

## Introduction

### Why study political parties abroad? Diasporas as new arenas for party politics

*Tudi Kernalegenn and Émilie van Haute*

Much of the literature on party politics is situated in the context of national states (Deschouwer 2006; Haegel 2007). However, due to developing processes of decentralization and of continental integration, political parties have also been increasingly studied at infra-state (Detterbeck and Hepburn 2010) and supra-state (Delwit, Külahci, and Van de Walle 2004; Gagatek and Van Hecke 2014; Timuş and Lightfoot 2014) levels. Accordingly, the multi-level study of political parties has slowly but surely developed in the last few years (Detterbeck 2012). However, one ‘territorial’ dimension of the study of political parties has been mostly overlooked and is clearly undertheorized: that of political parties abroad, active outside the territorial borders of the state to which they refer.

The history of political parties abroad is probably as old as that of political parties, and they can take many forms. Already at the end of the 19th century, Russian revolutionary parties had active cells in Paris, Geneva and London (Hartnett 2019). In Asia as well, Sun Yat-sen founded Xingzhonghui, ancestor of the Kuomintang, in 1894 in Honolulu, and initially developed the Chinese republican movement from abroad (Yung-Ching 1989). In another context, many of the anti-colonialist political organizations originally emerged in the European metropolis and were active abroad until independence (Anderson 1992). After a civil war or a conquest, it is a common trend for political parties to settle or develop abroad, such as the Spanish or Polish political parties after 1939 (Alted Vigil and Domergue 2003; Jaroszyńska-Kirchmann 2004).

In recent decades, globalization and transnationalization have raised questions about the civil and political rights of non-nationals on the national territory, and of nationals outside the national territory. On this last aspect, emigrants<sup>1</sup> have increasingly obtained civil and political rights in their country of origin: not only voting rights but also specific representative institutions and sometimes direct representation in the national parliament (Collyer and Vathi 2007; Ellis, Navarro, Morales, and Wall 2007; Rhodes and Harutyunyan 2010). Between 1989 and 2019, the number of countries granting voting rights to nonresident citizens increased from 31 to 149, more than half of them implementing such reforms after 2000.<sup>2</sup> Almost all democracies have now some form of voting from abroad.<sup>3</sup> Since the beginning of the 21st century, 15 countries (including five Member States of the European Union) have even granted their emigrants the right to directly elect members of

2 *Tudi Kernalegenn and Émilie van Haute*

parliament in one or more constituencies located outside the territorial boundaries of the state (Collyer 2014b; Palop-García 2018). These transformations concern millions of citizens: an estimated 3% of the world population – 215 million – live outside their country of birth (Meseguer and Burgess 2014). We maintain that these reforms have created a new arena for party politics.

Indeed, these reforms have important political consequences. From a normative perspective, they question ‘the traditional understanding of democratic citizenship in the nation-state’ (López-Guerra 2005: 216). The rise of political parties as institutions is intimately linked to the question of citizenship. For Weber (2003 [1917–1919]), the development of universal suffrage led to the rise of political parties. In order to address a population with citizen rights and the possibility of directly appointing its representatives, political parties were destined to replace notables. In fact, as Schattschneider (2009 [1942]) puts it, it is difficult to imagine representative democracy without political parties, which he considers as consubstantial to but also a prerequisite for modern democracy. At various times throughout their history, parties have initiated or adapted to the enlargements and transformations of the citizen and electoral bodies (Dalton, Farrell, and McAllister 2011). Rhodes and Harutyunyan (2010) compare the extension of civic and citizen rights of emigrants to that of other ‘previously excluded’ groups, such as the poor, racial minorities and women. The characteristics of these new beneficiaries of rights are not only social but also territorial, which upsets the classical understanding of territorial democracy (Østergaard-Nielsen and Ciornei 2019a). But these reforms also have important political and electoral outcomes. Emigrant voters can even influence the outcome of elections, as it was the case in Romania in 2009 (Burean 2011) or in Italy in 2006 (Laguerre 2013). This extension of the democratic sphere of established nation-states and its political and electoral consequences constitute opportunities and challenges for political parties. They face the choice of engaging or not in this new arena.

Given their normative and political significance, these reforms have been at the heart of a body of literature that has increasingly developed since the 1990s (Collyer 2013; Lafleur 2013). However, the literature has developed in two separate fields that have surprisingly so far devoted little attention to their implications for party politics.

The first field, rooted in the study of emigration and citizenship (Collyer 2013; Lafleur 2013; Laguerre 2013), addresses the issue from the individual point of view and focusses on the social and political rights related to it. While it has tackled the issue of distant voting by migrants (Bauböck 2007; Lafleur 2013), it tends to ignore the partisan dimension of this process. Although this literature regularly mentions the presence of political parties among emigrants, it usually integrates them into the wider landscape of community organizations without focussing specifically on them, with a few exceptions (Dark III 2003; Østergaard-Nielsen and Ciornei 2019b; Paarlberg 2019).

The second field, that of multi-level parties and electoral politics, heavily focusses on the national level. Despite a turning point denouncing the dominant methodological nationalism and the development of a literature focussing on

political parties in multi-level contexts (Detterbeck 2012), it tends to ignore the extraterritorial dimension of party politics. Electoral studies have investigated the voting behaviour of migrants in their host country (Bird, Saalfeld, and Wüst 2010) but have paid little attention to voting behaviour of migrants in their country of origin.

The purpose of this volume is to connect these literatures and to put parties abroad at the centre of the focus. Adopting a comparative perspective, the goal is to lay the first bases of a shared knowledge on the issue. We analyze the multidimensionality of political parties abroad by tackling the following questions: (1) what parties abroad are, (2) when and why do they emerge and develop, (3) how they organize and (4) what roles do they play? In doing so, we investigate emigrant politics as a new arena for party politics. By political parties abroad we mean committees, branches and federations established by national or regional parties outside their territory but also new political parties that only or mostly compete outside the national territory to defend the interests of migrants. By emigrant politics we mean a specific political sphere characterized by its territorial boundaries outside the national territory, its own rules and actors.

