexander 1957, Caballero 1986), Christian Democratic (Lynch 1993, Williams 1967), ‘national revolutionary’ (Martz 1966, 366–74), ‘mass’ (Hilliker 1971), conservative (Gibson 1996, 1–28), and ‘populist’ (Conniff 1982, DiTella 1965, van Niekerk 1974) parties. These studies have virtues of their own but do not make it possible to compare whole party systems cross-nationally, because (a) not every Latin American country has a member of the party families listed above and (b) these studies give insufficient information about the other parties in each system that are outside the family. There are a few works that attempt a more comprehensive survey of Latin American parties and party systems, but almost all either ignore the many minor parties (Dix 1989, Martz 1964) or classify party systems according to numbers (McDonald and Ruhl 1989). There are two exceptions that stand above the rest. One is the introduction to Mainwaring and Scully’s *Building Democratic Institutions* (1995), which classifies party systems by ideological polarization in addition to number and institutionalization. The other is the three-volume reference work *Political Parties of the Americas* (Alexander 1988 and Ameringer 1992), which provides short histories of all the major, and an amazing number of the minor, parties in every country and almost always informally specifies the ideological orientation of each one. The Mainwaring and Scully introduction is systematic but is too brief to do more than locate each country in a simple static typology. *Political Parties of the Americas* is encyclopedic but not quite systematic or consistent enough to provide cross-nationally comparable classifications of parties without additional research and conceptual precision.

I have therefore produced, with the help of several dozen country specialists, my own classification of Latin American parties into ideological blocs.ⁱⁱⁱ In lieu of precise and relatively objective information about party positions I defined classification criteria that seemed likely to capture the most salient aspects of the images of most parties in most Latin American countries. The classification scheme is based on two major dimensions and several minor ones. One major dimension is the Christian vs. secular conflict inherited from the nineteenth century. The other major dimension is the classic left-right dimension, which is segmented into right, center-right, center, center-left, and left blocs. I have assumed that these two dimensions cross-cut each other, producing 10 blocs ranging from the Christian Right to the Secular Left. In addition, parties that could not be

ⁱⁱⁱ Obviously this classification ignores variation within each bloc. This problem is due entirely to data limitations. If enough information had been available to place the several hundred parties involved on an ideological spectrum with any accuracy, I would have done that instead as a matter of methodological principle, to conserve as much information as possible. One cannot, however, conserve information that does not exist.

plausibly classified in left-right terms were classified as either 'personalist' or 'other' (meaning environmental, regional, ethnic, or feminist). Parties for which no good information was available—usually comprising a small fraction of the vote—were classified 'unknown.'

The following classification guidelines were sent to the country specialists who were asked to check my draft classifications:

General notes:

—These criteria are not intended to capture all aspects of a party's program or image, only those necessary for basic comparison with other Latin American parties.

—Neither are they intended to reflect every slight or temporary shift in a party's position. However, in some cases where there is a scholarly consensus that a party made a definite shift in position—as with COPEI's move toward the center before 1958 or the Chilean Radicals' shift to the left in the 1960s—its classification should reflect that. The relevant position in this study is the one that would help explain voting behavior. Think of a party's position as a midpoint between the variable image its leaders try to project in their discourse and the more slowly changing image most voters perceive.

—The religious dimension and the left-right dimension overlap, so that any party that can be classified in left-right terms must also be classified as Christian or secular (which is defined partly as a residual category to make this easier).

—Parties that are classifiable in left-right terms do not meet the criteria for the 'Personalist' or 'Other Bloc' categories as defined here. A prototypical example of each classification is given in italics.

The Criteria

Christian:

1. Parties that claim to base their ideology and programs on the authority of the Catholic Church, the Bible, or religious philosophy.
2. Parties that defend the temporal interests of the Catholic Church or oppose or seek to reduce the separation of church and state.
3. Parties that are widely perceived as satisfying either of the above criteria, even if religion is no longer an important aspect of their ideology, program, or policies (*P. Demócrata Cristiano Chileno*).

Secular:

1. A residual category, i.e., parties that do not claim to base their ideology and programs on the authority of the Catholic Church, the Bible, or

religious philosophy.

2. Parties that challenge the temporal interests of the Catholic Church or support the separation of church and state (*Mexican PRI*).

Right:

1. Parties that target heirs of the traditional elite of the nineteenth century without moderating their discourse to appeal to middle- or lower-class voters (*Chilean P. Conservador*).
2. Parties that employ a fascist or neofascist discourse (*Chilean P. Nacista*).

3. Parties sponsored by a present or former military government, as long as they have a conservative (organicist, authoritarian, elitist, looking to the past) message and are not primarily personalist vehicles for particular authoritarian leaders (*Brazilian ARENA*).

Center-Right:

Parties that target middle- or lower-class voters in addition to elite voters by stressing cooperation with the private sector, public order, clean government, morality, or the priority of growth over distribution (*Argentine UCeDé*).

Center:

1. Parties that stress classic political liberalism—broad political participation, civic virtue, the rule of law, human rights, or democracy—without a salient social or economic agenda (*Argentine Unión Cívica Radical*).
2. Governing parties whose policies are so divided between positions both to the left and to the right of center that no orientation that is mostly consistent between elections is discernible.

Center-Left:

Parties that stress justice, equality, social mobility, or the complementarity of distribution and accumulation in a way intended not to alienate middle- or upper-class voters (*Venezuelan Acción Democrática*).

Left:

Parties that employ Marxist ideology or rhetoric and stress the priority of distribution over accumulation and/or the exploitation of the working class by capitalists and imperialists and advocate a strong role for the state to correct social and economic injustices. They may consider violence an appropriate form of struggle but not necessarily. They do not worry about alienating middle- and upper-class voters who are not already socialist intellectuals (*P. Socialista de Chile; any Communist party*).

Other Bloc:

Any parties that represent an identifiable ideology, program, principle, region, interest, or social group that cannot be classified in left-right or Christian-secular terms (*Unidad Catamarqueña of Argentina, Movimiento Revolucionario Tupak-Katari of Bolivia, P. Verde*).

Personalist:

1. Parties that base their primary appeal on the charisma, authority, or efficacy of their leader rather than on any principles or platforms, which are too vague or inconsistent to permit a plausible classification of the party in any other way (*P. Nacional Velasquista of Ecuador*).
2. Independents.
3. Unusually heterogeneous electoral fronts formed to back a candidate (*P. Agrario Laborista of Ibáñez in Chile*).

Unknown:

Parties on which no information other than the name is available and whose names give no reliable clues about their orientation. 'Comunista' and 'Izquierda' are taken as reliable indicators of parties of the left, while 'Socialista' is not. Other common labels that are not considered reliable are Revolucion(ario), Demócrata, Democrático, Radical, Liberal, Laborista, Social, Popular, Auténtico, Republicano, Renovador, Independiente, Agrario, or names of leaders.

For the parties with which I am less familiar, the classifications that follow are based primarily on Alexander (1988), Ameringer (1992), and Delury (1983).

Abbreviations for Blocs Used in This Classification

| | | |
|-----|---|------------------------|
| XR | = | Christian Right |
| XCR | = | Christian Center-Right |
| XC | = | Christian Center |
| XCL | = | Christian Center-Left |
| XL | = | Christian Left |
| SR | = | Secular Right |
| SCR | = | Secular Center-Right |
| SC | = | Secular Center |
| SCL | = | Secular Center-Left |
| SL | = | Secular Left |

O = Other Bloc

P = Personalist

U = Unknown

Some readers will undoubtedly be skeptical about this enterprise on the grounds that Latin American parties are insufficiently ideological or inconsistent in their ideology, or that the left-right dimension is not relevant in Latin America, or that other dimensions such as church-state relations or ethnic or regional conflict are far more relevant than the left-right dimension. There is some truth to these perceptions. Indeed, I began the classification project uncertain myself about whether it would yield useful information and resolved to abandon it if the classifications enjoyed little face validity among specialists on each of the 11 countries. But for many reasons I am now convinced that this classification of parties is valid, meaningful, and useful.

First, many of the parties whose ideological purity is questionable due to

personalism, populism, or clientelism are *roughly* classifiable in left-right terms. The classification scheme is not, after all, extraordinarily precise. It is usually clear to country specialists whether these parties are basically left of center or right of center, and the questioning itself usually rules out classification in either the more ideological extreme left or the extreme right, so center-left or center-right are pretty safe choices in these cases. In the relatively rare instances in which even these assessments were impossible, I still had the option of classifying such parties as centrist, personalist, or ‘unknown.’

Second, although some parties make temporary shifts to the left or the right, I do not feel that such shifts must always be reflected in the classifications. Few governing parties have the luxury of doing exactly what their programs promised; all must compromise and react to unforeseen events, sometimes with policies that seem to contradict every principle for which the party stands. This is normal and does not mean that such parties have abandoned their ideological commitments. I believe that voters understand this and almost always expect—perhaps naively—that parties will at least try to fulfill their historic ideals. Moreover, sometimes the ‘center’ is an appropriate classification for a party that takes some positions on the left and some on the right; the second draft of the instructions to country specialists made this criterion explicit. For these reasons I did not reclassify parties lightly. But in a few cases parties have undeniably and credibly changed blocs, and in these cases their classifications change here as well.

Whether or not the left-right dimension is relevant in Latin America depends on how one defines it. In reality it is a bundle of issue dimensions that are all closely interrelated, such that a party that is on the left on one is likely to be on the left on the others as well, and vice-versa. Definitions of ‘left’ and ‘right’ do not always travel or age well: they can vary greatly from region to region, country to country, decade to decade, and even person to person if they are made very precise. The specific issue dimensions that are conventionally considered part of the bundle change. For example, in Latin America during the 1960s support for political democracy was often considered incompatible with being on the left, but in the early 1980s it was often considered incompatible with being on the extreme right. Huber and Inglehart (1995) list ten different issues that are considered relevant as criteria for being on the left or right in some country or other, but some of these would not be very relevant for many of the countries they discuss and still less for other historical periods. In extreme cases certain issue positions that are considered ‘right’ in some countries are considered ‘left’ in others (Kitschelt 1992). The more diverse the regions to be analyzed, and the longer the span of time to be covered, the less specific the criteria for the left-right dimension can be, because

dimensions that are relevant in only a few countries must be dropped from the cross-national criteria for comparison. Probably the only element that is common to all definitions is the association of ‘left’ with change and ‘right’ with either preservation of the status quo or a return to the past. Nevertheless, if the comparison is limited to one region and a manageable span of time, the criteria for the left-right dimension can be made more specific than positions for or against change. The criteria I used, and asked the experts consulted to use, focus on the social classes to which parties direct their appeals, as suggested by positions and rhetoric regarding the priority of growth and redistribution. These minimalist criteria for left and right resonate in every Latin American country during this century.

Finally, it is true that the left-right dimension is not the only relevant dimension of competition in Latin American party politics. It is precisely for this reason that my classification scheme also classifies parties on a Christian-secular dimension and allows parties that cannot be classified in either left-right or Christian-secular terms to be classified as ‘personalist,’ ‘other,’ or as a last resort ‘unknown.’ The ‘other’ category is a diverse combination of regional, indigenous, environmental, feminist, and other parties. But in every country the ‘other’ vote is so small that there seems to be little reward for attributing much significance to this dimension: the first two dimensions adequately capture the meaningful cleavages by themselves.

In the final analysis what matters is whether this classification of parties is considered acceptable by the communities of political scientists who know each country’s parties well. To minimize errors in the classification I sent out my draft classifications for each country to various specialists, asking for comments and revisions. The classifications went out to more than 80 country specialists, most of whom also specialize in the study of political parties. I received replies from 53 of them, all suggesting reclassification of some parties for some or all elections, often with additional commentary on the classification scheme or the country in question. I was pleased to find that the experts suggested relatively few revisions.^{iv} Thus, the vast majority of the classifications seem to be quite sound. In a few cases, however, there was no agreement on the classification of parties, some of which are quite important—the Peronists, the Mexican PRI, Costa Rica’s PUSC, the Colombian Liberals and Conservatives, and the Uruguayan Blancos and Colorados. In these cases I made judgment calls that I thought best reflected continuous patterns of evolution in each country while maintaining as much

^{iv} If no specialist suggested revision of a party’s classification, I retained my original one. If one or two experts suggested revisions but the majority did not, I usually kept the original classification. In a few cases particularly knowledgeable experts were especially persuasive and changed my mind, leading me to change a classification over the implicit objections of a silent majority.

cross-national comparability as possible.^v Nevertheless, some of these decisions will inevitably remain controversial.

Once individual parties were classified, I tallied the percentage of the total valid vote that each bloc won in each election. Several hundred parties remain unclassified, but they are so extremely small that I succeeded in classifying 97 percent of the vote cast in the average election. The percentage of the vote that remains 'unknown' is less than 15 percent in all but 5 elections (all in Argentina and Ecuador). Less than 10 percent of the vote is unclassified in all but 14 elections, and less than 1 percent is unclassified in 58 percent of the elections. The coverage of the classification is therefore quite thorough.

^v The classifications of these parties were: Peronists 'Other' 1948–95; Liberals SC; Conservatives XCR 1931–78 and SCR 1982–94; PUSC XCR; PRI SCR 1961–67, SCL 1970–73, SC 1976–79, and SCR 1982–94; Blancos SCR 1917–93; Colorados SCL 1917–66 and SC 1971–93.

Appendix A

Appendix A lists together, by country, all the parties in the same bloc. Party names, including abbreviations and case, are reproduced throughout exactly as found in the sources. After each party name I list the years of the legislative elections in which the party competed. These lists are annotated to note certain controversial classifications and explain how they were resolved. If a party is not footnoted or followed by a fraction, all of the experts acquiesced in my draft classification. The fractions that follow some entries indicate the degree of consensus among the experts, where there was disagreement. For example, '5/7' means that five of the seven experts (including my vote) did not challenge the draft classification. Because some of the experts were more assiduous in correcting the draft than others and none have had a chance to respond to my attempts to reconcile their disagreements, the experts are in no way responsible for the final classification. I am, however, very grateful to them for their input and advice, which resulted in the correction of quite a few initial blunders on my part.

Argentina 1912–95

Experts: Edward Gibson, Marcelo Leiras, Scott Mainwaring, James McGuire, and Guillermo O'Donnell.

Additional advice from: Rossana Castiglioni, Steven Levitsky, and Pierre Ostiguy.

