



Konrad
Adenauer
Stiftung



Prof. Savo Klimovski, PhD

Prof. Tanja Karakamisheva-Jovanovska, PhD

Doc. Aleksandar Spasenovski, PhD



SOVEREIGNTY

ELECTIONS

REFERENDUM

EUROPEAN UNION

CONSERVATISM

LIBERALISM

SOCIAL DEMOCRACY



POLITICAL PARTIES AND INTEREST GROUPS



Konrad
Adenauer
Stiftung



Prof. Savo Klimovski, PhD
Prof. Tanja Karakamisheva-Jovanovska, PhD
Doc. Aleksandar Spasenovski, PhD

POLITICAL PARTIES AND INTEREST GROUPS

Skopje, 2016

IMPRESSUM

Title:

Political Parties and Interest Groups

Authors:

Savo Klimovski, professor emeritus at "Iustinianus Primus" Faculty of Law in Skopje at Ss. Cyril and Methodius University of Skopje

Tanja Karakamisheva-Jovanovska, full time professor at "Iustinianus Primus" Faculty of Law in Skopje at Ss. Cyril and Methodius University of Skopje

Aleksandar Spasenovski, docent at "Iustinianus Primus" Faculty of Law in Skopje at Ss. Cyril and Methodius University of Skopje

Reviewers:

Irena Pejić, professor at the Faculty of Law in Niš, Republic of Serbia

Slaviša Kovačević, professor at the Faculty of Law in Niš, Republic of Serbia

Publishers:

Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung in the Republic of Macedonia
"Iustinianus Primus" Faculty of Law in Skopje

Coordination:

Davor Pasoski
Johannes D. Rey

Translation:

Perica Sardzoski
Blagovesta Pop-Stefanija

Proofreading:

Matthias Meyer

Computer and printing:

Vinsent Grafika DOO Skopje

Circulation:

200 copies

The book can be downloaded free at:

<http://www.kas.de/mazedonien/en/>

Note:

The views and opinions expressed in this book are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official position of the Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung.

This book is accepted as a coursebook for the subject Political Parties and Interest Groups with a decision brought forth by the Educational and Scientific Council of the Faculty of Law "Iustinianus Primus" at Ss. Cyril and Methodius University of Skopje, at the session held on 29.01.2016, registered under number 02-73/22 from 29.01.2016.

All rights are reserved. Any reproduction or multiplication, photocopying, or electronic storing of sections from this book, without prior consent of the authors is prohibited.

**Ss. Cyril and Methodius University
Faculty of Law "Iustinianus Primus" Skopje**

**Prof. Savo Klimovski, PhD
Prof. Tanja Karakamisheva-Jovanovska, PhD
Doc. Aleksandar Spasenovski, PhD**

POLITICAL PARTIES AND INTEREST GROUPS

(Second amended and supplemented edition)

CONTENTS

Preface	14
PART ONE	
POLITICAL PARTIES AND PARTY SYSTEMS (Prof. Tanja Karakamisheva-Jovanovska, PhD)	19
CHAPTER 1	
BASIC QUESTIONS FOR THE STUDY OF POLITICAL PARTIES	20
1. THE CONCEPT AND EMERGENCE OF A POLITICAL PARTY	21
2. DEFINING A POLITICAL PARTY	28
2.1. Party structure (organisation) – main traditions	32
2.1.1. Models of party organisation	37
2.2. The desire to come to power or stay in power as long as possible	43
2.2.1. Differences between the concepts of authority and governance	50
2.2.2. Party coalition and types of coalitions	51
2.3. Ideology as an element of defining a party	58
2.3.1. Types of ideologies	64
2.3.1.1. Liberalism	64
2.3.1.2. Conservatism	67
2.3.1.3. Socialism	71
2.3.1.4. Social Democracy	73
2.3.1.5. Nationalism	77
2.3.1.6. Other types of ideologies	79
2.3.1.6.1. Anarchism	79
2.3.1.6.2. Fascism	81
2.3.1.6.3. Feminism	83
2.3.1.6.4. Ecologism	85
2.3.1.6.5. Fundamentalism	87
2.4. Political legitimacy and public support of political parties	92
3. FUNCTIONS OF POLITICAL PARTIES	94