### **Transnationalism studies and the political engagement of emigrants**

With some exceptions, it is only recently that nation states have begun to take an interest in their emigrants. The idea of giving them social and political rights is even more recent (Burgess 2014), although it is in the process of being generalized (Gamlen 2008; Turcu and Urbatsch 2015). Not long ago, the disinterest and even hostility of states towards their emigrants was still the norm (Bauböck 2003; Østergaard-Nielsen 2003a). This is no longer the case, and an increasing number of states grant social and political rights to their nationals living abroad. This points to a global change of standards that partly splits the connection between citizenship and residence on the territory of the state (Barry 2006).

This interest of the state in their emigrants has taken five directions that create new arenas for political action for emigrants (Levitt and De la Dehesa 2003): (1) bureaucratic reforms to strengthen the state's presence among emigrants (in the form of consulates or ministerial policies, for example); (2) investment policies aimed at encouraging the economic engagement of emigrants in their country of origin; (3) the extension of political rights, such as remote voting or dual nationality; (4) the extension of state social services to emigrants (social protection, legal advice, etc.); and (5) identity and symbolic politics, such as festivals celebrating emigration or cultural policies for emigrants. Many of the policies that were until recently reserved for residents, are being extended to nonresidents, whether in terms of citizenship or even welfare (Østergaard-Nielsen 2003b). This serves the interests of the emigrants but also gives a presence to the 'absent' in the national imagination and in the decision-making processes (Collyer 2014b; Østergaard-Nielsen and Ciornei 2019a).

4 *Tudi Kernalegenn and Émilie van Haute*

As a consequence of this trend, since the 1990s a growing number of researchers have been studying emigration, that is to say the links between emigrants and their country of origin, as part of a growing literature on transnationalism (Bauböck 2003; Collyer 2013; Ragazzi 2009). The literature on transnationalism stresses how, through these reforms, nation-states are progressively structured and ‘territorialized’ in their relations with emigrants (Boccagni 2014; Kastoryano 2006). In return, the literature shows how these reforms enable the emigrants to be a politically active citizens in their host country and their country of origin (Bauböck 2003; Collyer 2013). There is thus a double dynamic at play, where emigration is constructed as a political space from above by the nation-states, and from below by emigrants who co-construct and appropriate (or not) this new political space. In that view, transnationalism is a continuum where emigrants engage in a multiplicity of forms and intensities of commitments or links (Lafleur 2013; Waldinger 2013), that can be oriented towards the country of origin (and thus have a transnational orientation), towards the country of residence (and therefore have an assimilationist orientation) or even towards other migrants (and thus be decentralized and have a diasporic orientation) (Landolt 2008: 54). In emphasizing this double dynamic, this literature questions the previous assimilationist perspective according to which the emigrants gradually integrated into their host country, cutting ties with their country of origin. Researchers emphasize that emigrants are not rootless individuals enrolled in a process of integration into their host country, but a person divided between a homeland and a host country, able to invest or project socially, politically and cognitively in two countries, creating a transnational space in the process (Portes, Guarnizo, and Landolt 1999; Waldinger 2013).

This corresponds to a ‘transnational turn’ in migration studies that started in the 1990s before becoming mainstream in the last decade (Bauböck and Faist 2010; Dufoix, Guerassimoff, and Tinguy 2010; Lafleur 2013; Maas 2013). It has pushed the research on the political involvement of emigrants into several directions.

The first one, called ‘diaspora politics’ (Østergaard-Nielsen 2003a), focusses on the ‘hot’ activism of diasporas and exiled minorities in conflict with a state of origin, such as the Kurds (Østergaard-Nielsen 2003a), the Tamils (Fair 2005; Fuglerud 1999), the Tibetans (Misra 2003), the Palestinians (Hanafi 2003), or the anti-Castro Cubans (Pedraza 2007). These studies look into how organized minorities continue abroad a political struggle that is rooted at home (Cochrane 2015).

Another research trend, ‘emigrant politics’ (Østergaard-Nielsen 2003a), focusses on the political activities of economic migrants from countries of emigration to countries of high immigration, such as Turks in Germany (Argun 2017; Østergaard-Nielsen 2003a), North Africans in France (Collyer 2006; Lacroix 2005) or Mexicans in the United States (Délano 2011; Roberts, Frank, and Lozano-Ascencio 1999). These studies investigate the migrants’ reactions to their marginalization or the terms of their integration. They emphasize the crucial political role of economic, social and political remittances, i.e., transfers of goods, projects but also norms and ideas, from the host country into the country of origin (Lacroix, Levitt, and Vari-Lavoisier 2016). They also highlight their political activity in their host and home countries (Boccagni and Ramírez 2013; Collyer 2013).

A third and rapidly developing line of research analyzes ‘external citizenship’ (Barabantseva and Sutherland 2011; Barry 2006; Brand 2006; Fox 2005; Laguerre 1999; Rhodes and Harutyunyan 2010). It focusses more specifically on the issue of long-distance voting, whether from a normative perspective (Bauböck 2007, 2009; López-Guerra 2005) or through the lens of political sociology (Collyer 2014a; Hartmann 2015; Lafleur 2013). Some studies have shown that electoral participation can be considered as an expression of belonging and symbolic attachment to the nation more than a sign of deep political involvement in the country of origin (Boccagni 2011; Itzigsohn 2012). In that view, it would be less about influencing the outcome of an election than about expressing one’s loyalty to the state of origin. Other studies, however, have pointed out that emigrant voters also express their own specific interests (Bauböck 2009), especially when the emigrant vote is visible, counted separately and even more so when it contributes to the direct election of specific representatives (Collyer 2014b).

More recently, the literature has investigated the drivers of political engagement of emigrants in their host or home countries (Ahmadov and Sasse 2016; Burgess 2014; Collyer 2014b; Lafleur 2013). Following the traditional theories on political participation (Van Haute 2009), these studies have looked at micro-level and macro-level factors. At the individual level, they have looked at the role of resources and motivations to explain the political engagement of emigrants. When it comes to resources, studies have mainly focussed on classic sociodemographic characteristics such as age or gender (Burgess 2014; Guarnizo, Portes, and Haller 2003; Jones-Correa 1998), education, occupation or socioeconomic status (Guarnizo et al. 2003) but also on the degree of integration into the host society (Ahmadov and Sasse 2016; Jones-Correa 1998) and on networks and social connections with the country of origin (Ahmadov and Sasse 2016; Burgess 2012; Careja and Emmenegger 2012).