XR:

XCR:

XC:

XCL: Cristiano Demócrata 1957–60, Cristiano Popular 1973, Demócrata Cristiano 1962–65 & 1983–91 & 1994–95 [5/6], Socialista Cristiano 1983.ⁱ

XL: Revolucionario Cristiano 1973.

SR: Alianza Liberal Nacional 1946, Autonomista 1912 & 1916–20 & 1930 & 1962, Autónomo Nacional 1912, Concentración Conservadora 1914, Concentración Nacional 1922, Conservador 1912–30 & 1957–65, Conservador P. 1960–65, Conservador Popular 1987, Demócrata 1914–18 & 1924 & 1928 & 1960–65,ⁱⁱ Demócrata Catamarca 1973, Demócrata Córdoba 1973, Dem. de Jujuy 1985, Demócrata (Mendoza) 1987–91 & 1994–95, Demócrata Nacional 1946, Demócrata Nacional Auténtico 1946, Dem. U. Provincial 1960, Democrático Liberal 1960 & 1965, Liberal 1912 & 1918–46 & 1960, Liberal Autonomista 1914 & 1924–26, Liberal Georgista 1924, MLP 1983–85, Movimiento por la Dignidad Nacional (MODIN) 1991 & 1994–95, Oficial 1912–14, Unión Conservadora 1960–65, Unión Federal 1960, Unión Nacional 1912.

SCR: Alianza de Centro (UCD) 1985–95 [5/6], Alianza (Republicana) Federal 1973–83, Al. Popular de Centro 1983, Alianza Popular Federalista 1973, Cívico Independiente 1960 [5/6], Confed. Nacional de Centro 1983, Confed. Pop. Federalista 1973, Confed. Republicana 1985, Conservador Autónomo 1987 & 1991, Conservador Popular 1983 & 1987, Demócrata Conservador 1973, Demócrata Federal 1973, Demócrata Liberal 1973, Demócrata Progresista 1983 & 1987–91 & 1994–95, Federal 1983–91 & 1994–95, Federalista Popular 1973, FREJUSO or FREDEJUSO (Palito Ortega) 1991, Fte. Acción Provincial 1987–89, Fte. Comité Renovador 1989–91, Frente de Fe 1991 (Palito Ortega), Frente Esperanza 1994 (with P. Justicialista), Fte. Trab. Y Prod. 1991, Fuerza

ⁱ Formerly U. One expert said XCL, another SCL.

ⁱⁱ This party was formerly classified as U, but one expert called it SR and one thought it might be SCR.

Republicana 1989–91 & 1994–95,ⁱⁱⁱ Generación Intermedia 1985 & 1991, Laborista 1995, Movimiento de Integración y Desarrollo 1965 & 1983–95, Mvto. Federal 1973, Nueva Fuerza 1973 [5/6], Renovador Federal 1973, Unión del Centro Democrático (Ucédé) (Alianza de Centro) 1983–85 & 1989 [5/6], Unión Popular 1987 & 1991, Vanguardia Federal 1973.

SC: Democrático/Demócrata Progresista 1916 & 1920–26 & 1930–46 & 1957–73 [5/6], DN y UCRI 1946, LY–UCR (JR) 1946, Movimiento Personalista Radical 1960, Unión Cívica 1912–14, U.C. Form. 1960, U.C. Pop. 1920, Unión Cívica Radical 1912–91 [6/6 except for 5/6 in 1946–73], UCRA 1960, UCR Anti-Personalista 1924 & 1928–30, UCR Aut. 1960, UCR-Avellaneda 1926, UCR Blanca 1926, UCR Bloquista 1922 & 1926–46 & 1962–65, UCR Cabadero 1930, UCR Comité Nacional 1946, UCR Corv. 1930, UCR Cruzada Renovadora 1962–65, UCR del Pueblo 1957–65, UCR Disidente 1916, UCR Dr. C. 1926, UCR F.C. 1928, UCR F.J. 1928, UCR Independiente 1920, UCR Intransigente 1920–22, UCR Intransigente 1957–65, UCRI Pop. 1960, UCR (JR) 1946, UCR J y P 1930, UCR L.V. 1960, UCR Lencinista 1920–46, UCR Nacional Unificada 1960, UCR Negra 1920, UCR Oficial 1920, UCR Opositora 1924 & 1930, UCR Personalista 1924, UCR Principista 1922 & 1926 & 1930 & 1962, UCR Roja 1922–26 & 1930, UCR S. Fr. 1946–48, UCR Sgo. 1946, UCR Sit. 1930, UCR–Tacuarembó 1926, UCR Tucumán 1922 & 1930, UCR Unificada 1924–30, UCR Yrig. 1924 & 1946, UCRY y Lab. 1946.

SCL: Alianza Democrática/Unidad Socialista 1983–91 & 1994 [5/6], Democrático Conservador 1960–65 [5/6], Frente Grande 1993–94, FREPASO 1995, Independiente Socialista 1930, Intransigente 1973–87 & 1991 & 1994–95, Liga Agraria 1920, Socialismo Democrático 1960–65 [5/6], Socialista 1924–62 [5/6], Socialista Auténtico 1985–91 & 1995, Socialista Dem. 1962–91 & 1994–95 [5/6], Socialista Popular 1973–85, U.P. Dem. C. 1960, U.P. Inmobiliario 1960–62.

SL: Alianza de Sur 1995, Al. Fte. Ezq. Rev. 1991, Comunista 1924–48 & 1960 & 1983 & 1987 & 1994, Comunista R.A. 1928–30, Comunista Obrero 1928, Concentración Obrera 1946, (Corriente) Patria Libre 1991 & 1995, Frente de Izquierda Popular 1973–85, Fte. Izq. Soc. 1994, Izquierda Unida 1987–91, Laborista 1924 & 1962–73, Movimiento Al Socialismo 1983 & 1987 & 1991 & 1994 (w/PTS)–95, Mvto. Democrático Popular Anti-Imperialista (MODEPA) 1991, Mvto Izq. Abierta 1991, Movimiento Socialista de los Trabajadores 1994–95, Obrero 1960 & 1983–91 & 1994–95, ‘Other Left’ 1987, Socialista 1912–22 [5/6], Socialista Argentino 1916–18, Socialista Argentino-CP 1962, Socialista Argentino-der. 1962, Socialista de Trabajadores 1973, Socialista Internacional 1918, Soc. Obrero L. 1989, Unión Popular 1973.

ⁱⁱⁱ One expert called it SR or P on the basis of Bussi’s authoritarian style, but another firmly classified it SCR; it was U before.

- O **(Peronist):** Blanco 1962–65, Blanco de los Trabs. 1973, del Pueblo 1960–65,^{iv} 17 de Octubre 1973,^v FREJULI 1985 [5/6], Frente Renovador (Cafiero) 1985–89, Justicialista 1973–95,^{vi} Laborista 1946, Laborista de Salta 1948, Laborista Independiente 1946, Lab. y otros 1946, Peronista 1946–48, Tres Banderas 1962–65 & 1983–87 & 1991.^{vii}

- O **(Regional):** Acción Correntina 1991, Acción Chubutense 1973–85 & 1994–95, Acción Chaqueña 1994–95, Acción Provincial 1991, Al. Ag. Vec. U. Pop. Fuegoína 1983, Al. Chaqueña 1989–91, Al. Fed. Chaqueña 1985, Al. Fte. Esp. Nva. Cata. 1991,

^{iv} Gibson identified this formerly ‘unknown’ party as neo-Peronist; therefore, ‘other.’

^v Formerly U, now identified as Peronist.

^{vi} The original expert ratings were 3/6 SCL for 1973–83; 4/6 SR, 1/6 SC, and 1/6 O for 1985; 4/6 SCL, 1/6 SC, and 1/6 O for 1987; 3/6 SCR, 2/6 SC, and 1/6 O for 1989–94; and 4/6 SCR and 2/6 SC for 1995. Rather than go with the volatile classifications of SR in 1985, SCL in 1987, and SCR in 1989–95 that would be indicated by the bare majority vote, I have decided that it is best to classify the Peronist party as ‘other’ throughout its history. I leave it to other scholars to debate what ‘other’ means. However, I am sympathetic to Ostiguy’s argument that the fundamental cleavage in Argentine politics is not left-right but ‘low-high’ and takes the form of Peronism vs. anti-Peronism. Those at the high end are more refined, cosmopolitan, and inclined to favor formal procedures; those at the low end are more crude, localist, and personalist or *caudillista*. It is a class cleavage defined in sociocultural rather than economic terms. In this scheme the Peronists, Montoneros, and Carapintadas are ‘low’ and the Radicals, Socialists, UCeDé, and FREPASO are ‘high.’ See Ostiguy (1997). I also consider the Peronist–anti-Peronist polarization to be roughly comparable in degree to polarization in left-right terms and suggest that for this purpose the ‘other’ vote (almost all of which is Peronist here) be counted as extreme before 1983 and moderate from that year on.

^{vii} Formerly U. Identified as neo-Peronist.

Alianza Salteña 1983, Blanco (de los Jubilados) 1987–91 & 1994,^{viii} Concentración Catamarqueña 1918, Convocatoria Independiente 1987 & 1994–95, Cruzada Federal 1995, Defensa Provincial 1960, Defensa Provincial 1987–91, Dif. Prov. B.B. 1930, Federalista Córdoba 1973, Feminista Nacional 1924–26, Fte. Just. Chubutense 1985, Fte. Pop. Corr. 1991, Fte. Pol. Riojano 1991, Frente San Luis 1994, Humanista 1985, Humanista/Verde 1989–91 & 1994–95 [5/6], Liga del Sur 1912–14, MOLIPO 1991, Mov. Fed. Pampeano 1983–85, Mov. Pop. B.A. 1991, Mov. Pop. Fueguino 1985, MOPOF 1987–91, Mo.Po.Fu. 1994–95, Mov. Pop. Jujeño 1973–85 & 1991 & 1994, Mov. Pop. Pampeano 1973, Mov. Patagon. 1994, Mov. Pop. Salteño 1973–83, Mov. Pop. Tucumano 1973, Mov. Region. 1994, Mov. Unidad Chaqueña 1983, ‘provincial’ 1991 & 1993, Provincial 1914–16, Provincial Rionegrino 1973–83 & 1987–91, Renov. de la Prov. 1983, Renov. de Salta 1983–87 & 1991, Salud Pública 1926, Socialista de Formosa 1985, Unidad Catamarqueña 1994–95, Unión Provincial 1914 & 1920–22 & 1926 & 1930, Unión Provincial 1962–65, Unión Provincial 1989 & 1995, Unión Vecinal 1991, Unitario 1918, Verde 1994, Verde Ecologista 1991.

P: Acción Chaqueña 1994–95 [4/6], Autonomista Liberal (Romero Feris) 1973–91 & 1995 [4/6], Bascaristas 1924, Bloquista San Juan 1973–91 & 1994–95 [5/6], Comité Independiente 1926, Mov. Pop. Catamarqueño 1973–85 & 1989, Mov. Pop. Chubut. 1995, Movimiento Popular Neuquino 1965–91 & 1994–95 [5/6], Veristas 1924, Videla 1926. In addition, unspecified parties or candidates listed as ‘independents’ with sources are classified as Personalist here.

U: Acción Indep. 1987, Acción Popular 1991, Acc. Pop. Lib. 1991, Acción Renovadora 1973, Agrario 1930, Al. Conoc. Popular 1991, Al. Conf. Lab. 1987, Al. Convoc. 1991, Al. Conv. Bas. 1991, Al. Conv. Pol. Social 1991, Al. Cristiana Socialista 1987, Al. Dem. Independiente 1985, Al. El Frente 1991, Al. Fte. de la Gente 1995, Al. Fte. Pop./Just. Soc. 1991, Al. Fte. Vang. Fed. Dem. Crist. 1983, Al. Honest. 1994, Al. Memoria 1994, Al. Nueva Op. 1994, Al. para el Cambio 1991, Al. P. El No 1994, Al. Patriótica 1987, Al. Popular 1987–89, Al. Pop. Revolucionaria 1973, Alianza Progresista 1960, Al. Solidaria 1991, Al. Un. Izq. Rev. 1991, Al. Un. Pop. 1991, Al. Un. Prov. 1991, Al. UTI 1991, Alternat. de Cambio 1987–89, Autonomista 1991 & 1994, Aut. Soberanía/Aut. y Soberanía 1985–87, Azules 1924, Azul L. Rest. 1989, Cabildo Abierto 1991, Cambio y Justicia 1991, Celeste Y Blanco Trabaj. 1985, Coalición 1912–14, Concentración 1916, Concentración Cívica 1914 & 1918–20 & 1926, Concentración Popular 1918 & 1926, Confed. Fed. de la Indep. 1987–91, Constitucional 1912–14, Convocatoria Independiente 1987 & 1991 & 1994–95, Conv. Reenc. 1991, Conv. Tras. 1991, Czda. Cívica Combatiente 1973, Czda. Renovadora 1989–91 & 1994, De Centro 1983, Defensor del Trabajo 1973, de la Independencia 1989–91 &

^{viii} The two best-informed experts independently singled out this small party as O, which leads me to change my initial classification from SCR. The degree of consensus is therefore at least 3/6, and probably would be higher if the others were consulted again in the light of the new information.