CHAPTER 2	
HISTORICAL REVIEW OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE POLITICAL PARTIES IN THE UNITED KINGDOM, THE USA, FRANCE, AND THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY	98
1. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE PARTIES IN ENGLAND (THE UNITED KINGDOM)	99
2. POLITICAL PARTIES IN ENGLAND (THE UNITED KINGDOM)	108
2.1. The Conservative Party	108
2.1.1. The internal organisation of the Conservative Party	110
2.2. The Labour Party	114
2.2.1. Internal organisation of the Labour Party	118
2.3. Other parties in the United Kingdom	120
3. THE POLITICAL PARTIES IN THE US	121
3.1. Periods in the historical development of the parties in the US	121
3.2. Organisational structure of American parties	127
4. THE POLITICAL PARTIES IN FRANCE	135
4.1. Historical review of the development of the parties in France	135
4.2. Organisational structure of the parties in France	139
5. THE POLITICAL PARTIES IN THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY	141
5.1. Historical review of the development of the parties in the Federal Republic of Germany	141
CHAPTER 3	
A PARTY LEADER AND LEADERSHIP THEORIES	150
1. THE CONCEPT OF PARTY LEADER AND LEADERSHIP	151
2. CURRENT TRENDS IN THE POLITICAL LEADERSHIP	160
2.1. Some important leadership theories	164
2.1.1. Max Weber's theory	164
2.1.2. George Burns' theory	166
2.1.3. Daniel Goleman's theory	168
3. A PARTY LEADER AND PARTY GOVERNANCE	169

CHAPTER 4	
INTRA – PARTY CONFLICTS AND FACTIONS	174
1. THE CONCEPT OF INTRA-PARTY CONFLICT	175
2. FACTIONS	178
2.1. The concept of factions	178
2.2. Advantages and disadvantages of factions	182
2.3. The concept of intra-party democracy	184
CHAPTER 5	
TYPES OF POLITICAL PARTIES AND PARTY SYSTEMS	190
1. DIFFERENT CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING THE TYPES OF PARTIES	191
2. THE CONCEPT AND TYPES OF PARTY SYSTEMS	194
2.1. The concept of party systems	194
2.2. Determining the types of party systems	195
2.2.1. One-party system	198
2.2.2. Two-party system	200
2.2.3. Multi-party system	202
2.3. Party systems with and without opposition	205
2.4. Main party families	209
CHAPTER 6	
FINANCING OF POLITICAL PARTIES AND ELECTION CAMPAIGNS	212
1. MODELS OF POLITICAL PARTY FINANCING	213
2. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE SOURCES FOR THE FINCANCING OF POLITICAL PARTIES AND OF ELECTION CAMPAIGNS	221
3. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE LIMITS IN FINANCING OF POLITICAL PARTIES AND ELECTION CAMPAIGNS	230
4. POLITICAL PARTY FINANCING IN THE REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA – LEGAL PROVISIONS	237

PART TWO
POLITICAL PARTIES IN THE REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA
(Doc. Aleksandar Spasenovski, PhD) **243**

CHAPTER 1
THE POLITICAL AND PARTY ORGANISATION UNTIL
THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE SOCIALIST
REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA **244**

1. INTRODUCTORY NOTES 245
2. THE POLITICAL AND PARTY ORGANISATION
UNTIL THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE SOCIALIST
REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA 246

CHAPTER 2
THE PARTY SYSTEM IN THE SOCIALIST
REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA **256**

1. THE PARTY SYSTEM IN
THE SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA 257
- 1.1. Characteristics of political monism (the first period) 257
- 1.2. Transition from political monism to political pluralism
(the second period) 262
- 1.3. The third period of political pluralism 266
- 1.3.1. Law amending and supplementing the Law
on Social Organisations and Civic Associations 267
- 1.3.2. Amendments to the Constitution of
the Socialist Republic of Macedonia from 1974 274
- 1.3.3. The Law on the Election
and Recall of MPs and Councilors 280
2. IDEOLOGICAL PROGRAMME PROFILE OF
THE FIRST REGISTERED POLITICAL PARTIES 283
- 2.1. Movement for Unified – Macedonian Action 285
- 2.2. League for Democracy 287
- 2.3. Party for Democratic Prosperity 289
- 2.4. Party of the Yugoslavians in Macedonia 291
- 2.5. SKM – Party for Democratic Transformation 292
- 2.6. VMRO – Democratic Party for Macedonian National Unity 294