When it comes to motivations, researches have pointed to a paradox in the political engagement of emigrants. Indeed, the costs of political engagement are high while the benefits seem low (Waldinger 2013). The state of origin has a limited capacity to act in favour of the emigrants in their host country (Fitzgerald 2009). Furthermore, the benefits or incentives for activism are low. Early research suggested that active emigrants were motivated by symbolic incentives in which political engagement is a way to preserve their self-esteem in a context of loss of status after migration (Schiller 2005; Skrbiš 2017). Other researches, however, emphasized that what characterizes politically active emigrants is education, a relatively large social capital and stability in their status in the host country (Guarnizo et al. 2003).

At the macro-level, studies have investigated the environment and the political opportunity structure of the host country (Ahmadov and Sasse 2016; Escobar, Arana, and McCann 2015; Lafleur and Sánchez-Domínguez 2015) or of the country of origin (Bauböck 2010; Burgess 2014).

Overall, this literature lays solid foundations on citizenship abroad and political engagement of emigrants. However, it mainly focusses on macro-level features (new legal framework, waves of migration, electoral outcomes) and individual-level aspects (voting behaviour, drivers of political engagement). In doing so, it

largely overlooks meso-level aspects, especially how operators, such as candidates, activists and political parties, adapt to the new transnational context. This is the gap that this volume intends to fill by connecting the literature on transnationalism to the literature on party politics.

### **Party politics and the extraterritorial dilemma**

The research on political parties has been mostly carried out in the context of nation-states, which reflects a form of methodological nationalism (Amelina, Nergiz, Faist, and Schiller 2012; Wimmer and Glick Schiller 2002). The processes of decentralization and continental integration have pushed the field to a turning point and the development of studies that focus on multi-level contexts, be it the infra- or supra-state levels (Gómez-Reino 2018).

As a result, the multi-level study of political parties has gradually developed in recent years (Detterbeck 2012; Swenden and Maddens 2009). This shift of the perspective highlighted the ability of parties to invest in the new opportunities offered by decentralization and European integration. However, this new perspective has globally ignored the extraterritorial dimension of parties, even if the extension of the democratic sphere of established nation-states and its political and electoral consequences constitute opportunities and challenges for political parties. Parties abroad can take various forms depending on the interaction between the institutional and political contexts in which they emerge both in the host and home countries. This edited volume investigates these variations and proposes a classification. Parties also face the choice of engaging or not in this new arena, and if so, how and for what purposes.

In order to address the questions of the origins and development of parties abroad, their structure and organization, and their roles and functions, this volume mobilizes the classic literature on political parties (Katz and Crotty 2006; Poguntke et al. 2016), rich in theories and typologies that can be applied and adapted to parties abroad. In return, the study of parties abroad can inform, qualify or challenge a number of dominant ideas in classic party literature. Contrary to the dominant narrative on party decline, some parties have successfully invested in the new arena of extraterritorial politics.

#### ***The origins and development of parties abroad***

This volume pays a particular attention to how parties abroad emerge and develop: What are the incentives and barriers for parties to emerge and operate abroad? Are they submitted to the same regulations as parties at home? How does it affect their development?

While representative democracy is now seen as inseparable from political parties, the structuring of political life around parties has not always been obvious. Initially, nascent democracies have often posed legal obstacles to the emergence of political organizations, through the banning of organized groups or political meetings. In addition, political parties have long been associated with a negative

image, with the idea of faction, being seen as groups pursuing private goals at the expense of the collective good, as sources of divisions of national unity (as evidenced by the very term ‘party’ whose root is ‘divide’). Because they brought these differences into large groups, gave them body and visibility, the parties were the ones that came most in conflict with the vision of homogeneous nations, united, and defined above all by a common interest. In the same way, parties have been criticized for betraying the very values of democracy in their internal functioning, and for institutionalizing organizations that are more involved to safeguard their own interests than to defend those they represented. In the case of parties abroad, these normative and legal constraints could exist both in the host and the home countries, generating additional barriers to their development. These constraints are investigated in this volume.

Despite these obstacles, political parties emerged as the central actors of representative democracies. The classic literature on parties has therefore developed theories and explanations for this emergence: why political parties, and why these political parties in particular according to national contexts? Several explanations have been developed that could be applied to parties abroad.

The first approach focusses on the role of institutions; and, in particular, mass electoral politics and parliamentarization. According to Scarrow (2006: 17), ‘The newfound prominence of political parties in much of the 19th-century Europe seems clearly linked to two distinct but interrelated developments: the transfer of political power to legislatures, and the expansion of the electorate’. The parliamentarization of democracies has indeed been accompanied by a structuring of parliamentary life around political parties. Thus, while the US Congress was initially composed of representatives with no political affiliation, parliamentary debates led to the emergence of groups within the Congress based on positions on the central issues of the time (role of the government in the new federation, report to the former colonizing power), systematically opposing two points of view. The parties of parliamentary origin are then machines in the service of deputies and their re-election. Similarly, the expansion of suffrage has created the need to develop formal organizations (Sartori 2011 [1976]: 23).

In the case of parties abroad, the role of institutional incentives such as the development of voting rights, representative institutions and specific representation in the national legislature could be strong incentives for national parties to develop abroad.

However, not all parties emerged as a consequence of the expansion of suffrage or in parliaments (Duverger 1951). Some have extra-parliamentary origins and emerged within a social movement or to represent a specific group, around a salient issue such as the extension of the suffrage or the defence of workers’ rights in countries facing rapid industrialization. This second approach focusses on structural and societal factors favouring the emergence of parties. It helps to grasp not only why parties emerged but also why some parties emerged and not others. It relates to one of the dominant classifications of political parties developed by Lipset and Rokkan (1967). They envision parties as the mediators of structural divisions of society called cleavages. In Western Europe, two revolutions

(industrial and national, at the origin of the structuring of nation-states), would have given rise to four potential cleavages (Church–State and Centre–Periphery for the National Revolution, Workers–Employers and Rural–Urban for the Industrial Revolution). An active cleavage in one country would give rise to a party on each side of the divide, with each party mediating the interests of the population on this side of the societal divide. This classification therefore identifies eight potential party families. In this perspective, the structure of the divisions at play in a country would determine which parties are present in the national party system.