1995, de la Liberación 1987–91, Del Trabajo y del Pueblo 1987–91, Dem. Aut. CP 1960, Dem. EE.RR. 1983, Dem. Pop. Fte. Social 1991, Democrático Unido 1962–65, De PO. I. Soc. 1994, De Trab. Soc. 1994, F. Indep. 1991, Fed. Autonomista 1985, FRECOPA 1995, Fte. de Jubilados 1995, Frente de Liberación 1973 & 1985, Frente del Pueblo 1985, Fte. del Pueblo Unido 1985, Fte. Dem. Part. 1987, Fte. Ind. Def. 1991, Fte. para el Cambio 1987, Frente P. Nacional 1985, Frente Patriótico 1985, Fte. Pol. y Social 1991, Frente Popular 1991, Fte. Pop. Federalista 1985, Fte. Progreso Social 1991, Fte. Pueblo Unido 1991, Fte. Rec. Popular 1991, Fte. Trab. y Solid. 1991, Frente Unico 1928, Fte. Un. Autént. 1987–89, Fte. Unico del Pueblo 1973, Fte. Un. Trab. 1994, Fte. Unido Popular 1985, Fte. Vict. 1994, Fte. Vol. Pop. 1991, Futuro Obrero 1995, Hon., Trab., y Efic. 1991, Intr. R&B 1960, Justicia Social 1987–91, Laborista Agrario 1960, Lab. Fed. Av. 1960, La Voz del Pueblo 1983, Liberal Popular 1960, L.N.S. 1960, MODEPA 1991, MOPOSA 1991, Movilización 1987–89, Mov. Acc. Cív. 1994, Mov. Acción Popular 1985, Mov. Azul y Blanco 1995, Mov. Crist. In. 1994, Mov. Esperanza 1994, MFP 1989–91, Mvto. Nacional 1991, Mov. Nacionalista 1973 & 1985, Mvto. Pat. de Lib. 1987–91 & 1994, Mvto. Popular 1991, Mov. Pop. Provincial 1973, Mov. Pop. Unido 1973, Mov. Ref. Ind. 1994–95, Mov. Renov. Federal 1987, Mov. Soc. Tra. 1994–95, Mvto. Unid. Renov. 1987–89, Nac. Const. 1991 & 1994, Nacional Independiente 1948, Nuevo Part. 1994, Obreros Independientes 1924, Orden y Justicia 1994–95, PACH 1987 & 1991, PAIS 1995, Para la Democracia Social 1983, Pat. 4 de junio 1946, Popular 1912–16 & 1924 & 1930, Popular Democrático 1973, Recup. Etica 1995, Renovador 1994–95, Republicano 1973, Social Ag. 1960, Soc. Partic. 1994, Socialista 1989, Soc. Pop. 1987–91 & 1994, Soc. Rep. 1987 & 1991, Solidaridad 1994–95, Tercera Posición 1985, Tradic. y Coher. 1987–89, Unid. Soc. Pop. 1991, Unidad y Resistencia 1946, Un. Cent. Ind. 1946, Unión Comunal 1912, Unión Democrática 1914–20, U. Dem. Centro 1985, Unión Popular 1922, U. Pop. 17 de octubre 1987, Un. Pop. Fed. Rep. 1987, U. Rep. 1960, Unión Republicana 1973. In addition, all votes for unspecified parties or candidates listed in the sources as ‘other parties,’ ‘otros partidos,’ ‘other,’ or ‘otros,’ are classified as unknown here.

Bolivia 1956–93

No experts commented on the draft classification.

Additional source: Gamarra and Malloy (1995), 413–30.

XR:

XCR:

XC:

XCL: Comunidad Democrática Cristiana 1966, Democrático Cristiano 1985, Social Cristiano 1958 & 1962.

XL:

SR: Acción Democrática Nacionalista (Bánzer) 1979–89, Alianza Institucionalista Democrática 1966, Falange Socialista Boliviano 1956–62 & 1980–93, Revolucionario Auténtico 1960–62 & 1980.

SCR: Acuerdo Patriótico (ADN + MIR) 1993, Alianza del MNR 1980, Movimiento Nacionalista Pazestensorista 1966, Movimiento Nacionalista Revolucionario 1989, MNR-Andrade 1966, Movimiento Nacionalista Revolucionario Histórico 1985, Movimiento Nacionalista Revolucionario–Movimiento Revolucionario Tupaj-Katari de Liberación 1993, MNR Unido 1980.

SC:

SCL: Movimiento de la Izquierda Revolucionaria 1985–89, Movimiento Nacionalista Revolucionario 1956–62, Movimiento Nacionalista Revolucionario de Izquierda 1985, Movimiento Nacional Revolucionario de Vanguardia 1985, Unión Democrática y Popular (UDP) 1979–80.

SL: Acción Cívica Popular 1985, Acción Humanista Revolucionaria (AUR) 1985, Alianza de Fuerzas de la Izquierda Nacional 1980, Alianza Renovadora Nacional 1985, Comunista Boliviano (PCB) 1956–62, Frente de Liberación Nacional (Comunista) 1966, Frente Popular Unido 1985, Fuerza Nacional Progresista 1985, Izquierda Unida 1985–93, Movimiento de Izquierda Nacional 1989, Movimiento Bolivia Libre 1993, MNR de Izquierda–1 1985, Obrero Revolucionario (POR) 1956–62 & 1985, Revolucionario de la Izquierda Nacional–Alianza (PRIN–Alianza) 1980, Socialista-1 (PS-1) 1979–89, Vanguardia Obrera 1979, Vanguardia Revolucionaria 9 de abril 1989–93.

O: Frente Unico de Liberación Katarista (FULKA) 1989, Movimiento Indio Tupaj Katari 1979–80, Movimiento Indio Tupaj Katari–1 1989, Movimiento Katarista

Nacional 1993, Movimiento Revolucionario Tupaj-Katari 1985, Movimiento Revolucionario Tupaj-Katari de Liberación 1985–89 (allied with MNR in 1993).

- P:** Conciencia de Patria (CONDEPA) (Carlos Palenque) 1989–93, Frente de la Revolución Boliviana (aka Movimiento Popular Cristiano) (Barrientos) 1966, Movimiento Nacional Revolucionaria de Vanguardia (Carlos Serrate Reich) 1985, Unión Cívica Solidaridad (Max Fernández) 1993, Vanguardia Revolucionaria 9 de abril (Carlos Serrate Reich) 1993.
- U:** Alianza Popular de Integración Nacional 1979, Alianza Renovadora Boliviana (ARBOL) 1993, Alternativa del Socialismo Democrático 1993, Eje de Convergencia Patriótica 1993, Frente Democrático Revolucionario–Nueva Alternativa 1980, Movimiento Federalista Democrático 1993, Organización Nacional de Independientes 1993, PUB 1979.

Brazil 1945–94

Experts: Barry Ames, David Fleischer, Scott Mainwaring, and Timothy Power.

Additional source: Mainwaring (forthcoming), tables 2.1 and 3.2.

XR:

XCR:

XC: Social Cristão 1986–94 [3/5].

XCL:

XL:

SR: Aliança de Renovação Nacional (ARENA) 1966–78, da Frente Liberal 1986–94, de Representação Popular (PRP) 1947–62 & 1990–94, Democrático Social (PDS) 1982–90, Liberal 1986–94, Libertador 1945 & 1950–62, Popular Sindicalista (PPS) 1945, Progressista Reformista 1994, Renovação da Ordem Nacional (PRONA) (Enéas Carneiro) 1990, Republicano 1945–62 [4/5], Social Democrático 1990–94, alliances^{ix} PSD-PDC-PL-PRP-PST 1958, PSD-PDC-PSP-PL-PRP 1954, PSD-PL 1950–54, PSD-PR 1962, PSD-PRP 1954–58, PSD-PRP-PL 1954, PSD-PRP-PST 1950, UDN-PL 1958, UDN-PR-PL 1954, UDN-PR-PST-PRP-PL 1950.

SCR: Demócrata Cristão 1945 & 1950–62 & 1986–90,^x Progressista 1994, Social Democrático 1945–62, PSL 1990, Social Trabalhista 1950,^{xi} Social Trabalhista

^{ix} My draft classified all alliances as personalist. Because Mainwaring objected strongly to this assumption, I reclassified all of them based on the orientations of the parties that composed them. Usually I classified the alliance in accordance with the orientation of the median party. In the case of ties, I favored the more centrist option. I am grateful to Scott Mainwaring for his comments on two drafts of this reclassification.

^x For elections before 1986 there was a 4/5 acquiescence on SCR. For 1986–90 the draft classification was XCR, but Fleischer changed it to SR and Ames changed it to SCR. This was sufficient to convince me that the party should be classified as secular. I chose SCR rather than SR because Fleischer's ratings were almost always farther to the right than anyone else's.

^{xi} Because Fleischer judged this party to be SR, so much farther to the right than the draft SC, I compromised by changing it to SCR. Again I chose Power's SCR rather than Fleischer's SR because Fleischer's ratings were almost always farther to the right than anyone else's.

1990,^{xii} Trabalhista Brasileiro (Ivete Vargas) 1982–94, Trabalhista Renovador 1986, União Democrática Nacional 1945–62 [4/5], alliances PDC-PRP-PDC-UDN 1962, PDC-PRT-UDN 1962, PL-PRP-PDC-UDN 1962, PR-PDC 1954, PRT-PSP-PSD 1962, PSD-PDC 1950 & 1962, PSD-PR-PSP 1950 & 1958, PSD-PR-PSP-PRP 1958, PSD-PSP 1962, PSD-PSP-PDC-PRP-UDN 1958, PSD-PST 1962, PSD-PTN 1962, PSD-UDN 1954 & 1962, PSD-UDN-PDC 1962, PSD-UDN-PDC-PTN 1954, PSP-PR 1950, PSP-PR-PRT-PRP 1950, PSP-PSD-PRT 1958, PSP-PST 1954, PSP-UDN-PL 1954, PST-PTN 1954, PTN-PR 1954, UDN-PDC-PR 1958, UDN-PDC-PTN 1962, UDN-PR 1950, UDN-PR-PSP 1958, UDN-PRP 1950 & 1958, UDN-PSP 1954–58, UDN-PSP-PDC 1962, UDN-PSP-PL-PST 1950, UDN-PSP-PRT-PR-PTN 1958, UDN-PST 1950 & 1958–62, UDN-PST-PSP 1954, UDN-PST-PTN 1958.

SC: do Movimento Democrático Brasileira 1978–94 [3/5 1978–86,^{xiii} 4/5 1990–94], Revolucionário Socialista 1990 [4/5], Trabalhista Nacional 1950,^{xiv} alliances PDC-PSP-PST-PSB 1958, PSB-PST 1962, PSD-PSP-PDC-PTN-PSB 1962, PSD-PSB-PRT-PR-PTN-PL 1958, PSD-PST-PTB-PRP-UDN 1950, PSD-PTB-PDC-PSB-PS-PR 1954, PSD-PTB-PRP 1958, PSD-PTB (PTB-PSD) 1954–62, PSD-PTB-UDN-PSP 1958, PSP-PTN-PRT-PR-MTR-PSB-UDN-PL 1962, PTB-PR-PRP 1962, PTB-PR-PRP-PSP 1954, PTB-PSP-PL 1962, PTB-PST 1954, PTB-UDN-PSP-PRP 1962, UDN-PTB 1958, UDN-PSB-PSP 1962, UDN-PTB-PR 1954, UDN-PSD-PR-PL-PSP-PTB 1950, UDN-PR-PRP-PDC-PTB-PL 1950.

SCL: Democrático Trabalhista (Brizola) 1982–94 [4/5], Movimento Democrático Brasileiro 1966–78 [4/5], MTR 1962, Social Democrático Brasileiro 1990–94, Socialista Brasileiro 1950, Trabalhista Brasileiro 1945–62, alliances, MTR-PSB-PST 1962, PSB-PTN 1958, PSP-PTB-PSB 1950, PTB-PSB 1962, PTB-PSB-PDC-PR 1958, PTB-PSP 1950 & 1962, PTN-MTR 1962, UDN-PTB-PSP-PTN-PSB 1958, UDN-PTB-PST 1962.

^{xii} With both Fleischer and Power placing this party to the right of center, my draft classification of SL was clearly a mistake.

^{xiii} Because both Fleischer and Mainwaring changed PMDB to SCL for at least 1982–86, I seriously considered accepting the change. However, Hagopian’s work has shown that the right-wing infiltration of PMDB took place well before 1990. Also, Mainwaring’s forthcoming book on Brazilian parties classifies PMDB for 1982–86 as ‘center,’ although the classification criteria may be different. For these reasons, and because I want this classification to register party ideological shifts only if absolutely necessary, I decided to stick with the majority view, which keeps PMDB consistently in the secular center.

^{xiv} Only Fleischer challenged the draft classification of SCL, but because PTN so often participated in electoral alliances with parties to the right of center, I have adopted his suggestion of SC.

- SL:** Comunista Brasileiro 1945–47 & 86–90, Comunista do Brasil 1986–94, do Trabalhador Revolucionário 1990 [4/5],^{xv} dos Trabalhadores 1982–94, Esquerda Democrática 1947, Popular Socialista 1994, POT 1950, Republicano Trabalhista 1950, Socialista Brasileiro 1986–94 [4/5], alliance POT-PSP 1950.
- O:** Unidos pelo Maranhão 1954, PV 1994.
- P:** Municipal Nacional 1990–94, P. da J 1986, Renovador Nacional (Collor) 1990–94 [4/5], Social Progresista (PSP-Ademar de Barros) 1947–62.
- U:** Comunitário Nacional 1986, Humanista 1986, da Mobilização Nacional 1986, Municipalista Comunitário 1986, Nacionalista 1986, da Nôva República 1986, do Pôvo Brasileiro 1986, PAN 1945, PAP 1990, PAS 1990, PCN 1990, PD 1990, PEB 1990, PLH 1990, PMB 1986, PND 1986, PNT 1990, Pr. Pop. 1945, Pr. Prog. 1945, PRB 1950, PRD 1945–50, PS 1982–86, PSU 1990, PT do B 1990, Reformador Trabalhista 1986, Republicano Progressista 1986, Socialista Agrário e Renovador Trabalhista 1986, Trabalhista Nacional 1986, alliance PSP-PSB-PR 1958.

^{xv} Fleischer called this party SR, but because he also noted that its name should be “de Trabalhador Renovador,” I assume he was thinking of a different party, the Partido Trabalhista Renovador, which Power identified as SCR for 1990.

Chile 1915–93

Experts: Manuel Antonio Garretón, Iván Jaksic, and Aníbal Pérez-Liñán.

XR: Conservador 1915–57 & 1965, Conservador Tradicionalista 1949–61, Nacional Cristiano 1953–57.

XCR: Movimiento Social Cristiano 1949.

XC: Demócrata Cristiano 1961–93 [3/4], Falange Nacional 1941–57 [3/4].

XCL:

XL: Izquierda Cristiana 1973.

SR: Acción Republicana 1937, Agrario 1932–45 & 1953, Avanzada Nacional 1989, del Sur 1989–93, Independientes allied with Democracia y Progreso pact 1989–93, Liberal 1915–18 & 1925–65, Liberal (Aliancistas) 1921, Liberal (Unionistas) 1921, Movimiento Nacional del Pueblo 1953 [2/4], Nacional 1969–93, Nacista 1937, other Liberal 1932, Otros Liberales 1945, Renovación Nacional 1989–93 [3/4], Unión Demócrata Independiente 1989–93.