CHAPTER 3	
THE PARTY SYSTEM IN THE REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA	302
1. THE PARTY SYSTEM IN THE REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA	303
1.1. Constitutional framework	304
1.2. Legislative framework	307
1.2.1. Defining the concept of political party	309
1.2.2. Ways of establishing a political party and registration confirmation	311
1.2.3. Political party registration procedure	314
1.2.4. The end of a political party's existence	316
1.2.5. Other issues related to the functioning of political parties	317
1.2.5.1. Party research and analytic centres	319
PART THREE	
ELECTIONS AND ELECTORAL SYSTEMS	
(Prof. Tanja Karakamisheva-Jovanovska, PhD)	321
CHAPTER 1	
SOVEREIGNTY OF CITIZENS	322
1. CONCEPT AND THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF SOVEREIGNTY	323
2. MECHANISMS TO ACHIEVE NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY	331
3. FORMS OF DIRECT REALIZATION OF CITIZEN SOVEREIGNTY (FORMS OF DIRECT DEMOCRACY)	333
3.1. Referendum	333
3.2. Citizen initiative and other forms of direct consideration	338
4. CONSTITUTIONAL POSITION OF REFERENDUM AND CITIZENS' INITIATIVE IN THE REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA	340
CHAPTER 2	
FORMS OF DIRECT SOVEREIGNTY RIGHTS OF THE CITIZENS (FORMS OF DIRECT DEMOCRACY)	346
1. THEORY OF REPRESENTATION	347
2. CONCEPTUAL DETERMINATION OF ELECTIONS	349

3. EVOLUTIONARY DIMENSION OF ELECTIONS (SHORT RETROSPECTIVE)	352
3.1. Elections in ancient Greece	353
3.2. Elections in ancient Rome	356
3.3. Elections in the Middle Ages	357
3.4. Elections in England – development of territorial office	358
3.5. France-an example of electoral radicalism	361
3.6. Development of the elections in the US	362
4. ELECTORAL FUNCTIONS	364

CHAPTER 3
BASIC REMARKS ON THE ELECTORAL SYSTEM **370**

1. ELECTORAL SYSTEM – CONCEPT AND DEFINITION	371
2. ELECTORAL SYSTEM IN NARROW SENSE OF THE WORD – COMPONENTS AND POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS	373
2.1. Majority election model (plural election model (First-Past-The-Post-System), election model in two election rounds and an alternative election model)	374
2.1.1. Plural election model (First-Past-The-Post-System)	374
2.1.2. Electoral model in two electoral rounds and alternative electoral model	380
2.2. Semi-proportional electoral models (separate non-transferable vote and parallel systems)	387
2.3. Proportional electoral models (systems with party lists in which the formula is of the largest remaining and the highest average)	390
2.3.1. Proportional electoral model with the largest remaining (The largest remainder system)	396
2.3.2. Proportional model with the highest average (The Highest Average System)	398
2.4. Mixed electoral models (individual portable vote)	401
3. ELECTORAL SYSTEM IN THE BROADER SENSE	413
3.1. Concept, definition and types of electoral units	413
3.2. Electoral threshold (the prohibitive electoral clause)	416