One can wonder whether the development of parties abroad might be linked to the sociology of migrations (diaspora politics, emigrant politics, or external citizenship) and the representation of specific interests of emigrants.

Finally, other authors argue that the institutionalist and sociological approaches miss the true explanation for the emergence of political parties. The parliamentarization and the social context can constitute favourable conditions for their development, but these explanations leave aside the role of political actors and their weight in the decision or not to create a political party. In his book *Why Parties?*, Aldrich (1995) argues that political parties are created by rational actors who engage in the partisan adventure if and only if it allows them to maximize their chances of achieving their goal (to win the elections). The context (the composition of the electorate, the institutions and the societal context) influences how actors will make this evaluation: are there common interests to be aggregated, and are parties the most effective way to achieve the goals in the given context? Kalyvas (1996) offers a similar reasoning in his analysis of the birth of Christian democracy. He stressed that there were strategic and ideological objections to the creation of Christian Democratic parties. From a strategic point of view, the risk was to divide the Conservative electorate (as Catholics and conservatives shared common interests) and to unite non-Catholics in reaction. From an ideological point of view, the creation of a political party means the acceptance of democracy and the acceptance that there are divergent interests within the community. These positions were not very compatible with the position of the Church in the mid-19th century and the Catholic conception of the indivisible community. Therefore, how can one explain that, in some national contexts, a Christian Democratic party has emerged? For Kalyvas, the explanation goes through an analysis of the recognition by actors of a change in the conditions for such an emergence: a fierce anticlerical opposition, a change in the balance of power within the Catholic movement in favour of Christian democracy and a social structuring of the strong Catholic movement that precedes its political structuring. It is a deliberate choice of actors in a specific context.

In this volume, we analyze under what conditions and in what context the development of parties abroad is considered the most appropriate solution to achieve one's objectives. Does this cost-benefit calculation fundamentally differ from that made during the establishment of parties on the national territory? Who are the political entrepreneurs engaged in setting up parties abroad and what are the drivers of their commitment? Some studies highlight the role of the national leadership in the context of electoral campaigns (Lafleur 2013) or



legislative work (Østergaard-Nielsen and Ciornei 2019a), but this needs to be investigated further.

Thus, we investigate the barriers and opportunities for the development of parties abroad. We focus on the legal and contextual barriers as well as the role of the institutional and societal context in the host and home countries as opportunities for parties to develop abroad. Furthermore, we investigate the role of national and local political actors.

### ***The structure and organization of parties abroad***

Another sub-field in the classic literature on political parties, embodied by pioneers such as Bryce, Michels, Ostrogorski or Duverger, deals with party organizations. The development of models has become an Olympic discipline, with each researcher aiming to impose his label on a specific organizational model. The classical opposition between mass parties and cadre parties of Duverger (1951) or Neumann (1956) was complemented by Kirchheimer's catch-all party (1966), and then variants of the metaphor of the franchise party (Carty 2004), the business-firm party (Hopkin and Paolucci 1999) or the entrepreneurial party (Krouwel 2006) and finally the cartel party (Katz and Mair 1995). These different models focus on the way in which the parties ensure the link between citizens and the state (Lawson 1980). They distinguish the parties based on their basic unit or branch but also their characteristics in terms of resources, size and composition of the party base, type of leadership, level of professionalization, bureaucratization and efficiency, their more or less centralized structure and the balance of power between what has been called the three 'faces' of party organizations: the party in central office, the party in public office and the party on the ground.

The typologies of party organizations can be used as analytical grids to study the way parties abroad are structured (Katz and Mair 1995; Krouwel 2006). Do they also rely on three distinct faces? What is the relationship between the party abroad and the central party at home? These are questions that are addressed in this volume.

### ***The roles and functions of parties abroad***

Parties constitute a means to render intelligible a series of processes for citizens. They are often regarded as indispensable to the functioning of political representation and democracy. Many authors have suggested classifications of the functions performed by parties, without a consensus really emerging on a common categorization (Lawson and Merkl 2014; Panebianco 1988 [1982]; Sartori 2011 [1976]; Wright 1971). At most, the literature agrees on three main categories of functions identified by Key (1964): (1) functions exercised in relation to the electorate, (2) as an organization or (3) in the context of governmental participation (Van Haute and Sauger 2018).

In relation to the electorate, parties would simplify and structure electoral choices (aggregation of interests), serve as channels of communication, educate

citizens, participate in their socialization and their integration into the political system (integration), generate symbols of identification and loyalty or organize election campaigns. Parties are also considered as channels of political participation (participation/mobilization).

As organizations, parties recruit, train and select leaders and candidates (recruitment of political staff) and develop political programmes (programmatic function). In relation to government, parties also fulfil certain functions. They would create majorities, organize government, lead opposition and debate (mediation/expression), implement political objectives, ensure accountability for government actions, control the government administration, maintain the stability of the government, structure the parliamentary divisions and organize the representation (function of government, coordination and political decision).

In this volume, we analyze whether the functions performed by parties abroad fall within this typology or whether they exercise specific roles related to the context in which they operate. Notably, do they develop specific claims and political cultures, or are they just relays of their mother-party at home? The answer does not need to be the same for all parties and countries.

### **Structure of the book**

For the first time with this volume, political parties abroad are at the centre of the focus. Using the ‘mother’ parties at home and the related classic theories of parties but also Europarties and their relation to national parties as a reference point, our main goal is to investigate (1) what parties abroad are, (2) when and why they emerge and develop, (3) how they organize, and (4) what roles they play. In doing so, we intend to offer a less scattered and more conceptual knowledge about parties abroad.

In order to answer these questions and analyze the multiple faces of parties abroad, the volume adopts an inductive and comparative perspective. Indeed, since the volume is exploratory research and investigates an emerging phenomenon, our strategy was to adopt an inductive approach starting from empirical evidence to proceed in the conclusion to theory-building. For the same reason, it was important to have a broad and open perspective on parties abroad.