SCR: Confederación de la Democracia 1973, Democracia Agrario Lab. 1961, Democracia Radical 1949, Demócrata 1937–65, Liberal 1989, Liberal Progresista 1945–49, Movimiento Republicano 1957, Radical Democrático 1949, Radical Democrático 1973.

SC: Democracia Radical 1989, Democrático de Chile 1973, Independientes allied with Alianza de Centro pact 1989–93, Radical 1915–25 & 1961–65.

SCL: Demócrata 1915–32, Democrático de Izquierda 1993, Independientes allied with Concertación 1989, Liberal Democrático 1915–21 & 1932, Liberal Democrático (Aliancistas) 1918–21 & 1932, Liberal Doctrinario 1932, Por la Democracia (PPD) 1989–93 [3/4], Radical 1932–57 & 1969 & 1989–93, Radical Doctrinario 1949–57 & 1973, Social Democracia 1993, Socialista 1993, Socialista Chileno 1989.

SL: Agrupación de Socialistas de Chile 1941, Alianza Humanista/Verde 1993,^{xvi} Amplio de la Izquierda Socialista (PAIS) 1989, Comunista Chileno 1932 & 1941–45 & 1961–73 & 1993, Democrático 1932–49, Democrático Doctrinario

^{xvi} I decided to go with Garretón's judgment that this party was more leftist than environmental.

1957, Democrático Nacional (PADENA) 1961–69, Humanista 1989,^{xvii} Independientes allied with Unidad para la Democracia pact 1989–93, independents with new left 1993, Movimiento de Acción Popular Unitario (MAPU) 1973 & 1993 [2/4],^{xviii} Proletariano Nacional (Comunista) 1937, Radical 1973, Radical Socialista 1932 & 1941, Radical Socialista Democrático 1989, Socialista Auténtico 1945–49, Socialista Chileno 1915–21 & 1932–37 & 1945–69 & 1989, Socialista Demócrata 1969, Socialista Popular 1949–57 & 1969–73, Unidad Popular (misc.) 1973, Vanguardia Nacional del Pueblo 1965, Vanguardia Popular Socialista 1941.

O: Verde 1989, Movimiento Ecologista 1993.

^{xvii} I decided to go with Garretón's judgment that this party was more leftist than environmental.

^{xviii} Although MAPU was a splinter from the Christian Democrats, it left behind any Christian identification.

- P:** All other independents 1915–41, Acción Popular Independiente 1973 (R. Tarud), Acción Renovadora de Chile (Ibáñez) 1949, Agrario Laborista 1949–57 (Ibáñez), Democrático del Pueblo 1949–53 (Martonez Quezada + Ibáñez), Movimiento Nacional Ibañista 1953, Movimiento Nacional del Pueblo 1953–57, unaligned independents 1989, Unión de Centro Centro (Errázuriz) 1993, Unión Nacional de Independientes 1953–57.
- U:** Otros 1915–21 & 1932–41 & 1949–53, Alianza de Liberación Popular 1941–45, Avanzada Nacional 1965, Comandos Populares 1961–65, del Trabajo 1957, Independientes 1945 & 1957–69, independents with Liberal/Socialista Chileno pact 1989, Laborista 1953–57, Nacional 1915–21, Nacionalista 1918, Unidad Popular 1953, Unión Nacional 1961.

Colombia 1931–94

Experts: Pablo Abitbol, Ronald Archer, David Bushnell, Robert Dix, Jonathan Hartlyn, Gary Hoskin, Francisco Leal Buitrago, and Steven L. Taylor.

Additional sources: Unpublished research by Pablo Abitbol, sponsored by the Friends of Colombia, 1994; and Taylor (1995).

XR:

XCR: Conservador 1931–78 [7/7 1931–51, 6/7 1953–58, 5/7 1960–78], Conservatismo Independiente 1994, Laicos Por Colombia 1994, Movimiento Nacional Progresista 1994.

XC:

XCL: Compromiso Cívico Cristiano con la Comunidad (C4) 1994,^{xix} Movimiento Cristiano Evangélico 1990b,^{xx} PDC 1991, Partido Nacional Cristiano 1994, Unión Cristiana 1991–94.

XL:

SR:

SCR: Cambio Democrático Malcón 1994, Conservador 1994 [6/7], Conservador Humbertista 1991, Liberalismo Independiente de Restauración (LIDER) 1991, Movimiento Fuerza Progresista 1994, Movimiento Humbertista 1991–94,^{xxi} Movimiento Nacional Conservador 1990a & 1991–94 [3/7], Movimiento de Salvación Nacional 1990b–94,^{xxii} Movimiento Unico de Renovación Conservadora (MURCO) 1994, Nueva Fuerza (Democrática) 1994,^{xxiii} Partido Nacional Conservador 1991 [3/7], Social Conservador 1982–91,^{xxiv} Voluntad Popular 1994.

^{xix} Reclassified from XC due to extra weight given to the opinion of Steven Taylor, who has studied new parties carefully.

^{xx} 1990a refers to the election for the lower chamber and 1990b to the constituent assembly election; see Appendix B page 41.

^{xxi} According to Steven Taylor this appears to be the same as Unidad Norte Vallecaucana, but lacking additional confirmation, I have classified them differently.

^{xxii} My original classification was SR, but both experts who revised it suggested CR (one XCR and one SCR).

^{xxiii} Two experts changed my SR to SCR; I assume they know something the rest of us do not.

^{xxiv} All who made corrections called the Conservatives secular by 1982, so there is probably consensus on that part of the change. For 1982 five let CR stand, one said Center, and one said CL. For 1986–94 six let CR stand and one said Center.

SC: Liberal 1931–94.^{xxv}

SCL: Coalición Partido Liberal-Unión Patriótica 1994, Frente Popular 1947, Frente Popular (2) 1991, (Movimiento) Nueva Colombia 1991–94, Movimiento Unido Estudiantil 1990b, Nuevo Liberalismo 1986.

SL: Alianza Democrática/M–19 1990b–94, Comunista 1945 & 1949–51 & 1990a, Frente Democrático 1982, Frente Unido Popular 1978–82, Quintin Lame 1991,^{xxvi} Socialista 1947, Socialista de Trabajadores (PST) 1990b–91, Unión Nacional de Oposición 1974–78, Unión Patriótica 1986 & 1990b–94.

O: Alianza Social Indígena (ASI) 1994, (Movimiento) Autoridades Indígenas de Colombia (AINCO/MAIC) 1990b–94, comunidades negras (1) 1994, comunidades negras (2) 1994, comunidades negras (3–sin curules) 1994, Convergencia Cívica del Meta 1994, Convergencia Popular Caldense 1994, Integración Regional 1991–94, Movimiento Cívico Amazonas Unido 1994, Movimiento Cívico Por Caldas 1991, MPNPPN (pro-children) 1990b, Organización Nacional Indígena de Colombia (ONIC) 1990b, Quindianos Por Colombia 1991, Unidad Norte Vallecaucana 1991.

P: Alianza Nacional Popular (ANAPO) (Rojas Pinilla) 1974 & 1990a & 1994 (6/7), Independiente (Viviani Morales) 1994, Movimiento Unitario Metapolítico (Regina XI) [1/3^{xxvii}] 1990a–94.

U: Others; “coaliciones” 1990a & 1991; Alianza Reserva Acción Cívica 1994, Alternativa Democrática Nacional 1994, Ganas 1994, Integración Popular 1991, LFD (only in Cauca and Meta) 1982, MC (only in Valle) 1982, Movimiento Dep. Conservador 1991, MID (only in Cundinamarca) 1982, [Movimiento] Cívico Independiente 1991–94, Movimiento Unidos Por Colombia 1991, Participación Popular 1994, Renovación Democrática 1991–94, Transformación 1991, UD (only in Atlántico, Boyacá, Huila, and Tolima) 1982.

^{xxv} The Liberal Party is the most difficult Colombian party to classify. I decided to put it in the center because of the slightly but frequently diverging views of the experts. They were 1931–33: 3 SCR, 2 SC, 2 SCL; 1939–45: 3 SCR, 3 SC, 1 SCL; 1947: 3 SCR, 2 SC, 2 SCL; 1951–53: 4 SCR, 3 SC; 1958–74: 3 SCR, 4 SC; 1978: 4 SCR, 3 SC; 1982–94: 3 SCR, 4 SC.

^{xxvi} Quintin Lame is an indigenous party, but its position on the left is so clear that two experts persuaded me that the left identity should take precedence over the indigenous identity.

^{xxvii} In this case David Bushnell and Ron Archer provided information in sufficient detail for classification.

Costa Rica 1948–94

Experts: John Booth, Fabrice Edouard Lehoucq, Manuel Rojas Bolaños, Mitchell Seligson and Cynthia Chalker, Jorge Vargas, and Deborah Yashar.

XR: Alianza Nacional Cristiana 1986–94.

XCR:

XC:

XCL: Demócrata Cristiano 1970–74 [6/7].

XL:

SR: Constitucional 1948–49 [6/7], Demócrata 1953 [6/7], Movimiento Nacional (Mario Echandi) 1982 [6/7], Unión Nacional (Otilio Ulate) 1948–62 & 1970.

SCR: Unidad Coalición 1978–82, Unidad Social Cristiana (PUSC) 1986–94, Unificación Nacional 1966–78.^{xxviii}

SC:

SCL: Frente Nacional 1970 [4/7+1SL+1SC], Liberación Nacional 1953–94 [7/7 1953–82, 6/7 1986–94], Social Demócrata 1948–49.

SL: Acción Democrática Popular (Comunista) 1958–62, Acción Socialista (Comunista) 1970–74, Alianza Popular 1986, del Progreso 1990, Frente Popular Costarricense 1970–78, Fuerza Democrática 1994, Movimiento Revolucionario Costarricense 1970, Obrero Campesino 1982, Organización Socialista de los Trabajadores (POST) 1978, Pueblo Unido 1978–90, Revolucionario de los Trabajadores en Lucha 1990, Socialista Costarricense 1974, Vanguardia Popular 1994 [5/7].

O: Acción Democrática Alajuelense 1982–86 & 1994, Agrario Nacional 1990–94, Alajuelense Democrático 1962, Alajuelense Solidario 1986–90, Alajuelita Nueva 1994, Auténtico Limonense 1978–94, Auténtico Puntarenense 1978–82, Democrático Alajuelense 1949, Rev. Punt. 1970, Unión Agrícola Cartaginesa 1970–94, Unión Cartaginés 1949, Unión Guanacasteca Independiente 1962 & 1994, Unión Parlamentaria de Cartago 1982.

P: Acción Cívica 1948, Demócrata 1966 & 1974–82, Demócrata Cortesista 1949, Democrático Auténtico 1958, Independiente (Jorge Rossi) 1958, Independiente (G.W. Villalobos G.) 1974–94, Liberalismo Nacional Republicano Progresista 1982, Movimiento Renovador Nacional 1962, MRP 1948, Nacional Independiente (Jorge González Martén) 1974–78, Renovador Democrático (Rodrigo Carazo)

^{xxviii} Two experts hinted at personalism, however.

1974,^{xxix} Republicano (R.A. Calderón Guardia) 1958–62 [5/7], Republicano Nacional (R.A. Calderón Guardia) 1953 [4/7], Republicano Nacional 1974,^{xxx} Unión Cívica Revolucionaria (Frank Marshall Jiménez) 1958, Unión Generala (regional) 1986–94 [6/7], Unión Republicana 1978.

U: Acción del Pueblo 1982, Acción Laborista Agrícola/Agraria 1990–94, Acción Solidarista 1962, Concordia Costarricense 1978–82, Confraternidad 1948, Convergencia Nacional 1994, Laborista Nacional 1978, Liberal 1948, Movimiento Democrático Oposición 1958, Nacional Democrático 1982.

^{xxix} Originally classified SCL, but two experts said P and one said SC, which indicates that Carazo was not convincingly CL and therefore probably more personalist in his split away from the PLN.

^{xxx} Originally classified XCL, but two experts said or hinted at P and one said SC, which indicates that it was not convincingly CL and therefore probably more personalist.

Ecuador 1947–94

Experts: J. Samuel Fitch and Andrés Mejía Acosta.

Additional sources: Published classifications by Fernando Bustamante, Luis Verdesoto Custode, and E. Durán D., supplied by Andrés Mejía Acosta.

XR: Conservador (Ecuatoriano) 1947–94 [5/6].

XCR: Acción Cívica Cristiana (= Movimiento Social Cristiano + minor parties) 1962.

XC:

XCL: Democracia Popular–Unión Demócrata Cristiana 1984–94.

XL:

SR: Alianza Liberal-Social 1950,^{xxx1} Fuerzas del Liberalismo Radical 1962, Liberal (Radical Ecuatoriano) 1947 & 1954 & 1966–94 [5/6], Movimiento Cívico Democrático Nacional 1947, Social Cristiano 1979–94 [5/6],^{xxxii} Unidad Republicana (PUR) 1992–94 [5/6].

SCR: Coalición Institucionalista Democrática/Coalición Nacional Republicano/Republicano 1979–88 [5/6], Frente Radical Alfarista (Calderón & Castro family) 1984–94.^{xxxiii}

SC:

SCL: del Pueblo 1988–90 [5/6], Demócrata (Francisco Huerta Montalvo) 1984 & 1988,^{xxxiv} Izquierda Democrática 1979–94.

SL: Comunista Ecuatoriano 1958, Frente Amplio de Izquierda (FADI) 1984–90, Liberación Nacional 1990, Movimiento Popular Democrático (PCMLE) 1979–94,

^{xxx1} According to Fitch, this was probably an alliance, not a party, which included the Liberals and Socialists and backed the Galo Plaza government even though the Socialists backed a different Liberal candidate in 1948.

^{xxxii} PSC was originally a Christian Democratic splinter party but became secularized by the 1970s.

^{xxxiii} This was reclassified from personalist because three judges assigned it to an ideological bloc: 1 SC, 1 SCR, and 1 SR. Although there is no consensus among the judges, all consider it somewhat right of center.

^{xxxiv} This party was reclassified from personalist because the only two experts who suggested reclassification independently reclassified it as SCL.

Movimiento Unión Nacional Revolucionaria Ecuatoriana (MUNRE) 1958, Socialista (Ecuatoriano) 1954 & 1962 & 1979–94, Unidad Popular (Comunista) 1954, Unión Democrática Popular 1979.

O: Unión Cívica de Pichincha 1962.