CHAPTER 4	
THEORETICAL RELATIONS BETWEEN THE ELECTORAL AND THE PARTY SYSTEM	418
1. SEVERAL THEORETICAL IDEAS FOR THE RELATION BETWEEN ELECTORAL AND PARTY SYSTEMS	419
1.1. Theory of Maurice Duverger	419
1.2. Contemporary theoretical ideas on the relationship between the electoral and party system	425
1.3. Theoretical ideas on the interaction between the electoral system, model of democracy and systems of organizing the government	430
2. INTERNATIONAL AND EUROPEAN STANDARDS FOR ELECTIONS WITH SPECIAL REVIEW OF THE CODEX OF THE VENICE COMMISSION FOR GOOD PRACTICES IN ELECTORAL ISSUES	436
3. EUROPEAN ELECTORAL LAW	445
3.1. Content of the Code	450
3.2. Conditions for the implementation of the principle	452
PART FOUR	
EUROPEAN PARTIES AND THE PARTY SYSTEM IN THE EU (Prof. Tanja Karakamisheva-Jovanovska, PhD)	459
CHAPTER 1	
BASIC REMINDERS OF THE EUROPEAN INTEGRATION	460
1. WHY EUROPEAN INTEGRATION?	461
2. SHORT REVIEW OF THE THEORIES OF EUROPEAN INTEGRATION	465
2.1. Federalist theory	465
2.2. Functionalism theory	467
2.3. The neo-functionalism theory	470
2.4. Inter-governmentalists theory	472
2.5. Liberal-intergovernmentalism theory	473
2.6. Theory of "new institutionalism" of the rational election	476
2.7. Constructivism theory	477
3. THE EUROPEAN UNION AS POLITICAL SYSTEM "SUI GENERIS"	478

3.1. European Parliament	485
3.1.1. Historical development of the European Parliament	485
3.1.2. Competencies and internal organization of the European Parliament	488
3.1.3. Changes of the position of the European Parliament with the Lisbon Treaty	497
4. EUROPEAN POLITICAL PARTIES	506
4.1. European People's party – Christian Democrats	512
4.2. Party of European Socialists	515
4.3. Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Eu	518
4.4. European Green Party	520
4.5. Alliance of the European Conservatives and Reformists	525
4.6. Party of the European left	527
4.7. Movement for a Europe of Liberties and Democracy	528
4.8. European Democratic party	529
4.9. European Free Alliance	532
4.10. European Alliance for Freedom	533
4.11. Alliance of European National Movements	534
4.12. European Christian Political Movement	535
4.13. EU Democrats	535
5. EUROPEAN POLITICAL (PARLIAMENTARIAN) GROUPS	538
5.1. History of the political groups in the European Parliament	538
5.2. Structure of European Parliament according the affiliation in the political groups	541
6. EU PARTY SYSTEM	548

PART FIVE

INTEREST GROUPS

(Prof. Savo Klimovski, PhD)

555

CHAPTER 1

INTEREST CONCEPT DEFINITION

556

1. INTEREST-DEFINITION	557
2. INTEREST CONCEPTS IN THE PERIOD OF CLASSICAL LIBERALISM	560
3. MODERN INTEREST CONCEPTS	562
4. OTHER INTEREST THEORIES	564
4.1. Theory of power in local communities	568

CHAPTER 2	
INTEREST GROUP DEFINITION	572
1. INTEREST GROUP DEFINITION	573
2. TYPES OF INTEREST GROUPS	576
3. POLITICAL PARTIES AND INTEREST GROUPS	584
4. INTEREST REPRESENTATION	588
5. INTEREST GROUPS IN THE EUROPEAN UNION	592
5.1. Business interests in the EU	593
5.2. Trade unions, public interests and social movements in the EU	594
5.3. Territorial (regional) interests in the EU	596
5.4. National interests and co-social agreement	599
5.5. Interest groups and democracy	602
РЕЗИМЕ (МК)	
ПОЛИТИЧКИ ПАРТИИ И ИНТЕРЕСОВНИ ГРУПИ	607
REYZME (SQ)	
PARTITË POLITIKE DHE GRUPET E INTERESIT	610
ZUSAMMENFASSUNG (DE)	
POLITISCHE PARTEIEN UND INTERESSENGRUPPEN	613
SUMMARY (EN)	
POLITICAL PARTIES AND INTEREST GROUPS	616
REFERENCES	621



PREFACE



Since the emergence of the “third wave” of democratization of political systems in the beginning of the 1970s, the political events that took place in transitional, but also in consolidated democracies in the world, had their main focus on three basic political goals: 1. To strengthen the need and conditions for having free, fair and competitive elections, which requires participation of several political parties and an appropriate number of their candidates, 2. To establish and develop a democratic civil society based on assistance programmes to autochthonous and autonomous citizens’ associations and organisations in a specific country, assistance to citizens’ groups that have direct public support, and in relation to this, the need for independent and professional media, and 3. To strengthen and improve the operational quality of key state institutions by encouraging the process of establishing a functioning and independent judiciary and public prosecution, efficient legislative power, efficient administration and executive power.