The volume therefore digs into 12 case studies that were selected for their diversity and therefore for their expected potential to investigate the diversity of forms and functions that political parties abroad can take. These cases are characterized by differences in terms of legal frameworks and social and political contexts both at home (authoritarian and democratic regimes, with and without institutional provisions for voting rights and representation for emigrants, European and non-European countries) and in the host country but have the commonality of having developed parties abroad. This is the strategy adopted in the classic theories of parties: comparing party organizations in different settings in order to highlight commonalities and understand differences. These different settings include democratic and non-democratic cases. This broad case selection strategy allows us to explore the diversity of forms of political parties abroad and to offer

an original and comprehensive classification of parties abroad in our conclusion. It also ensures to investigate the diversity of paths that lead to the emergence and development of parties abroad.

In our conclusion, we then suggest an integrated theory of parties abroad based on the empirical insights of the case studies, using the classic literature on parties but also considering the specific context in which they operate. Analyzing these different cases also allows us to emphasize whether parties abroad present commonalities in terms of functions and organizations despite these differences. We apply and amend the classic functionalist and organizational approaches of party politics to political parties abroad.

If the case selection is based on differences on our first two questions (what parties abroad are and how they emerge), the volume is then structured around our last two concerns: how parties abroad organize and what roles they play.

The first group of chapters look at how parties abroad channel the vote of emigrants, and how it leads to the development of specific party structures. Focussing on the paradoxical transnational involvement of an Estonian anti-immigrant party among Estonian emigrants in Finland (EKRE), Mari-Liis Jakobson, Tõnis Saarts and Leif Kalev explain how EKRE successfully identified a transnational target audience that resembles their supporters back home and had been neglected by other Estonian political parties. Their strategy was so successful that between 2015 and 2019 they went from the sixth to the first most voted party among emigrants. The branches of American parties abroad studied by Amanda Klekowski von Koppenfels are much older and developed. Emigrants' votes are organized differently for intra-party procedures (nomination) and general elections. It impacts how these parties organize abroad and what activities they develop. In Mexico too, parties seek support from citizens residing abroad despite low turnout and restrictive rules regarding overseas campaigning. Michael Paarlberg explains that outreach efforts are not uniform: this variation is shaped by the partisan skew of the diaspora community, itself a product of historical legacies of migration and state policy.

The second group of chapters investigates cases where parties abroad also contribute to the selection of specific representatives of the emigrants, and how in return it affects their organization abroad. Sergiu Gherghina and Sorina Soare explain that the existence of MP seats for Romanians emigrants incentivized political parties to compete for their votes and establish organizations abroad. Dominated by the party in central office and very localized in some areas of high emigration, party branches abroad nevertheless play a networking role with their sister-parties. With a particularly large political representation, including 23 parliamentarians, French emigrants constitute a dynamic and globalized extra-territorial political space. Tudi Kernalegenn and Cédric Pellen show how La République en Marche (LREM) was able to take advantage of this opportunity structure, organize itself rapidly both at a local and global scale and become, in 2017, the dominant party among French emigrants. Their chapter also emphasizes the specific challenges of institutionalizing party branches abroad. Ecuador is another country with special representation, with three overseas electoral districts.

Sebastián Umpierrez de Reguero and Régis Dandoy analyze how MPAIS won most of the electoral seats since 2007: external voting was not only crucial for the party's electoral and political success but it successfully adapted its ideology and its internal structure in order to integrate nonresident voters.

The third set of chapters investigate cases where the institutional incentives for the development of parties abroad are absent or minimal, but where parties abroad have nevertheless developed to perform other functions such as lobbying for and with emigrants. Comparing three cases from Northeast Asia, Takayoshi Uekami, Jisun Park and Boyu Chen demonstrate how the presence of parties abroad can be determined by home political rules. Since domestic local branches of Japanese and Korean parties are usually based on personal networks of elected officials, these weak parties face difficulties in setting up organizations abroad in a context of highly personalized politics. On the contrary, the two major parties in Taiwan are incentivized by the social context to develop. They are mainly built around the social cleavage between Natives and Mainlanders. This structural conflict has been transplanted to Taiwanese societies abroad even in the absence of voting opportunity. Avital Friedman and Ofer Kenig also investigate why Israeli parties invest a lot of resources for sustaining their activities and branches outside of Israel in a context where citizens cannot vote from abroad. They emphasize that the ethnos, rather than the demos, can act as a strong incentive for parties to develop abroad. They explain that Israeli parties abroad focus their activities on the relations with interest groups and other elites, mainly in the Jewish communities and not Israeli citizens. Focussing on Syriza in Paris, Modestos Siotos also emphasizes the lobbying dimension of parties abroad. Party leaders in Athens urged members living abroad to create local branches in order for Syriza's political agenda to spread around Europe, specifically in the context of the foreseen conflict with Greece's lenders. However, the section did not manage to survive the party's generalized crisis after the end of its first six months in power, reminding readers how dependent sections abroad are from home politics.

Our last set of chapters investigates the role of parties abroad when they develop in relation to an authoritarian regime at home, leading them to fulfil specific functions such as controlling emigrants in the host country in the framework of a conflict at home. Mathilde Zederman compares two Tunisian parties established in France at the time of the authoritarian regime of Ben Ali: the *Rassemblement Constitutionnel Démocratique* (RCD), the party-state of the regime, and the Islamist party Ennahda, then banned in Tunisia. The two parties develop an opposite vision of Tunisia and try to mobilize emigrants to popularize their vision. The party abroad then becomes not only an instrument of propaganda to promote a project and discredit the opposing party but also an instrument of supervision and control of the Tunisian diaspora. The case of the Algerian neighbour, studied by Belkacem Benzenine, is relatively different. Parties are far from positioning themselves as political forces able to frame the political life of emigrants. However, they affect the diaspora indirectly through the many associations they create and control. The networks of the two major parties take a clientelist form thanks to the support of consular and diplomatic representations. Opposition parties, on

the other hand, face logistical difficulties in carrying out their activities abroad. Likewise, İnci Öykü Yener-Roderburg explains that Turkish parties abroad are not very visible but nonetheless influential through the associations and institutions they control. However, the Justice and Development Party (AKP) and the Peoples' Democratic Party (HDP) display significantly different levels of mobilization abroad due to the dissimilar structural origins: while AKP's vote is directly oriented by the home country headquarters, HDP's is arranged by the diasporic groups themselves.

