



The Prohibition Party backed women's suffrage. Above, Elsie Hill, representing the Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage Woman's Party, addresses a crowd in St. Paul, Minnesota during a July 1916 party convention.

500,000 votes) ever for any Prohibitionist candidate. After the ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment, the party was among the first to run women for the U.S. Senate. In 1920 and 1922, in multiparty contests, Prohibitionist women (Ella Boole, Leah Cobb Marion, and Rachel Robinson) won over five percent of the statewide vote in New York and Pennsylvania.

After the 1920s, the party rapidly declined. In recent years, the Prohibition Party has been more a one-person hobby than a viable party. Since 1976, Earl Dodge of Colorado, a political button vendor, has been on the party's national ticket eight consecutive times, twice as the vicepresidential nominee (1976–80) and six times as the presidential nominee (1984–2004). In 2000 and 2004, Dodge received a mere 208 and 140 votes, respectively.

SEE ALSO: Nineteenth Amendment; Religious Issues in Campaigns; Republican Party; Third Parties.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. John Kobler, *Ardent Spirits: The Rise and Fall of Prohibition* (G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1973); R.C. Storms, *Partisan Prophets: A History of the Prohibition Party* (National Prohibition Foundation, 1972).

D. JASON BERGGREN
FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY

Proportional Representation

IN A PROPORTIONAL representation system, the goal is to translate as closely as possible each party's share of votes into a share of seats in the legislature. Proportional representation facilitates the existence of multiparty systems and coalition governments. While proponents point out that this ensures a better

representation of minorities and greater consideration of a wider range of policies in the government, critics claim that it encourages fragmentation, indecision, instability, and possibly opens the door to extremist parties. Proportional representation emerged in continental Western Europe at the end of 19th century. It was first used in some Swiss cantons in the 1890s, and Belgium was the first country to use it for national elections in 1900. Currently, all countries in the European Union, with the exception of France and Britain, use some form of proportional representation. The system is also widely used in Latin America. In the United States, proportional representation has been used in many cities (for example, on city councils and school boards). It is also used for apportioning seats to states in the House of Representatives.

THE SYSTEM

The party list vote is the most widely used form of proportional representation, and the most frequently used electoral system in the world, currently employed in about 70 countries. Each party presents a list of candidates, and the voter chooses from among these lists. The total vote for each party determines the number of its candidates who get elected. For example, in a 100-member legislature, a party receiving 10 percent of the vote will be entitled to 10 seats. In a closed party list system, these individuals will be the top 10 candidates on the list (the order on the list is decided by the party leaders). In an open party list system, voters can express their preference for a specific candidate, but these votes will first be added up to give a total party vote. This total will determine how many seats a party will get; for example, the 10 individuals who are elected are the top 10 vote getters.

By definition, proportional representation requires multi-member electoral districts, and the number of representatives elected in a district is referred to as district magnitude. This number ranges from Chile's two-member districts to Ukraine's nationwide, 450-member district. In the latter case, the whole country is treated as a unique district for the purpose of electing the members of its legislature. Most countries want to retain some degree of local representation, thus the country is divided into a set of multi-member districts, and seats are allocated within each district. There is a tradeoff between proportionality, on the one hand, and the closeness of the relationship between representa-

tives and constituents on the other. In a case such as Chile, with only two members elected within each district, the relationship is much closer than in Ukraine, and resembles the constituents-representative link in a single-member district system as in the United States. However, this comes at a heavy price for proportionality: a party must win at least one-third of the total vote to be guaranteed a seat. Thus, smaller parties are essentially excluded from competition in such a system.

District magnitude is essential for the proportionality of the system. The lower the magnitude, the more disproportional the system. Another way to limit the proportionality and, consequently, to ensure that the legislature does not become too fragmented is to raise the legal threshold, the minimum percentage of votes required by law to gain representation. In practice, this legal threshold varies from the Netherlands' 0.67 percent to Turkey's 10 percent.

The Netherlands combines this low threshold with a single, nationwide district (the district magnitude equals the size of the legislature, 150 members), and creating an almost perfect match between votes and seats, or real proportional representation. This leads to the representation of a wide array of parties and an extremely fragmented legislative body. For instance, after the Netherlands' 1994 parliamentary elections, 12 parties gained representation, including two parties representing pensioners. The result is that no party ever gains a majority, and the government is always a broad coalition of parties. Such governments tend to be short-lived: The Netherlands has had 28 changes of government since 1945. Other democratic regimes using proportional representation provide even more extreme examples of governmental instability. One such example is the French Fourth Republic, which had 21 prime ministers in less than 12 years (1947–58).