Political parties too are in the focus of the political goal in transitional, as well as consolidated democracies, along with their role in setting the rules for the development of modern and representative democracies. In contemporary political theory there are various views on the roles and functions of political parties in the political system. Theoreticians supporting the idea of a participative, direct, deliberative and strong democracy quite often review parties under the prism of high skepticism, i.e. based on the conviction that citizens should address problems and determine priorities within their communities in a much more relaxed manner, without the influence of “contaminated” party interests, as they put it.

This new viewpoint builds on the traditional, promoted primarily by Madison and Rousseau, according to which parties should be studied as organisations with “frightening interests” established to underestimate, pervert or usurp the will of the majority. Besides viewpoints of this kind, there are predominantly positive views and standpoints in the political theory in relation to the necessity for the existence of political parties in the democratic political system, as well as the

need to direct their activity and functioning towards the advancement and modernization of a representative democracy. According to these positive standpoints in theory, today one cannot imagine a representative democracy existing without political parties.

In this sense, it is emphasized that political parties in the political systems serve several key functions:

1. Parties are truly necessary for building and maintaining the support among the broad citizens' coalitions and interest groups with regards to the chosen way and contents for the functioning of political institutions;
2. Parties integrate the different requirements of citizens in coherent political programmes;
3. Parties elect and train their candidates as representatives in the legislative and executive bodies of the state;
4. Parties are key creators of new models of political governance, main promoters of new styles of leadership, and new skills in political leadership;
5. Parties give citizens the possibility to elect specific teams and policies that are presented to the citizens, and
6. Parties establish political institutions and demonstrate political responsibility for the implementation of the winning election programmes.

The fact is that a representative democracy cannot possibly exist if there is no multi-party competitive system, and if there is no competitive political and party offer provided in the interest of the citizens of the country.

Political parties are the cornerstone of democratic societies and democratic states. Without them it would be truly difficult and almost impossible to conduct a true political mobilization and integration of the citizens, to articulate citizens' interests, to establish public policies, to recruit political leaders, and to organise the key political institutions in the country – the parliament and the government.

As authors of this second amended and supplemented edition of the course book *Political Parties and Interest Groups*, we truly made an attempt to explain the essence of the central position and role of political parties in a representative democracy. We tried to elaborate in detail all the party elements, all the most important development moments of party life and of course, to set rightly and into focus the ideological foundations of the programme functioning of the key and most influential parties in the world.

At the same time, through the analysis of these most important issues we hope that we managed not to neglect the other key elements that go along with the functioning of party systems – elections, electoral models, the European Parliament and political groups, on the one hand, and interest groups, on the other.

In order to gain the right image of the role and the importance of political parties in a democratic political system, it is necessary to explain all the elements that serve as a foundation for that system, as well as the role and the importance of each of them for the development and for setting the conditions to successfully implement representative democracy in real life.

We truly hope that this course book will successfully clarify all the aspects relating to the existence and functioning of political parties in practice, but also to alleviate the learning process covering all aspects, theoretical, practical, philosophical, and experiential. Although the course book is intended, primarily, for students of Political Studies available at the Law Faculty Iustinianus Primus in Skopje, where in accordance with the academic curriculum, this subject is in the group of required subjects for graduate studies, we realize that its application might have much greater impact.

This course book should serve as basic literature for students attending MA studies in Constitutional Law on Law Studies at the Faculty of Law, for the elective subject *Political Parties and Interest Groups*.

We are convinced that this course book will have much greater applicability beyond the faculty and university. This text should find its place as a basic tool in the functioning of each political party in the country, and having in mind that it will be translated into English, the course book will be available and can serve as a tool for political parties in other countries as well.

Its basic educational goal is not an obstacle on the path to promoting its higher goal, which is to provide a basic civil text to serve in the interest of the wide civil education in the area of political and legal categories that are directly or indirectly related to political parties.

We would be infinitely grateful if we could obtain all the goals set.