Of course, these case studies do not exhaust the diversity of political parties abroad, but they nevertheless make it possible to lay the foundations of a real, original knowledge on parties abroad. Whether because of constraints, such as the ban in the country of origin, or opportunities, such as the extension of the right to vote or the setting up of specific representation, emigrants are increasingly integrated in the political arena of their home country. It is not a marginal phenomenon, and it has important political consequences. Political parties operate in this changing context of globalization and transnationalization. This volume shows under which circumstances these adaptable organizations engage in this new arena for party politics.

## Notes

- 1 In this introduction we use the concept of emigrants to designate all country nationals residing abroad, independent of the length of their stay, their status or motivation for emigration. It is used as an umbrella concept that integrates diasporas, economic emigrants, expatriates and external citizens.
- 2 Retrieved from International IDEA, 'Voting from Abroad Database', [www.idea.int/data-tools/data/voting-abroad](http://www.idea.int/data-tools/data/voting-abroad). Accessed 27 July 2019.
- 3 Only two full democracies (Malta and Uruguay) and five 'flawed' democracies (Jamaica, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Taiwan and Trinidad and Tobago) have, as of 2019, strictly no provision for external voting. We use the Democracy Index 2018 definition and may therefore have omitted micro-states excluded from that source. Retrieved from [www.eiu.com/topic/democracy-index](http://www.eiu.com/topic/democracy-index). Accessed 27 July 2019.

## References

- Ahmadov A. K., Sasse G. (2016), 'A Voice Despite Exit: The Role of Assimilation, Emigrant Networks, and Destination in Emigrants Transnational Political Engagement', *Comparative Political Studies*, 49(1), pp. 78–114.
- Aldrich J. H. (1995), *Why Parties? The Origin and Transformation of Political Parties in America*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Altied Vigil A., Domergue L. (2003), *El exilio republicano español en Toulouse, 1939–1999*. Madrid; Toulouse: UNED/Presses universitaires du Mirail.
- Amelina A., Nergiz D. D., Faist T., Schiller N. G. (eds.). (2012), *Beyond Methodological Nationalism: Research Methodologies for Cross-Border Studies*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Anderson B. (1992), *Long-Distance Nationalism: World Capitalism and the Rise of Identity Politics*. Amsterdam: The Wertheim Lecture, Centre for Asian Studies.
- Argun B. E. (2017), *Turkey in Germany: The Transitional Sphere of Deutschkei*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Barabantseva E., Sutherland C. (2011), 'Diaspora and Citizenship: Introduction', *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 17(1), pp. 1–13.
- Barry K. (2006), 'Home and Away: The Construction of Citizenship in an Emigration Context', *New York University Law Review*, 81, pp. 11–59.
- Bauböck R. (2003), 'Towards a Political Theory of Migrant Transnationalism', *International Migration Review*, 37(3), pp. 700–723.
- Bauböck R. (2007), 'Stakeholder Citizenship and Transnational Political Participation: A Normative Evaluation of External Voting', *Fordham Law Review*, 75, pp. 2393–2447.
- Bauböck R. (2009), 'The Rights and Duties of External Citizenship', *Citizenship Studies*, 13(5), pp. 475–499.
- Bauböck R. (2010), 'Cold Constellations and Hot Identities: Political Theory Questions About Transnationalism and Diaspora'. In: Bauböck R., Faist T. (eds.), *Diaspora and Transnationalism: Concepts, Theories and Methods*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, pp. 295–323.
- Bauböck R., Faist T. (2010), *Diaspora and Transnationalism: Concepts, Theories and Methods*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Bird K., Saalfeld T., Wüst A. M. (eds.). (2010), *The Political Representation of Immigrants and Minorities: Voters, Parties and Parliaments in Liberal Democracies* (Vol. 70). London; New York, NY: Routledge.
- Boccagni P. (2011), 'Reminiscences, Patriotism, Participation: Approaching External Voting in Ecuadorian Immigration to Italy', *International Migration*, 49(3), pp. 76–98.
- Boccagni P. (2014), 'Making the "Fifth Region" a Real Place? Emigrant Policies and the Emigration-Nation Nexus in Ecuador', *National Identities*, 16(2), pp. 117–137.
- Boccagni P., Ramírez J. (2013), 'Building Democracy or Reproducing "Ecuadoreanness"? A Transnational Exploration of Ecuadorean Migrants External Voting', *Journal of Latin American Studies*, 45(4), pp. 721–750.
- Brand L. A. (2006), *Citizens Abroad: Emigration and the State in the Middle East and North Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bureau T. (2011), 'Political Participation by the Romanian Diaspora'. In: Sum P. E., King R. F. (eds.), *Romania Under Băsescu*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, pp. 83–105.
- Burgess K. (2012), 'Collective Remittances and Migrant-State Collaboration in Mexico and El Salvador', *Latin American Politics and Society*, 54(4), pp. 119–146.
- Burgess K. (2014), 'Unpacking the Diaspora Channel in New Democracies: When Do Migrants Act Politically Back Home?' *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 49(1), pp. 13–43.
- Careja R., Emmenegger P. (2012), 'Making Democratic Citizens: The Effects of Migration Experience on Political Attitudes in Central and Eastern Europe', *Comparative Political Studies*, 45(7), pp. 875–902.
- Carty R. K. (2004), 'Parties as Franchise Systems: The Stratarchical Organizational Imperative', *Party Politics*, 10(1), pp. 5–24.
- Cochrane F. (2015), *Migration and Security in the Global Age: Diaspora Communities and Conflict*. London; New York, NY: Routledge.
- Collyer M. (2006), 'Transnational Political Participation of Algerians in France: Extra-Territorial Civil Society Versus Transnational Governmentality', *Political Geography*, 25(7), pp. 836–849.
- Collyer M. (ed.). (2013), *Emigration Nations: Policies and Ideologies of Emigrant Engagement*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Collyer M. (2014a), 'A Geography of Extra-Territorial Citizenship: Explanations of External Voting', *Migration Studies*, 2(1), pp. 55–72.