Even a moderate threshold can lead to a significant decrease in the number of parties. Between 1961 and 1980, Germany's five percent threshold kept down the number of parties represented in the federal parliament to just three. An even higher threshold, such as Turkey's 10 percent, can lead to a substantial number of wasted votes (that is, votes cast for parties that do not cross the threshold). In Turkey's 2002 parliamentary election, only two parties gained representation, and 46 percent of the votes were wasted. This illustrates the inherent tension that exists in proportional representation systems. If the system is too proportional, it can lead to

fragmentation and instability. If the system is made less proportional, either through low district magnitude or through a high threshold, it starts resembling a winner-take-all system, and by doing so defeats the very purpose of proportional representation.

SEE ALSO: Multiparty System; Plurality Vote; Winner-Take-All System.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. D.J. Amy, *Real Choices/New Voices: The Case for Proportional Representation Elections in the United States* (Columbia University Press, 2001); Vernon Bogdanor, *What Is Proportional Representation?* (Blackwell, 1984).

FLORIN FESNIC
UNIVERSITY OF BUCHARES

Protectionism

PROTECTIONISM FORMS PART of an American political legacy inherited from the colonial era as part of Great Britain's mercantilist traditions. Independence did not change the need to protect America's infant industries. Hence, protectionism formed a critical part of Secretary of the Treasury Alexander Hamilton's approach to the economy as reflected in his *Report on Manufacturers* (1791). The method employed to deliver this protection from foreign competition was a system of import charges or duties.

Protectionism also offered the federal government a way to raise revenue, which was the clear purpose behind the first tariff in 1789. The tariff would remain the principal source of government revenue until World War I and the onset of income tax. Other early tariffs, such as the 1816 Tariff, were clearly protectionist. This tariff charged a 25 percent rate on imported textiles, and even more on certain manufactured goods. The 1824 Tariff expanded these rates to include a wider range of imported goods such as wool, iron, lead, and glass.

The height of this early protectionist drive came in the Tariff of 1828, also known by its opponents as the Tariff of Abominations, which increased rates to almost 50 percent. Although beneficial to the emerging economic interests of New England manufacturers, it was seen in other areas as a penalty on their economies. This was

particularly the case in South Carolina. Enforcement hurt cotton exports and made the cost of manufactured imports astronomical. Southern criticism of the tariff became a campaign issue that benefited Andrew Jackson's faction in what would soon become a separate Democratic Party.

Jackson exploited this unpopularity in his 1828 campaign against President John Quincy Adams, who had signed the tariff bill. Although Jackson benefited from this opposition, and by 1832 had overseen tariff reductions, the tariff still created bitter feelings in the south, a situation that was exploited by South Carolina's Senator John C. Calhoun. Calhoun elevated the disagreement to the point that it is remembered as the Nullification Crisis. South Carolina threatened secession from the union if tariff reduction did not occur. The tariff had emerged by mid-century as a key political divide. The Whigs were committed to protective tariffs, while the Democratic Party opposed high tariff legislation.

Whig control of Congress allowed the tariff to be increased in 1842. With the Democrats in a majority and James K. Polk in the presidency, the tariff was lowered in 1846. Duties were further lowered in 1857, under Democratic President James Buchanan to a 20 percent average. The Civil War transformed America and saw the rise of Republican dominance of both the presidency and Congress with the withdrawal of southern Democratic opposition. Republican support of high tariff policies that favored domestic manufacturing over agriculture became a political mainstay of the party.

The period after the Civil War became an era of protectionist Republican tariffs. This shaped national debate on the issue, and Republican practice until 1913. Rates generally remained high, but a number of exemptions were included in the legislation. American industrial strength had expanded during these years and did not seem in need of so much protection, nevertheless, high tariff policy was embraced in exchange for native business support.

In the latter decades of the 19th century, such increased protectionism was opposed in the campaigns of Grover Cleveland, who fell on the free trade side of the Democratic Party. However, Cleveland was defeated by Benjamin Harrison and the Republicans, who built protectionism into the McKinley Tariff of 1890. Republican platforms maintained support for the protective tariff into the 20th century, as seen in the