- P:** Acción Popular Revolucionaria Ecuatoriana (Frank Vargas Pazzos) 1984–94,^{xxxv} PAB Assad Bucaram 1992–94, Concentración de Fuerzas Populares 1954–62 (Guevara Moreno) & 1979–94 (Assad and Averroes Bucaram),^{xxxvi} Directiva Velasquista de Pichincha 1962,^{xxxvii} Federación Nacional Velasquista 1958, Federación Poncista 1966,^{xxxviii} Grupos electorales 1950, Independiente 1954, Movimiento Nacional Arosemenista 1966, Nacional Velasquista 1979–84 [4/6], Nacionalista Revolucionario (C.J. Arosemena Monroy) 1979–84 [4/6], Roldosista Ecuatoriano (Abdalá Bucaram) 1984–94 [4/6], Velasquista 1954.
- U:** “otros” 1947 & 1958 & 1966; Demócratas Auténticos 1958, Frente Democrático Nacional 1962, Frente Popular Democrático 1954, Liberal Revolucionario 1962, Lista 3 1950, Movimiento Republicano Independiente 1966, Pueblo Cambio y Democracia (León Roldós) 1984–90,^{xxxix} Unidad Popular Latinoamericano 1992–94.

^{xxxv} Because two experts say SCR and one says SCL, I feel that APRE lacks a clear ideological position and should be classified personalist.

^{xxxvi} Because two experts say SCR and one says SCL, I feel that CFP lacks a clear ideological position and should be classified personalist.

^{xxxvii} This party was reclassified from O (regional) because Fitch argued convincingly that it was probably a splinter from the PNV.

^{xxxviii} This party was reclassified from O (regional) because Fitch argued convincingly that it was probably a vehicle for Camilo Ponce.

^{xxxix} This party is known but unclassifiable. The experts said 2 SCL, 1 SR, 1 U, and 1 P.

Mexico 1961–94

Experts: John Bailey, Roderic Ai Camp, Robert Dix, Joseph Klesner, Xochitl Lara Becerra, Soledad Loaeza, Alonso Lujambio, Kevin Middlebrook, Juan Molinar Horcasitas, and Esperanza Palma.

Additional source: Juan Molinar Horcasitas (1989), 265–90.

XR: Demócrata Mexicano (PDM) 1979–94, Nacional Mexicano (PNM) 1961.^{x1}

XCR: Acción Nacional (PAN) 1961–94 [10/11 1961–70, 8/11 1973, 7/11 1976–94].

XC:

XCL:

XL:

SR:

SCR: Auténtico de la Revolución Mexicana (PARM) 1961–94 [8/11], del Frente Cardenista de Reconstrucción Nacional (PFCRN) 1988–94,^{x2} Revolucionario Institucional (PRI) 1961–67 [10/11] & 1982–88 [10/11] & 1991–94.

SC: Revolucionario Institucional (PRI) 1976–79.^{x3}

SCL: de la Revolución Democrática (PRD) 1991–94, de Trabajo (PT) 1991–94 [10/11], Mexicano de los Trabajadores (PMT) 1985, Mexicano Socialista (PMS) 1988,

^{x1} Few seem to know much about the PNM, but of the three judges who rated it there was complete consensus that it was on the right; the only question is whether it was Christian or secular. Molinar says Christian, Lujambio says secular, and Middlebrook says it could be either, but because he prefers Christian, I have classified it as XR.

^{x2} The PFCRN was rated SCR by four judges, SCL by three, SC by one, Personalist by one, and Other by one. The total lack of consensus seems to be due to the lack of guidance on how to treat ‘parastatal’ parties, which have no ideology of their own other than to support the governing party. I have decided that unless the judges agree that these parties should be classified differently, I will put them in the same category as the governing party.

^{x3} Slim majorities of five and six out of nine favored calling the PRI a center-right party during the López Portillo government (1976 & 1979 elections), but four and two judges, respectively, called it center-left. I have decided to classify it as SC for these years, while adding a new alternative to the definition of ‘center’: Governing parties whose policies are so divided between positions both to the left and to the right of center that no orientation that is mostly consistent between elections is discernible. Only Alonso Lujambio suggested SC for the PRI in these years, but I suspect that many more would have chosen a center rating if this definition had been offered.

- Revolucionario Institucional (PRI) 1970–73 [8/11 1970, 9/11 1973], Socialista de los Trabajadores (PST) 1979–85 [10/11].
- SL:** Comunista Mexicano (PCM) 1979, Popular Socialista (PPS) 1961–94 [10/11], Revolucionario de los Trabajadores (PRT) 1982–91, Socialista Unificado de México (PSUM) 1982–85 [9/11].
- O:** Ecologista Mexicano (PEM) 1991, Verde Ecologista Mexicano (PVEM) 1994.
- P:**
- U:** Social Demócrata (PSD) 1982.^{xliii}

^{xliii} I have left this as U because there was no clear tendency among the judges: 6/11 U, 2/11 SC, 2/11 SCL, and 1/11 P.

Peru 1931–95

Experts: Carol Graham, Charles Kenney, Cynthia McClintock, Felipe Ortiz de Zevallos, and David Scott Palmer.

XR: Conservador Renov. del Perú 1931.

XCR: Popular Cristiano (& its coalitions of 1980–85) 1978–95,^{xliv} Renovación 1992–95.^{xlv}

XC:

XCL: Demócrata Cristiano 1962 & 1978 [5/6].

XL:

SR: Acción Republicana 1931, Unión Nacional Odrísta (Manuel A. Odría) 1962–63.^{xlvi}

SCR: Acción Popular 1995, AP–PPC 1980–85 [5/6], Coordinadora Democrática (CODE)/País Posible 1992–95 [5/6], Frente Democrático (Fredemo) 1990, Frente Independiente Moralizador 1992–95,^{xlvii} Unión Revolucionaria (Sánchez Cerro) 1931–45.

SC: Solidaridad y Democracia (SODE) 1992.^{xlviii}

^{xliv} There was a consensus among experts that the PPC should be XCR in 1978 and 1990–95. In 1980–85 it ran joint slates with some parties that could not be classified as Christian, so I initially classified these alliances as SCR. Two experts noted that PPC leaders held the most important positions in these coalitions for 1985 at least so, in the interest of consistency, I reclassified PPC's coalitions in 1980–85 as XCR.

^{xlv} This was originally unclassified, but it was identified as either XCR or XR; I chose XCR to hedge.

^{xlvi} This is a fairly rare case of a party that was personalist, to the point of being named after its founder, but while maintaining a clear and consistent ideological orientation that takes precedence over the personalism.

^{xlvii} Kenney labeled this party SCR and McClintock, P. I have chosen SCR because McClintock characterized it as an anticorruption party, which fits my criteria for the center-right.

^{xlviii} This is a group of economists with Christian Democratic ties which helped Morales Bermúdez with economic stabilization and subsequently allied with APRA and FREDEMO. This confusing trajectory led experts to classify it as SC, SCR, or P

SCL: Acción Popular (Belaunde) 1962 [4/6], AP-DC 1963 [4/6], Alianza Popular Revolucionaria Americana (APRA or Partido Aprista Peruano) 1931 [6/6] & 1962–90 & 1995 [4/6 1962–78, 6/6 1980–95], Frente Democrático Nacional (Bustamante + APRA) 1945 [4/6], Frente Nacional de Trabajadores y Campesinos/Frenatraca/FNTC 1978–1990 [3/6 1978–90, 4/6 1992–95],^{xlix} Perú al 2000/Frenatraca 1995.

(although one expert explicitly rejected a personalist label for it). I feel that SC best captures its willingness to go either left or right of center.

^{xlix} No one is very happy with any classification of Frenatraca because of its pragmatism, opportunism, and maybe personalism, all of which appear to have been accentuated in the 1990s. However, four out of six experts mentioned SCL as a possibility to consider, so I decided it is the least bad option.

- SL:** Acción Política (or perhaps Popular) Socialista 1980, Acción Revolucionaria Socialista 1978, Comunista Peruano 1978, Democrático Reformista Peruano (PDRP) 1978 [5/6], Frente de Liberación Nacional 1962, Frente Obrero-Campesino-Estudiantil y Popular (FOCEP) 1978–80, Izquierda Socialista (Barrantes) 1990 [5/6], Izquierda Unida 1985 & 1995, Mariateguista para la Liberación Nacional (PMLN) 1985, Movimiento Democrático de Izquierda 1992 [5/6], Movimiento Social Progresista 1962, Revolucionario de los Trabajadores 1980, Socialista de los Trabajadores 1985, Socialista del Perú (PSP) 1962 & 1980–85, Socialista Revolucionario (PSR) 1978, Unidad Democrática Popular 1978–80, Unidad de Izquierda 1980, Unión de Izquierda Revolucionaria (UNIR) 1980.
- O:** Frente Agrícola Peruano (FREPA) 1992.¹
- P:** “listas independientes” 1985–90; Cambio 90/Nueva Mayoría (Fujimori) 1990–95, Frente Democrático de Unidad Nacional (FDUN) (Morales Bermúdez) 1985–90, Mario Samamá Bossio (perhaps Boggio) 1963, Movimiento Democrático Peruano (M. Prado) 1978–80 [5/6], Movimiento Cívico Nacional OBRAS (R. Belmont) 1995, Organización Política de la Revolución Peruana (Juan Velasco) 1980, Partido de Avanzada e Integración Social (aka Movimiento Popular de Acción e Integración Social) (PAIS) 1980, Unión Nacional 1978–80, Unión Por el Perú (Pérez de Cuéllar) 1995 [5/6].
- U:** Alternativa Perú Puma 1995, Apertura para el Desarrollo Nacional 1995, Frente Independiente Reconciliación Nacional 1995, Frente Popular Agrícola/FIA del Perú 1995, Movimiento 7 de junio 1985, Movimiento Independiente Agrario 1992–95, Movimiento Independiente Inca 1995, Movimiento Social Independiente Recambio 1995, Partido de Avanzada Nacional 1985, Partido Independiente Nuevo Perú 1995, Reformista del Perú 1995.

¹ Identified by Kenney as a ‘religious’ party that should be classified ‘other.’

Uruguay 1917–94

Experts: David Altman, Rossana Castiglioni, and Juan Rial.^{li}

Additional sources: Gillespie (1986, 215–44); González (1986); and Rial (1986, 245–71).

XR:

XCR: Unión Cívica 1919–58 & 1984.^{lii}

XC: Movimiento Cívico Cristiano 1966–71.

XCL: Demócrata Cristiano 1962–66.

XL:

SR:

SCR: Nacional (Blanco) 1917–94.^{liii}

^{li} The final classification is my interpretation of the comments by one respondent to my questions, Juan Rial, who moreover was very diligent in applying my criteria. He advised classifying the factions (*sublemas*) within the parties, and proceeded to do so for me. In order to preserve comparability with other party systems, I chose to classify parties rather than factions in Uruguay, but Rial's advice was nevertheless extremely useful, as it enabled me to do a second-draft classification of the Blancos and Colorados in this draft according to the tendency of the dominant bloc within each.

^{lii} This classification was changed from XC in response to Rial's comments.

^{liii} In the second draft, the classification of the Blancos was SCR 1917–58 and SC 1962–94, while the Colorados was SCL 1917–31 and SC 1934–94. (This is according to Rial's interpretation of my coding criteria; according to his own standards, the Colorados had shifted to SCR by 1989, resulting in a rare leapfrogging of the two main parties!) In this scheme, however, more than two-thirds of the party system was in the center from 1962–94, and the classification is rendered useless for saying anything about competition between Blancos and Colorados. The classification I am using insists on maintaining *some* distinction between these two parties, even if it does exaggerate the degree of ideological difference between them. The classification presented here—Blancos SCR throughout and Colorados SCL 1917–31 and SC 1934–94—retains the idea of overall secular movement toward the center while resisting complete overlap or leapfrogging. It should be understood that the Blancos have moved in a centrist direction also, though not perhaps enough to escape the SCR coding. This may disturb those who perceive the large *Por la Patria sublema* of Wilson Ferreira as being SCL in the mid-1980s but, as I understand it, the 'radicalism' of Ferreira came from his conflict with the military over the pace of the democratic transition and therefore lacked the economic dimension that is the

basis for my left-right coding. The Colorados, for their part, could be considered to have crossed over into SCR after 1989, but Uruguay's policy debates in the 1980s and 1990s lagged behind those in neighboring countries, so that what seems SCR in the Uruguayan context is arguably SC or SCL in comparative perspective. The Colorados over the decades made a much more noticeable shift to the center, so they are the party chosen to manifest the centripetal movement. While I recognize that this classification of Blancos and Colorados introduces some distortion in the form of insensitivity to small shifts and intraparty diversity and a tendency to portray personal or power struggles as mild ideological competition, I think it is superior to any alternatives, or at least not inferior to them. Despite his many highly nuanced corrections, Rial wrote, "Tu clasificación de partidos es muy adecuada de acuerdo a tus definiciones. Claro siempre puede haber un pero, y este parte de la aceptación o no del sistema en su conjunto."

SC: Colorado 1971–94,^{liv} Nacional Independiente 1950–54.^{lv}

SCL: Autonomía Colorada 1917, Colorado 1917–66,^{lvi} Demócrata Social 1942–46, Nuevo Espacio 1989–94.

SL: Comunista 1922–58, Encuentro Progresista Frente Amplio 1994, Frente Amplio 1971–89, Frente Izquierda de Liberación (FIDEL) 1962–66, Socialista 1917–58 & 1966, Unión Popular 1962–66.

O: Verde 1989.

P:

U: Others 1931–38 & 1954–89; Agrario Popular 1928–31, Agrupación Militar Patria y Ejército 1931, Demócrata 1919, Movimiento Renovador 1958, Rionegrense 1917, Sindicato de Gente de Artes y Afines 1931, Unión Demócrata Reformista 1958.

^{liv} See footnote 53.

^{lv} This classification was changed from SCR in response to Rial's comments.

^{lvi} See footnote 53.

Venezuela 1947–93

Experts: Brian Crisp, Luis Gómez Calcaño, José Molina Vega, David J. Myers, Juan Carlos Navarro, and Juan Carlos Rey.

XR: Social Cristiano (COPEI) 1946–47 [6/7], Unión Federal Republicana 1947.

XCR: Organización Renovadora Auténtica 1978 & 1988–93,^{lvii} Social Cristiano (COPEI) 1958–93.

XC:

XCL:

XL: Izquierda Cristiana 1968.