- Collyer M. (2014b), 'Inside out? Directly Elected "Special Representation" of Emigrants in National Legislatures and the Role of Popular Sovereignty', *Political Geography*, 41, pp. 64–73.
- Collyer M., Vathi Z. (2007), *Patterns of Extra-Territorial Voting*. Brighton: University of Sussex.
- Dalton R. J., Farrell D. M., McAllister I. (2011), *Political Parties and Democratic Linkage: How Parties Organize Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dark III T. (2003), 'The Rise of a Global Party? American Party Organizations Abroad', *Party Politics*, 9(2), pp. 241–255.
- Délano A. (2011), *Mexico and Its Diaspora in the United States: Policies of Emigration Since 1848*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Delwit P., Kùlahci E., Van de Walle C. (eds.). (2004), *The Europarties: Organisation and Influence*. Bruxelles: Éditions de l'Université de Bruxelles.
- Deschouwer K. (2006), 'Political Parties as Multi-Level Organizations'. In: Katz R. S., Crotty W. (eds.), *Handbook of Party Politics*. London: Sage, pp. 291–300.
- Detterbeck K. (2012), *Multi-Level Party Politics in Western Europe* (Vol. 2). Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Detterbeck K., Hepburn E. (2010), 'Party Politics in Multi-Level Systems: Party Responses to New Challenges in European Democracies'. In: Erk J., Swenden W. (eds.), *New Directions in Federalism Studies*. London; New York, NY: Routledge, pp. 106–125.
- Dufoix S., Guerassimoff C., Tinguay A. D. (eds.). (2010), *Loïn des yeux, près du coeur: les États et leurs expatriés*. Paris: Presses de Sciences Po.
- Duverger M. (1951), *Les partis politiques*. Paris: Armand Colin.
- Ellis A., Navarro C., Morales I., Wall A. (eds.). (2007), *Voting from Abroad: The International IDEA Handbook*. Stockholm: International Idea.
- Escobar C., Arana R., McCann J. A. (2015), 'Expatriate Voting and Migrants Place of Residence: Explaining Transnational Participation in Colombian Elections', *Migration Studies*, 3(1), pp. 1–31.
- Fair C. C. (2005), 'Diaspora Involvement in Insurgencies: Insights from the Khalistan and Tamil Eelam Movements', *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 11(1), pp. 125–156.
- Fitzgerald D. (2009), *A Nation of Emigrants: How Mexico Manages Its Migration*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Fox J. (2005), 'Unpacking "Transnational Citizenship"', *Annual Review of Political Science*, 8, pp. 171–201.
- Fuglerud Ø. (1999), *Life on the Outside: The Tamil Diaspora and Long-Distance Nationalism*. London: Pluto Press.
- Gagatek W., Van Hecke S. (2014), 'The Development of European Political Foundations and Their Role in Strengthening Europarties', *Acta Politica*, 49(1), pp. 86–104.
- Gamlén A. (2008), 'The Emigration State and the Modern Geopolitical Imagination', *Political Geography*, 27(8), pp. 840–856.
- Gómez-Reino M. (2018), *Nationalisms in the European Arena*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Guarnizo L. E., Portes A., Haller W. (2003), 'Assimilation and Transnationalism: Determinants of Transnational Political Action Among Contemporary Migrants', *American Journal of Sociology*, 108(6), pp. 1211–1248.
- Haegel F. (ed.). (2007), *Partis politiques et système partisan en France*. Paris: Presses de Sciences Po.
- Hanafi S. (2003), 'Rethinking the Palestinians Abroad as a Diaspora: The Relationships Between the Diaspora and the Palestinian Territories', *International Social Science Review*, 4(1–2), pp. 157–182.

- Hartmann C. (2015), 'Expatriates as Voters? The New Dynamics of External Voting in Sub-Saharan Africa', *Democratization*, 22(5), pp. 906–926.
- Hartnett L. A. (2019), 'Relief and Revolution: Russian Émigrés Political Remittances and the Building of Political Transnationalism', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, à Paraitre, pp. 1–17. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2018.1554290>
- Hopkin J., Paolucci C. (1999), 'The Business Firm Model of Party Organisation: Cases from Spain and Italy', *European Journal of Political Research*, 35(3), pp. 307–339.
- Itzigsohn J. (2012), 'A "Transnational Nation"? Migration and the Boundaries of Belonging'. In: Lyons T., Mandaville P. G. (eds.), *Politics from Afar: Transnational Diasporas and Networks*. London: Hurst, pp. 181–196.
- Jaroszńska-Kirchmann A. D. (2004), *The Exile Mission: The Polish Political Diaspora and Polish Americans, 1939–1956*. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press.
- Jones-Correa M. (1998), 'Different Paths: Gender, Immigration and Political Participation', *International Migration Review*, 32(2), pp. 326–349.
- Kalyvas S. N. (1996), *The Rise of Christian Democracy in Europe*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Kastoryano R. (2006), 'Vers un nationalisme transnational: Redéfinir la nation, le nationalisme et le territoire', *Revue Française de science politique*, 56(4), pp. 533–553.
- Katz R. S., Crotty W. J. (eds.). (2006), *Handbook of Party Politics*. London: Sage.
- Katz R. S., Mair P. (1995), 'Changing Models of Party Organization and Party Democracy: The Emergence of the Cartel Party', *Party Politics*, 1(1), pp. 5–28.
- Key V. O. J. (1964), *Politics, Parties, and Pressure Groups*. New York, NY: Crowell.
- Kirchheimer O. (1966), 'The Transformation of the Western European Party Systems'. In: LaPalombara J., Weiner M. (eds.), *Political Parties and Political Development*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Krouwel A. (2006), 'Party Models'. In: Katz R. S., Crotty W. J. (eds.), *Handbook of Party Politics*. London: Sage, pp. 249–269.
- Lacroix T. (2005), 'L'engagement citoyen des marocains de l'étranger: Les migrants et la démocratie dans les pays d'origine', *Hommes & Migrations*, 1256, pp. 89–102.
- Lacroix T., Levitt P., Vari-Lavoisier I. (2016), 'Social Remittances and the Changing Transnational Political Landscape', *Comparative Migration Studies*, 4(1), pp. 441–445.
- Lafleur J.-M. (2013), *Transnational Politics and the State: The External Voting Rights of Diasporas*. London; New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lafleur J.-M., Sánchez-Domínguez M. (2015), 'The Political Choices of Emigrants Voting in Home Country Elections: A Socio-Political Analysis of the Electoral Behaviour of Bolivian External Voters', *Migration Studies*, 3(2), pp. 155–181.
- Laguerre M. (1999), *Diasporic Citizenship: Haitian Americans in Transnational America*. New York, NY: St Martin's Press.
- Laguerre M. (2013), *Parliament and Diaspora in Europe*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Landolt P. (2008), 'The Transnational Geographies of Immigrant Politics: Insights from a Comparative Study of Migrant Grassroots Organizing', *The Sociological Quarterly*, 49(1), pp. 53–77.
- Lawson K. (1980), *Political Parties and Linkage: A Comparative Perspective*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Lawson K., Merkl P. H. (eds.). (2014), *When Parties Fail: Emerging Alternative Organizations*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Levitt P., De la Dehesa R. (2003), 'Transnational Migration and the Redefinition of the State: Variations and Explanations', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 26(4), pp. 587–611.