SR: Cruzada Cívica Nacionalista 1988–93, Movimiento de Acción Nacional 1963–73, Unión Democrática Independiente (UDI) 1968.

SCR: Frente Nacional Democrático 1968–73, GIRASOL 1993, Independientes Pro-Desarrollo de la Comunidad (IPDC) 1978, Independientes Pro-Frente Nacional 1963 [6/7], Integración Republicana 1958, Movimiento Libertador (ML) 1968, Movimiento Renovación Nacional (MORENA) 1978–83 & 1993,^{lviii} Nueva Generación Democrática 1983–93, Socialista Venezolano 1947–73.

SC: Acción Independiente Revolucionaria (AIR) 1968, F[actor] D[emocrático] 1993,^{lix} Movimiento Demócrata Independiente (MDI) 1968, Profesionales Independientes del Volante (PRIVO) 1968.

SCL: Acción Democrática 1947–93 [7/7 in 1946–88],^{lx} AD-Oposición 1963, Fuerza Democrática Popular 1963–78 [4/7], La Causa R 1978–93 [5/7], Movimiento al Socialismo 1993 [5/7], Movimiento Electoral del Pueblo 1968–93, Movimiento Electoral Nacional Independiente (MENI) 1958–68, Movimiento Pro-Defensa de

^{lvii} This was reclassified from SCR because three experts noted that it is an evangelical party and two of them also placed it on the center-right.

^{lviii} This was a vehicle for Leonardo Montiel Ortega, but both judges who assigned it a left-right position agreed that it was SCR.

^{lix} This previously unclassified party was judged SCR by one and SC by another.

^{lx} Four out of seven of the experts would have supported SC in 1993, but in retrospect the 1993 SCR campaign of Claudio Fermín seems to have been a short-lived deviation with which many party leaders were uncomfortable. Furthermore, AD clearly positioned itself on the SCL during the second half of Caldera's second government. For these reasons I think a classification of AD as anything but SCL is premature.

las Ideas Nacionalistas (MPDIN) 1988, Organización Popular Independiente Revolucionaria (OPIR) 1968, Revolucionario de Integración Nacionalista (PRIN) 1968, Unión Republicana Democrática (Jóvito Villalba) 1947–93.^{lxi}

SL: Comunista de Venezuela 1947–58 & 1973–93, Grupo de Acción Revolucionaria 1978–83, Liga Socialista 1978–93, MAS-MIR 1988, Movimiento al Socialismo 1973–88 [7/7 before 1983, 5/7 in 1988], Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria 1973–83, Movimiento de la Patria Socialista 1983, Movimiento Revolucionario del Pueblo 1983, Nueva Alternativa 1983–88, Revolucionario del Proletariado 1947, Socialista de Trabajadores 1958, Unión para Avanzar 1968, Vanguardia Unitaria Comunista (VUC) 1978.

O:

P: Causa Común (Diego Arria) 1978,^{lxii} Convergencia Nacional (Rafael Caldera) 1993, Cruzada Cívica Nacional(ista) 1968–78 [5/7 in 1968, 4/7 in 1973–78], Formula Uno (Rhona Ottolina) 1988–93 [6/7], Frente Unido Nacionalista (Gómez Silva) 1973–93, Fuerza Emancipadora 1973–83, Independientes con Caldera 1983, Independientes Con el Cambio 88 1988, Independientes Con el Cambio 93 1993, La Nueva República (Jorge Olavarría) 1988, Movimiento de Integración Nacional (Renny Ottolina) 1983–93 [6/7], Movimiento Popular Justicialista (MPJ) 1973,^{lxiii} Opinión Nacional (OPINA) 1968–93,^{lxiv} Unión Republicana Democrática 1978–93 [5/7].

U: AA 1993, Acción Municipal (AM) 1968, Acción Renovadora Vencedora Independiente (ARVI) 1973, ACONA 1993, AGAIN 1993, Alianza Cívica Nacional (ALCINA) 1973, Alianza Liberal Venezolana (ALVE) 1968, Alianza Popular Independiente (API) 1968, Alianza Revolucionaria Patriótica (ARPA) 1973, Amigos de Anzoátegui 1993, AP 1993, ASI 1993, Auténtico Nacional 1968, Carabobo 1 1968, Caricua Decide 1993, CD 1983 & 1993, CEM 1993, CI 1993, CIDE 1983, CIMA 1983 & 1993, COIM 1983, CONFE 1983, CPPP 1993, Cruzada Electoral Popular Agrupación S 1963, CUMANAGOTOS 1993, DAR 1993, DC 1993, DCARA 1993, DDP 1993, De Chacao 93 1993, Decisión Cojedeña 1993, Democracia Popular 1973, Desarrollo de la Comunidad 1973, EEF 94 1993, EI 1983, Electores Venezolanos Independientes (EVI) 1968, ENADE 1983, EPAP 1993, EREDE 1993, Factor E 1993, FAI 1993, FDP 1993, FEVO 1993, FIC 1993, FIE 1993, FIN 1993, FPI 1993, Frente Independiente Regional

^{lxi} This was reclassified from P because two judges independently argued that it had a sufficiently clear SCL image.

^{lxii} This was previously unclassified, then reclassified as P because of the lack of agreement among the experts who commented on it: 1 SCR, 1 SC/P, and 1 P.

^{lxiii} MPJ was founded to represent the ‘ideals’ of former dictator Marcos Pérez Jiménez, although it did not enjoy his backing after 1968.

^{lxiv} This was reclassified from SCR because of persuasive comments by Gómez Calcaño

(FIR) 1968, FT 1993, Fuerza Electoral Independiente 1968, Fuerza Revolucionaria Feminina Indiv. Hom. (FRFI) 1968, FURIA 1993, GE 1993, Gente del Pueblo (GP) 1988–93, GEO-PRO-S 1983, GIO 1993, GOA 1983, Grito Vecinal 1993, IDEAL 1993, Independientes Progresistas 1973, Integración Renovadora Electoral 1983–93, ISA 1993, Línea Democrática Republicana (LIDER) 1988–93, LSN 1993, LVP 1993, M93 1993, MACARIO 1993, MAR 1993, MDIPG 1993, MDP 1993, MELI 1993, MID 1993, MIDV 1993, MIL 1993, MIO 1983 & 1993, MONCHO 1993, MOREPO 34 1993, MOV-83 1983, Movimiento Acción Independiente (MAI)-Bolívar 1978, Movimiento de los Barrios 1968, Movimiento del Trabajo (MDT) 1978, Movimiento Independiente de Acción Popular (MIAP) 1988–93, Movimiento Independiente Popular (MIPO) 1988–93, Movimiento Municipalista 1968, Movimiento Nacionalista Venezolano (MNV) 1988, Movimiento Pro-Candidatura Obrera (MPCO) 1968, MR 1993, MRI 1993, MRM 1993, MS 1993, Nacionalista 1988, NI 1993, NOR 1983 & 1993, NR 1993, Nosotros el PSN 1988, OCIM 1993, OI 1993, ONDA 1993, ONI 1993, ONIS 1983, Organización Venezolana Nacionalista Independiente (OVNI) 1968, PAN 1993, Partido Nacional Integracionista (PNI) 1973, Partido Revolucionario Nacionalista (PRN) 1973, PCI 1993, PEV 1993, PLT 1947, PN 1993, PND 1993, PNV 1983, PODER 1993, Poder 7 1993, PQAC 1993, PROSOCIAL 1993, PST 1993, PUNI 1993, RDB 1983, Renovación 1988–93, RN 1983, SENCO 1993, SI 1993, Socialista Independiente 1983, TMSD 1993, U 1993, UCII 1993, Unión Progresista del Pueblo (UPP) 1968, Unión Revolucionaria Independiente (URI) 1973, UO 1993, UP 1993, UPA 1993, UPC 1993, UVI 1993, VCI 1993, VIA 1993, VIENE 1993, VO 1993, VOI 1983.

Appendix B

Appendix B contains country-by-country and election-by-election tallies of the vote for each bloc. Those who have worked with historical election data know that minor inconsistencies are common. One of these inconsistencies is that the votes reported do not always sum to 100 percent. Therefore, the tables in this appendix include a row of adjustments to the sums. For most purposes these adjustments can be added to the 'unknown' vote.

Sources for Electoral Data

Argentina

1912–48, 1960, 1962: Darío Cantón, *Materiales para el estudio de la sociología política en la Argentina* (Buenos Aires: Editorial del Instituto Torcuato di Tella, 1968); **1957–62 & 1965:** Peter G. Snow, *Political Forces in Argentina* (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1971), p. 29; **1963:** Dieter Nohlen, ed., *Enciclopedia electoral latinoamericana y del Caribe* (San José, Costa Rica: Instituto Interamericano de Derechos Humanos, 1993); **1973:** Gregorio Badeni, *Comportamiento electoral en la Argentina* (Buenos Aires: Plus Ultra, 1976), Tables 21 and 23, pp. 88 and 92; **1983–85:** Appendix to Alejandro L. Corbacho, *Elecciones y representación: Un enfoque experimental sobre sistemas electorales en la Argentina: 1973–1985*, Documento de Trabajo No. 102, Instituto Torcuato Di Tella, Diciembre 1988, pp. 66–80; **1985–91:** compiled from Rosendo Fraga, *Argentina en las urnas* (Buenos Aires: Fundación para la Nueva Mayoría, 1992), based on complete data except for the province of Formosa, which is missing due to a printer's error in the source material. This alters the results very little because Formosa accounts for less than 2.5% of the national vote. TVV is estimated for 1989 and 1991 by increasing the total by the proportion of the 1987 vote cast in Formosa.); **1993:** *Elections Today* 4:2–3 (April 1994): 28; 1994 Constituent Assembly: calculated from Instituto de Estudios sobre Estado y Participación, *El nuevo mapa electoral argentina IV: Apuntes sobre las elecciones para constituyentes* (Buenos Aires: Asociación Trabajadores del Estado, 1994); **1995:** “Suplemento especial: Todos los números de la elección presidencial,” *Microsemanario* 5:195 (8–14 April 1995). A few party shares were added from Dieter Nohlen, *Handbuch der Wahldaten Lateinamerikas und der Karibik* (Leske + Budrich, 1992) to reduce the ‘other’ party totals.

Bolivia

1956–89: Nohlen, *Enciclopedia electoral*; **1993:** Corte Nacional Electoral, *Informe al H. Congreso Nacional: Elecciones generales 1993* (La Paz, 1994), p. 314.

Brazil

1945–82: Bolívar Lamounier and Judith Muszinsky, “O processo eleitoral brasileiro da velha e Nova República” (Serie Textos IDESP, 1989); **1990:** Compiled from *Deputados Brasileiros*, 1991–95; **1994:** Tribunal Superior Eleitoral, Suervisão de Engenharia de Sistemas, provided by Scott Mainwaring. Complete and accurate data for 1986 do not exist. The results reported in the first ‘1986’ column for 1986, which were compiled from *Assembléia Nacional Constituyente* (1987), are incorrect. They are based on total preference votes cast for candidates of parties that satisfied each state’s electoral quotient, which was calculated on a base that included blank and null votes. These estimates therefore underestimate votes for small parties and understate the TVV. The data in the second ‘1986’ column are also incorrect: they are incomplete, but accurate for 14 states—Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo, Bahia, Pernambuco, Ceará, Espírito Santo, Amazonas, Pará, Roraima, Sergipe, Amapá, Santa Catarina, Rio Grande do Sul, and Mato Grosso. These data come from a personal communication from Rogério Schmitt to Scott Mainwaring.

Chile

1925–73: Germán Urzúa, *Historia política electoral de Chile 1931–1973* (Santiago: Tamarco-Van, 1986); **1989:** *Chronicle of Parliamentary Elections*, vol. 24 (1989–90), pp. 43–45; **1993:** Gerardo L. Munck, “Democratic Stability and Its Limits: An Analysis of Chile’s 1993 Elections,” *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs* 36:2 (summer 1994): 11.

Colombia

1931–78 & 1986: Registraduría Nacional del Estado Civil, *Historia electoral colombiana, 1980–1988*; **1990a:** *Registraduría Nacional del Estado Civil*; **1982 & 1990b–91:** Nohlen, *Enciclopedia electoral*; 1994: unpublished compilation by Steven L. Taylor, from official returns.

Costa Rica

No reliable returns exist for **1948 & 1949**. The returns provided here are from *Latin American Political Statistics* (Los Angeles: UCLA Latin American Center, Sept. 1972) and are only to give a rough idea of the blocs that competed in the election, not to indicate their relative sizes. **1953–74**: Wilberg Jimenez Castro, *Análisis electoral de una democracia*. **1978–90**: Nohlen, *Enciclopedia electoral*, 1993, pp. 193–94; **1994**: data furnished by Manuel Rojas Bolaños of FLACSO-Costa Rica.

Ecuador

1950–58 & 1966: *Latin American Political Statistics* (Los Angeles: UCLA Latin American Center, 1972); **1979**: Vje Koslav Darlic Mardesic, *Estadísticas electorales del Ecuador, 1978–87*; **1963 & 1984–90**: Nohlen, *Enciclopedia electoral*; **1992–94**: Tribunal Supremo Electoral, supplied by Andrés Mejía Acosta.

Mexico

1961–82: *Reforma política, gaceta informativa de la Comisión Federal Electoral*, vol. 9, *Acuerdos, indicadores de opinión pública y estadística electoral* (Mexico City: Comisión Federal Electoral, 1982); **1985**: *Latin America Regional Reports: Mexico and Central America*, 16 Aug. 1985, p. 4; **1988**: Federal Electoral Commission document, 1988, as reported in “Modernization, Economic Crisis, and Electoral Realignment” by Joseph Klesner; **1991**: Unlabeled PRI document supplied by Joseph Klesner; **1994**: Alonso Lujambio, “La evolución del sistema de partidos, 1988–1994” in Jorge Alcocer V., coord., *Elecciones, diálogo y reforma: México, 1994/II* (Mexico: Nuevo Horizonte, 1995), p. 66.

Peru

1931–62: Fernando Tuesta Soldevilla, *Perú político en cifras: Elite política y elecciones* (Lima: Fundación Friederich Ebert, 1987); **1963–90**: Nohlen, *Enciclopedia electoral*; **1992**: Tuesta Soldevilla, *Perú político en cifras: Elite política y elecciones*, 2d. ed. (Lima: Fundación Friederich Ebert, 1994); **1995**: *Elections Today* 5:2 (May 1995), p. 37.