- Lipset S. M., Rokkan S. (1967), 'Cleavage Structures, Party Systems, and Voter Alignments: An Introduction'. In: Lipset S. M., Rokkan S. (eds.), *Party Systems and Voter Alignments*. New York, NY: The Free Press, pp. 1–64.
- López-Guerra C. (2005), 'Should Expatriates Vote?' *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 13(2), pp. 216–234.
- Maas W. (2013), *Multilevel Citizenship*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Meseguer C., Burgess K. (2014), 'International Migration and Home Country Politics', *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 49(1), pp. 1–12.
- Misra A. (2003), 'A Nation in Exile: Tibetan Diaspora and the Dynamics of Long Distance Nationalism', *Asian Ethnicity*, 4(2), pp. 189–206.
- Neumann S. (ed.). (1956), *Modern Political Parties: Approaches to Comparative Politics*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Østergaard-Nielsen E. (2003a), *Transnational Politics: Turks and Kurds in Germany*. London: Routledge.
- Østergaard-Nielsen E. (ed.). (2003b), *International Migration and Sending Countries: Perceptions, Policies and Transnational Relations*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Østergaard-Nielsen E., Ciornei I. (2019a), 'Making the Absent Present: Political Parties and Emigrant Issues in Country of Origin Parliaments', *Party Politics*, 25(2), pp. 153–166.
- Østergaard-Nielsen E., Ciornei I. (2019b), 'Political Parties and the Transnational Mobilisation of the Emigrant Vote', *West European Politics*, 42(3), pp. 618–644.
- Paarlberg M. A. (2019), 'Competing for the Diaspora's Influence at Home: Party Structure and Transnational Campaign Activity in El Salvador', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 45(4), pp. 539–560.
- Palop-García P. (2018), 'Contained or Represented? The Varied Consequences of Reserved Seats for Emigrants in the Legislatures of Ecuador and Colombia', *Comparative Migration Studies*, 6(38). doi:<https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-018-0101-7>
- Panbianco A. (1988 [1982]), *Political Parties: Organization and Power*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pedraza S. (2007), *Political Disaffection in Cuba's Revolution and Exodus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Poguntke T., Scarrow S. E., Webb P. D., Allern E. H., Aylott N., Van Biezen I., . . . Deschouwer K. (2016), 'Party Rules, Party Resources and the Politics of Parliamentary Democracies: How Parties Organize in the 21st Century', *Party Politics*, 22(6), pp. 661–678.
- Portes A., Guarnizo L. E., Landolt P. (1999), 'The Study of Transnationalism: Pitfalls and Promise of an Emergent Research Field', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22(2), pp. 217–237.
- Ragazzi F. (2009), 'The Invention of the Croatian Diaspora: Unpacking the Politics of "Diaspora" During the War in Yugoslavia', *Global Migration and Transnational Politics, Working Paper*, 10.
- Rhodes S., Harutyunyan A. (2010), 'Extending Citizenship to Emigrants: Democratic Contestation and a New Global Norm', *International Political Science Review*, 31(4), pp. 470–493.
- Roberts B. R., Frank R., Lozano-Ascencio F. (1999), 'Transnational Migrant Communities and Mexican Migration to the US', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22(2), pp. 238–266.
- Sartori G. (2011 [1976]), *Partis et systèmes de partis: Un cadre d'analyse*. Bruxelles: Les Éditions de l'Université de Bruxelles.
- Scarrow S. E. (2006), 'The Nineteenth-Century Origins of Modern Political Parties: The Unwanted Emergence of Party-Based Politics', *Handbook of Party Politics*, pp. 16–24.

- Schattschneider E. E. (2009 [1942]), *Party Government: American Government in Action*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Schiller N. G. (2005), 'Long-Distance Nationalism'. In: Ember M., Ember C. R., Skogsgard I. (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Diasporas: Immigrant and Refugee Cultures Around the World*. New York, NY: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, pp. 570–580.
- Skrbiš Z. (2017), *Long-Distance Nationalism: Diasporas, Homelands and Identities*. London: Routledge.
- Swenden W., Maddens B. (eds.). (2009), *Territorial Party Politics in Western Europe*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Timuş N., Lightfoot S. (2014), 'Europarties: Between the Processes of "Deepening" and "Widening"', *Acta Politica*, 49(1), pp. 1–4.
- Turcu A., Urbatsch R. (2015), 'Diffusion of Diaspora Enfranchisement Norms: A Multinational Study', *Comparative Political Studies*, 48(4), pp. 407–437.
- Van Haute É. (2009), *Adhérer à un parti. Aux sources de la participation politique*. Bruxelles: Éditions de l'Université de Bruxelles.
- Van Haute É., Sauger N. (2018), 'Partis Politiques et Systèmes Partisans'. In: Déloye Y., De Waele J.-M. (eds.), *Politique Comparée: Traité de Science Politique*. Bruxelles: Bruylant, pp. 575–610.
- Waldinger R. (2013), 'Immigrant Transnationalism', *Current Sociology*, 61(5–6), pp. 756–777.
- Weber M. (2003 [1917–1919]), *Le savant et le politique*. Paris: La Découverte.
- Wimmer A., Glick Schiller N. (2002), 'Methodological Nationalism and Beyond: Nation-State Building, Migration and the Social Sciences', *Global Networks*, 2(4), pp. 301–334.
- Wright W. E. (1971), *A Comparative Study of Party Organizations*. Columbus, OH: Merrill Publishing Company.
- Yung-Ching C. (1989), 'The Kuomintang and Democratic Movements in Early Republican China', *Chinese Studies in History*, 23(1), pp. 38–54.