Uruguay

1917–89: Nohlen, *Enciclopedia electoral*; **1994:** *Elections Today* 5 (May 1995): 38.

Venezuela

1946: John D. Martz, *Acción Democrática: Evolution of a Modern Political Party* (Princeton UP, 1966), p. 75); **1947–78:** Consejo Supremo Electoral, *La estadística evolutiva de los partidos políticos en Venezuela, 1958–1979*, 2d. ed. (Caracas: CSE, 1983); **1983:** Consejo Supremo Electoral, *Elecciones 1983* (Caracas: CSE, 1984); **1988:** Consejo Supremo Electoral, *Elecciones 1988* (Caracas: CSE, 1989); **1993:** Consejo Supremo Electoral, “Elecciones 1993,” mimeo.

References

- Alexander, Robert Jackson. 1957. *Communism in Latin America* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press).
- _____, ed. 1988. *Political Parties of the Americas: Canada, Latin America, and the West Indies*, 2 vols. (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press).
- Ameringer, Charles D., ed. 1992. *Political Parties of the Americas: 1980s to 1990s* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press).
- Caballero, Manuel. 1986. *Latin America and the Comintern 1919–1943* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Collier, Ruth Berins and David Collier. 1991. *Shaping the Political Arena* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).
- Conniff, Michael L., ed. 1982. *Latin American Populism in Comparative Perspective* (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press).
- Delury, George, ed. 1983. *World Encyclopedia of Political Systems and Parties* (New York: Facts on File).
- Diamond, Larry and Juan J. Linz. 1989. "Introduction: Politics, Society, and Democracy in Latin America." In Larry Diamond, Juan J. Linz, and Seymour Martin Lipset, eds., *Democracy in Developing Countries*, vol. 4, *Latin America* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner).
- DiTella, Torcuato. 1965. "Populism and Reform in Latin America." In Claudio Véliz, ed., *Obstacles to Change in Latin America* (London: Oxford University Press), 47–74.
- Dix, Robert H. 1989. "Cleavage Structures and Party Systems in Latin America." *Comparative Politics* (October): 23–37.
- Dominguez, Jorge I. and James A. McCann. 1996. *Democratizing Mexico : Public Opinion and Electoral Choices* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press).
- Drake, Paul and Eduardo Silva, eds. 1986. *Elections and Democratization in Latin America, 1980–85* (San Diego: Center for Iberian and Latin American Studies, UCSD).

- Duverger, Maurice. 1954. *Political Parties* (New York, NY: Methuen and Wiley).
- Gamarra, Eduardo A. and James M. Malloy. 1995. "The Patrimonial Dynamics of Party Politics in Bolivia." In Scott Mainwaring and Timothy R. Scully, eds., *Building Democratic Institutions: Party Systems in Latin America* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press).
- Gibson, Edward. 1996. *Class and Conservative Parties: Argentina in Comparative Perspective* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press).
- Gillespie, Charles. 1986. "Activists and Floating Voters: The Unheeded Lessons of Uruguay's 1982 Primaries." In Drake and Silva, eds., 215–44.
- González, Luis Eduardo. 1986. "Los partidos políticos y la redemocratización en Uruguay." *Cuadernos del CLAEH* 37: 1.

- Hilliker, Grant. 1971. *The Politics of Reform in Peru: The Aprista and Other Mass Parties of Latin America* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press).
- Huber, John and Ronald Inglehart. 1995. "Expert Interpretations of Party Space and Party Locations in 42 Societies." *Party Politics* 1 (January): 73–111.
- Kitschelt, Herbert. 1992. "The Formation of Party Systems in East Central Europe." *Politics and Society* 20 (March): 7–50.
- Lijphart, Arend. 1984. *Democracies* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press).
- Lipset, Seymour M. and Stein Rokkan. 1967. "Cleavage Structures, Party Systems, and Voter Alignments: An Introduction." In Lipset and Rokkan, *Party Systems and Voter Alignments: Cross-National Perspectives* (New York, NY: Free Press).
- Lynch, Edward A. 1993. *Latin America's Christian Democratic Parties: A Political Economy* (Westport, CT: Praeger).
- Mainwaring, Scott. Forthcoming. *The Party System and Democratization in Brazil* (Stanford: Stanford University Press).
- Mainwaring, Scott and Timothy R. Scully. 1995. "Introduction: Party Systems in Latin America." In Mainwaring and Scully, eds., *Building Democratic Institutions: Party Systems in Latin America* (Stanford, CT: Stanford University Press), 1–34.
- Martz, John D. 1964. "Dilemmas in the Study of Latin American Parties." *Journal of Politics* 26 (August).
- _____. 1996. *Acción Democrática: Evolution of a Modern Political Party* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).
- Martz, Mary Jeanne Reid. 1980. "Studying Latin American Political Parties: Dimensions Past and Present." *Journal of Latin American Studies* 12 (May): 139–67.
- McDonald, Ronald H. and J. Mark Ruhl. 1989. *Party Politics and Elections in Latin America* (Boulder, CO: Westview).
- Mettenheim, Kurt von. 1990. "The Brazilian Voter in the Democratic Transition, 1974–1982." *Comparative Politics* 23 (October): 23–44.

- Molinar Horcasitas, Juan. 1989. "The Future of the Electoral System." In W. Cornelius, J. Gentleman, and P. Smith, eds., *Mexico's Alternative Political Futures* (San Diego: Center for US-Mexican Studies, UCSD).
- Niekerk, A.E. van. 1974. *Populism and Political Development in Latin America* (Rotterdam: Universitaire Pers Rotterdam).
- Ostiguy, Pierre. 1997. "Peronism and Anti-Peronism: Social-Cultural Bases of Political Identity in Argentina." Paper prepared for delivery at the 1997 meeting of the Latin American Studies Association, Guadalajara, Mexico, 17–19 April.
- Rial, Juan. 1986. "The Uruguayan Elections of 1984: A Triumph of the Center." In Drake and Silva, eds.

- Sartori, Giovanni. 1966. "European Political Parties: The Case of Polarized Pluralism." In Joseph LaPalombara and Myron Weiner, eds., *Political Parties and Political Development* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).
- _____. 1970. "Concept Misinformation in Comparative Politics." *American Political Science Review* 64 (December): 1033–53.
- _____. 1976. *Parties and Party Systems: A Framework for Analysis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Taylor, Steven L. 1995. "Third Party Activity in Colombia." Paper prepared for delivery at the 1995 meeting of the Latin American Studies Association, Washington, DC, 28–30 September.
- Williams, Edward J. 1967. *Latin American Christian Democratic Parties* (Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press).

Argentina
Blocs in Lower-Chamber Elections as Percentage of Total Valid Vote

| Year | 1912 | 1914 | 1916 | 1918 | 1920 | 1922 | 1924 | 1926 | 1928 | 1930 | 1946 | 1948* | 1957* | 1958 | 1960 | 1962 | 1963 |
|----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|-------|------|------|
| XR | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| XCR | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| XC | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| XCL | | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.4 | 3.9 | 5.19 | 2.0 | 5.7 |
| XL | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SR | 41.60 | 22.79 | 17.08 | 20.18 | 18.75 | 12.79 | 12.39 | 10.22 | 8.28 | 14.24 | 8.81 | .02 | 7.5 | 3.5 | 11.36 | 4.9 | 2.9 |
| SCR | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | .08 | | |
| SC | 25.67 | 36.91 | 60.68 | 55.55 | 60.50 | 63.78 | 60.17 | 71.09 | 77.66 | 63.52 | 64.94 | 27.84 | 63.2 | 76.4 | 63.47 | 48.2 | 60.8 |
| SCL | | | | | .05 | | 14.84 | 11.32 | 4.70 | 15.87 | 1.25 | .07 | 8.1 | 6.3 | 9.30 | 5.1 | 3.4 |
| SL | 5.40 | 9.26 | 8.93 | 13.10 | 12.07 | 9.11 | 1.80 | .82 | .37 | .62 | 1.62 | 3.13 | | | .88 | 28.5 | 3.6 |
| P | | | | | | | 2.12 | 1.07 | | | | | | | | .2 | .3 |
| O | 2.58 | 8.22 | 2.16 | 1.18 | 1.20 | 1.98 | .32 | 2.06 | | 2.38 | 16.08 | 62.09 | | | 1.95 | 4.2 | 1.8 |
| U | 24.75 | 22.82 | 11.18 | 9.99 | 7.50 | 12.33 | 9.43 | 3.80 | 9.00 | 3.38 | 7.26 | 6.85 | 14.8 | 10.6 | 6.44 | 6.7 | 13.2 |
| adjust. | | | -.03 | | -.07 | +.01 | +1.07 | -.38 | -.01 | -.01 | +.04 | | | -.7 | +1.24 | +.2 | +8.3 |

*Constituent assembly elections.

Argentina
Blocs in Lower-Chamber Elections as Percentage of Total Valid Vote (cont.)

| Year | 1965 | 1973 | 1983 | 1985 | 1987 | 1989 | 1991 | 1993 | 1994* | 1995 |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| XR | | | | | | | | | | |
| XCR | | | | | | | | | | |
| XC | | | | | | | | | | |
| XCL | 2.73 | .03 | .94 | .44 | .09 | .01 | .25 | | .42 | .02 |
| XL | | .21 | | | | | | | | |
| SR | 5.14 | 1.13 | .46 | .73 | .65 | .02 | 4.18 | | 10.56 | 2.55 |
| SCR | 6.62 | 19.07 | 4.04 | 6.28 | 8.90 | 11.52 | 10.05 | 8.70 | 7.04 | 5.28 |
| SC | 38.57 | 20.66 | 48.02 | 43.23 | 37.24 | 29.31 | 29.12 | 30.39 | 19.79 | 22.08 |
| SCL | 2.50 | 1.87 | 3.86 | 7.59 | 3.57 | 2.52 | .81 | 3.73 | 15.65 | 21.47 |
| SL | 33.19 | 2.40 | 1.87 | .35 | 3.14 | 4.11 | 2.40 | | .94 | .64 |
| P | .37 | 2.15 | 1.35 | 1.67 | 1.78 | 1.44 | 2.12 | | .95 | 2.05 |
| O | 2.40 | 45.70 | 39.25 | 36.48 | 43.27 | 47.17 | 43.36 | 51.66 | 38.95 | 44.24 |
| U | 8.48 | 7.15 | .18 | 3.24 | 1.36 | 4.10 | 7.87 | 5.52 | 5.80 | 1.68 |
| adjust. | | -.37 | +.03 | -.01 | | -.20 | -.16 | | -.10 | -.01 |

*Constituent assembly elections.

Bolivia
Blocs in Lower-Chamber Elections as Percentage of Total Valid Vote

| Year | 1956 | 1958 | 1960 | 1962 | 1966 | 1979 | 1980 | 1985 | 1989 | 1993 |
|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| XR | | | | | | | | | | |
| XCR | | | | | | | | | | |
| XC | | | | | | | | | | |
| XCL | | .62 | | 1.84 | 13.67 | | | 1.60 | | |
| XL | | | | | | | | | | |
| SR | 14.01 | 12.37 | 22.62 | 11.37 | 1.12 | 14.89 | 21.24 | 34.16 | 25.98 | 1.27 |
| SCR | | | | | 14.75 | 35.88 | 22.02 | 30.36 | 25.65 | 56.60 |
| SC | | | | | | | | | | |
| SCL | 84.42 | 85.03 | 76.10 | 84.80 | | 35.98 | 38.74 | 15.66 | 21.83 | |
| SL | 1.57 | 1.95 | 1.28 | 1.99 | 3.31 | 5.95 | 11.22 | 10.23 | 11.51 | 6.34 |
| P | | | | | 67.14 | | | 4.80 | 12.25 | 29.34 |
| O | | | | | | 1.93 | 2.51 | 3.19 | 2.78 | .77 |
| U | | | | | | 5.37 | 4.26 | | | 5.68 |

Brazil
Blocs in Lower-Chamber Elections as Percentage of Total Valid Vote

| Year | 1945 | 1947* | 1950 | 1954 | 1958 | 1962 | 1966 | 1970 | 1974 | 1978 | 1982 | 1986** | 1986*** | 1990 | 1994 |
|---------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|---------|-------|-------|
| XR | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| XCR | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.06 | .93 | 3.28 | |
| XC | | | | | | | | | | | | .35 | .59 | .92 | 1.38 |
| XCL | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| XL | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SR | 6.47 | 1.5 | 10.6 | 14.5 | 13.7 | 3.5 | 63.98 | 69.46 | 52.00 | 50.42 | 43.22 | 32.01 | 28.62 | 27.15 | 26.07 |
| SCR | 71.0 | 69.5 | 53.1 | 44.81 | 53.5 | 59.84 | | | | | 4.45 | 4.03 | 5.96 | 6.17 | 10.49 |
| SC | | | 6.02 | 13.0 | 3.85 | 9.41 | 36.02 | 30.54 | 48.00 | 49.58 | 42.96 | 50.54 | 43.66 | 20.41 | 19.58 |
| SCL | 10.2 | 13.8 | 18.4 | 17.2 | 24.4 | 26.1 | | | | | 5.82 | 5.18 | 6.99 | 19.03 | 25.52 |
| SL | 8.6 | 1.9 | 1.5 | .7 | | | | | | | 3.55 | 6.72 | 10.96 | 12.93 | 14.58 |
| P | | 13.2 | 7.3 | 9.3 | 2.5 | 1.0 | | | | | | | | 9.51 | 1.38 |
| O | | | | .06 | | | | | | | | | | | .13 |
| U | 3.67 | .1 | .15 | | .3 | | | | | | | .12 | 2.14 | .55 | .88 |
| adjust. | .06 | | 2.93 | .43 | 1.75 | .15 | | | | | | -.01 | .15 | .05 | -.01 |

* partial election.

** complete but inaccurate—see source information.

*** accurate but incomplete—see source information.

Chile

Blocs in Lower-Chamber Elections as Percentage of Total Valid Vote

| Year | 1915 | 1918 | 1921 | 1925 | 1932 | 1937 | 1941 | 1945 | 1949 | 1953 | 1957 | 1961 | 1965 | 1969 | 1973 | 1989 | 1993 |
|----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| XR | 21.47 | 19.31 | 19.19 | 19.83 | 16.84 | 21.31 | 16.88 | 23.62 | 22.72 | 17.13 | 18.66 | 14.80 | 5.34 | | | | |
| XCR | | | | | | | | | .43 | | | | | | | | |
| XC | | | | | | | 3.40 | 2.57 | 3.92 | 2.87 | 9.42 | 15.93 | 43.60 | 31.05 | 28.79 | 25.99 | 27.12 |
| XCL | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| XL | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.14 | | |
| SR | 15.59 | 19.77 | 21.10 | 32.42 | 18.01 | 28.93 | 15.49 | 20.98 | 17.98 | 11.93 | 15.34 | 16.60 | 7.53 | 20.82 | 21.31 | 36.53 | 33.37 |
| SCR | | | | | | 4.86 | 1.40 | 2.76 | 6.81 | 1.48 | 6.21 | .06 | 1.93 | | 2.86 | .69 | |
| SC | 21.13 | 24.74 | 30.58 | 21.39 | | | | | | | | 22.15 | 13.71 | | .40 | 1.77 | .23 |
| SCL | 25.22 | 21.17 | 22.57 | 22.41 | 26.37 | 18.66 | 21.49 | 19.99 | 22.65 | 15.58 | 22.11 | | | 13.59 | 1.79 | 24.66 | 28.08 |
| SL | .34 | .30 | 1.06 | | 19.92 | 19.86 | 38.60 | 27.78 | 13.79 | 14.10 | 11.06 | 29.99 | 26.83 | 34.44 | 42.79 | 6.07 | 7.88 |
| P | 6.51 | 2.69 | 1.06 | 3.94 | 10.09 | 4.13 | .23 | | 10.60 | 30.60 | 12.28 | | | | .82 | 1.88 | 3.29 |
| O | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | .22 | .03 |
| U | 9.75 | 12.02 | 4.43 | | 8.77 | 2.24 | 2.51 | 2.30 | 1.10 | 6.30 | 4.91 | .47 | 1.05 | .09 | | 2.18 | |
| adjust. | -.01 | | .01 | .01 | | .01 | | | | .01 | .01 | | .01 | .01 | .10 | .01 | |

Colombia
Blocs in Lower-Chamber Elections as Percentage of Total Valid Vote

| Year | 1931 | 1933 | 1939 | 1941 | 1943 | 1945 | 1947 | 1949 | 1958 | 1960 | 1962 | 1964 | 1966 | 1968 | 1970 | 1974 | 1978 |
|----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| XR | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| XCR | 48.90 | 37.36 | 35.11 | 35.71 | 33.84 | 33.60 | 44.41 | 46.05 | 42.19 | 41.74 | 45.42 | 48.61 | 44.33 | 46.62 | 48.71 | 32.07 | 39.45 |
| XC | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| XCL | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| XL | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SR | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SCR | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SC | 51.07 | 62.44 | 64.41 | 63.83 | 64.39 | 62.95 | 54.71 | 53.52 | 57.81 | 58.26 | 54.58 | 51.39 | 55.67 | 53.38 | 51.29 | 55.71 | 55.20 |
| SCL | | | | | | | | .09 | | | | | | | | | |
| SL | | | | | | 3.16 | .78 | .39 | | | | | | | | 3.06 | 4.28 |
| P | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| O | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| U | .03 | .20 | .49 | .46 | 1.78 | .29 | | | | | | | | | | | 1.08 |
| adjust. | | | -.01 | | -.01 | | .01 | .04 | | | | | | | | .15 | -.01 |

Colombia

Blocs in Lower-Chamber Elections as Percentage of Total Valid Vote (cont.)

| Year | 1982 | 1986 | 1990a | 1990b* | 1991 | 1994 |
|----------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|
| XR | | | | | | |
| XCR | | | | | | 2.55 |
| XC | | | | | | |
| XCL | | | | 3.16 | 1.76 | 2.51 |
| XL | | | | | | |
| SR | | | | | | |
| SCR | 40.35 | 37.15 | 33.28 | 27.36 | 28.03 | 29.40 |
| SC | 56.36 | 47.80 | 59.20 | 29.33 | 51.17 | 51.42 |
| SCL | | 6.62 | | 1.76 | 1.44 | 1.82 |
| SL | 1.88 | 1.99 | .35 | 29.96 | 12.43 | 3.79 |
| P | | | .31 | .55 | .50 | 1.04 |
| O | | | | 2.16 | 1.82 | 3.25 |
| U | 1.40 | 6.44 | 6.86 | 5.70 | 3.22 | 3.86 |
| adjust. | .01 | | | .02 | | -.01] |

*Constituent assembly election.

Costa Rica
Blocs in Lower-Chamber Elections as Percentage of Total Valid Vote

| Year | 1948* | 1949* | 1953 | 1958 | 1962 | 1966 | 1970 | 1974 | 1978 | 1982 | 1986 | 1990 | 1994 |
|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| XR | | | | | | | | | | | 1.7 | 1.66 | 1.43 |
| XCR | | | | | | | | | | | 41.45 | 46.21 | 40.38 |
| XC | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| XCL | | | | | | | 2.54 | 2.06 | | | | | |
| XL | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SR | 87.03 | 87.43 | 28.04 | 21.37 | 13.27 | | 1.15 | | | 3.6 | | | |
| SCR | | | | | | 43.16 | 35.89 | 24.71 | 46.56 | 29.08 | | | |
| SC | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SCL | 7.64 | 6.64 | 64.75 | 41.68 | 48.85 | 48.93 | 53.81 | 40.88 | 38.86 | 55.15 | 47.83 | 41.88 | 44.61 |
| SL | | | | .3 | 2.46 | | 6.11 | 5.99 | 9.71 | 6.53 | 5.14 | 3.95 | 6.68 |
| P | 1.89 | 2.48 | 7.21 | 35.97 | 33.84 | 7.54 | | 25.14 | 2.89 | .84 | 1.54 | 3.64 | 3.21 |
| O | | 3.46 | | | .69 | .37 | .49 | 1.21 | 1.53 | 2.75 | 2.17 | 2.32 | 3.38 |
| U | 3.43 | | | .69 | .89 | | | | .43 | 2.1 | .18 | .36 | .32 |
| adjust. | .01 | -.01 | | -.01 | | | .01 | .01 | .02 | -.05 | -.01 | -.02 | -.01 |

*Disputed returns.

Ecuador

Blocs in Lower-Chamber Elections as Percentage of Total Valid Vote

| Year | 1947 | 1950 | 1954 | 1958 | 1962 | 1966 | 1979 | 1984 | 1986 | 1988 | 1990 | 1992 | 1994 |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| XR | 31.45 | 27.47 | 23.22 | 32.55 | 22.90 | 34.24 | 7.85 | 2.80 | 1.39 | 2.00 | 4.24 | 8.46 | 5.61 |
| XCR | | | | | 23.20 | | | | | | | | |
| XC | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| XCL | | | | | | | | 6.42 | 9.37 | 10.87 | 10.05 | 7.22 | 8.23 |
| XL | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SR | 46.45 | 11.41 | 14.77 | | 16.40 | 20.51 | 16.58 | 21.57 | 21.07 | 15.14 | 27.76 | 39.83 | 32.26 |
| SCR | | | | | | | 6.27 | 9.25 | 6.21 | 4.49 | 4.19 | 3.50 | 4.70 |
| SC | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SCL | | | | | | | 18.42 | 28.60 | 14.48 | 25.11 | 14.03 | 9.13 | 9.96 |
| SL | | | 8.00 | 22.46 | .21 | | 9.77 | 12.04 | 17.76 | 12.53 | 17.75 | 10.93 | 13.30 |
| P | | 50.99 | 42.23 | 37.63 | 25.40 | 24.31 | 41.10 | 16.87 | 22.76 | 28.69 | 21.12 | 20.40 | 25.01 |
| O | | | | | 2.99 | | | | | | | | |
| U | 22.10 | 10.13 | 11.79 | 7.37 | 8.55 | 14.00 | | 2.45 | 2.30 | 1.16 | .88 | .46 | .93 |
| adjust. | | | -.01 | -.01 | .35 | 6.94 | .01 | | 4.66 | .01 | -.02 | .07 | |

Mexico
Blocs in Lower-Chamber Elections as Percentage of Total Valid Vote

| Year | 1961 | 1964 | 1967 | 1970 | 1973 | 1976 | 1979 | 1982 | 1985 | 1988 | 1991 | 1994 |
|-----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|
| XR | .28 | | | | | | 2.20 | 2.29 | 2.9 | 1.25 | 1.09 | .44 |
| XCR | 7.64 | 11.53 | 11.29 | 14.21 | 16.37 | 8.99 | 11.47 | 17.54 | 16.5 | 17.96 | 17.73 | 25.74 |
| XC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| XCL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| XL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SR | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SCR | 91.31 | 87.09 | 86.18 | .84 | 2.02 | 2.67 | 1.93 | 70.65 | 69.2 | 66.63 | 67.99 | 52.16 |
| SC | | | | | | 85.17 | 74.13 | | | | | |
| SCL | | | | 83.53 | 77.59 | | 2.26 | 1.79 | 4.5 | | 9.41 | 19.57 |
| SL | .96 | 1.37 | 2.53 | 1.42 | 4.02 | 3.17 | 8.03 | 7.55 | 7.0 | 14.17 | 2.38 | .69 |
| P | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| O | | | | | | | | | | | 1.46 | 1.40 |
| U | | | | | | | .19 | | | | | |
| adjust.* | -.19 | -.03 | | | | | -.02 | -.01 | -.10 | -.01 | -.06 | |

*Where U=0, the adjustments in this row will be applied to the PRI vote.

Peru
Blocs in Lower-Chamber Elections as Percentage of Total Valid Vote

| Year | 1931* | 1945* | 1962* | 1963* | 1978** | 1980 | 1985 | 1990 | 1992** | 1995 |
|----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|
| XR | 6.55 | | | | | | | | | |
| XCR | | | | | 23.78 | 9.20 | 11.16 | | 16.84 | 6.06 |
| XC | | | | | | | | | | |
| XCL | | | 2.88 | | 2.37 | | | | | |
| XL | | | | | | | | | | |
| SR | 7.32 | | 28.44 | 25.52 | | | | | | |
| SCR | 50.75 | 33.03 | | | | 39.64 | 7.73 | 29.88 | 12.33 | 12.38 |
| SC | | | | | | | | | 2.04 | |
| SCL | 35.38 | 66.97 | 65.11 | 73.41 | 39.20 | 29.42 | 52.33 | 24.82 | 3.84 | 7.60 |
| SL | | | 3.57 | | 30.58 | 18.90 | 25.38 | 5.27 | 5.48 | 1.92 |
| P | | | | 1.06 | 4.06 | 2.83 | 2.64 | 40.03 | 49.23 | 68.08 |
| O | | | | | | | | | 2.74 | |
| U | | | | | | | | | 1.71 | 3.98 |
| adjust. | | | .01 | .01 | .01 | .01 | .76 | | 5.79 | -.02 |

* Presidential vote.

** Constituent assembly elections.

Uruguay
Blocs in Lower-Chamber Elections as Percentage of Total Valid Vote

| Year | 1917 | 1919 | 1922 | 1925 | 1928 | 1931 | 1934 | 1938 | 1942 | 1946 | 1950 | 1954 | 1958 | 1962 | 1966 | 1971 | 1984 | 1989 | 1994 |
|----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| XR | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| XCR | | 1.13 | 1.13 | 1.10 | .92 | 2.40 | 2.76 | 3.94 | 4.24 | 5.24 | 4.36 | 5.03 | 3.74 | | | | | 2.45 | |
| XC | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | .34 | .53 | | | |
| XCL | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.05 | 3.02 | | | | |
| XL | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SR | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SCR | 22.70 | 44.34 | 47.12 | 46.86 | 48.55 | 44.33 | 37.29 | 32.58 | 34.61 | 40.44 | 30.76 | 35.24 | 49.68 | 46.54 | 40.34 | 40.19 | 35.02 | 38.87 | 31.44 |
| SC | | | | | | | | | | | 7.57 | 3.68 | | | | 40.96 | 41.22 | 30.29 | 32.57 |
| SCL | 76.52 | 51.87 | 50.05 | 49.59 | 48.18 | 49.12 | 56.13 | 58.38 | 57.08 | 47.09 | 52.91 | 50.55 | 37.70 | 44.51 | 49.33 | | | 9.01 | 5.20 |
| SL | .55 | 2.30 | 1.69 | 2.44 | 2.29 | 3.84 | 3.81 | 5.03 | 4.06 | 7.23 | 4.40 | 5.48 | 6.22 | 5.80 | 6.81 | 18.28 | 21.26 | 21.23 | 30.79 |
| P | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| O | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | .55 |
| U | .23 | .35 | | | .06 | .31 | .01 | .01 | | | | .02 | 2.66 | .10 | .15 | .03 | .05 | .05 | |
| adjust. | | .01 | .01 | .01 | | | | .06 | .01 | | | | | | .01 | .01 | | | |

Venezuela
Blocs in Lower-Chamber Elections as Percentage of Total Valid Vote

| Year | 1946* | 1947 | 1958 | 1963 | 1968 | 1973 | 1978 | 1983 | 1988 | 1993 |
|----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|-------|
| XR | 13.28 | 20.29 | | | | | | | | |
| XCR | | | 15.20 | 20.77 | 24.03 | 30.24 | 39.82 | 28.68 | 32.4 | 23.49 |
| XC | | | | | | | | | | |
| XCL | | | | | | | | | | |
| XL | | | | | .02 | | | | | |
| SR | | | | .55 | .67 | .28 | .21 | | .1 | .02 |
| SCR | | .10 | 1.18 | 14.17 | 3.64 | 1.26 | .80 | .16 | 3.3 | .49 |
| SC | | | | | .91 | | | | | .05 |
| SCL | 82.67 | 75.17 | 76.78 | 63.66 | 55.86 | 53.83 | 42.43 | 52.4 | 46.7 | 55.42 |
| SL | 3.64 | 4.23 | 6.83 | | 2.82 | 7.49 | 11.17 | 11.25 | 11.8 | .54 |
| P | | | | .35 | 11.19 | 4.54 | 5.12 | 5.90 | 4.5 | 15.82 |
| O | | | | | | | | | | |
| U | .40 | .18 | | .66 | 1.05 | 1.48 | .45 | 1.65 | 1.2 | 6.89 |
| adjust. | .01 | .03 | .01 | -.16 | -.19 | .88 | | -.04 | | -2.72 |

*Constituent assembly election.