Finally, on behalf of the Faculty of Law Iustinianus Primus and on our own behalf we would like to express our gratitude to the representative office of the Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung in the Republic of Macedonia for their support and engagement with the publication of this course book.

Skopje, 2016

By the authors

PART ONE

**POLITICAL PARTIES AND
PARTY SYSTEMS**

CHAPTER 1



BASIC QUESTIONS FOR THE STUDY OF POLITICAL PARTIES

1. THE CONCEPT AND EMERGENCE OF A POLITICAL PARTY

The word party has its etymological root in the Latin word **pars** - which means **part of the wider whole, and in the word partie** – meaning **to separate**. The term party enters into use in the first half of the 19th century instead of the existing terms **factio** and **sekta**.¹

Therefore, **the concept of party has double meaning:**

- 1. the concept of a party as part of the wider whole (the party and political system), and**
- 2. the concept of a party as an ideological, political and organisationally part separated from the whole.**

However, the concept of a party is quite often related to the English word **partnership** – **implying cooperation, identification, as well as to the word partaking** – **meaning involvement, or the French verb partager** – **which means to separate**.

Due to these terminological differences, the concept of a party can be explained as part of the whole, as something that is divided and separated, and as a part that connects, familiarises, and identifies. It seems that the modern concept of party takes into consideration the division of the citizens

¹ These two terms were actively used until the end of the 17th century denoting religious divisions. The term **factio** was introduced by the Gracchus brothers in Ancient Rome referring to the group of aristocrats who controlled the Roman Senate. Gaius Gracchus uses this term for his enemies. Cicero in his work *De re publica*, also uses the term **factio** with reference to the Greek oligarchs. Due to the negative connotation this term had carried ever since ancient Roman times, at the end of the 18th and the first half of the 19th century, it was replaced with the term **party** denoting the form and shape of a political citizens' organisation implicitly abandoning the negative attitude towards the organising forms of the old age. See: Sartori, G (1976) *Parties and Party Systems: A Framework for Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, (pp. 3-13). Blondel too thought that the parties emerged in Rome, at the end of the Republic, and that the Gracchus brothers might have been the first party leaders with specific public support. With the collapse of the Republic, the parties disappeared to reappear later in the Renaissance period in Italy.

from ideological, valuable, but also from the aspect of the political programme, and the moment of connection, familiarity, cooperation, exchange and identification.

The contemporary concept of party aims to represent and explain not only the elements that distance citizens from each other due to their different party affiliations, but also those that connect and familiarize them, bringing them into a state of partnership and cooperation. Thus, for instance, for Neumann the term party at the same time denotes identification with a group of affiliates, their cooperation within the specific organisation, but also their separateness from other groups and organisations.

The first political parties in a modern sense of the word were established in the US and England in the end of the 18th century as a result of, as Maurice Duverger would put it, two basic reasons:

- 1. Expanding the general voting right, and**
- 2. Development of the parliament**

According to this so-called “general scheme of party emergence” by Maurice Duverger, **parties are formed in two ways:**

1. The parliamentary way, which is known to integrate and connect the “parliamentary groups”, formed by the MPs, and the “electoral committees”, formed by the citizens in order to influence the election process. The purpose of this connection is dual – re-election of current MPs in Parliament and the possibility for citizens-voters to influence the activities of the elected MPs. The American parties emerged from the groups of parliamentary supporters of Jefferson and Hamilton.

However, not all parties in the world have a parliamentary background. For instance, in the US, the People’s, Prohibitionist, Socialist and other parties emerged as a result of

the activities taken by numerous associations and citizens' organisations outside Parliament in order to promote their interests.

2. This is why it is necessary to highlight the importance of the second way of forming parties, known as extra-parliamentarian, where the parties are formed as an instrument of influence for various interest groups (trade unions, churches, economic chambers, agrarian associations etc.). This is how socialist parties emerged in western European countries, the Labour Party in the United Kingdom, the agrarian, Christian democratic parties, etc.

In fact, the second base or source of the parties is the workers' movements. This is how the Labour Party in England emerged, when the workers' movement gained political identity to run for political power. The third way for party emergence is through national liberation movements, such as the Congress Party in India. Finally, the reasons for establishing parties could be based on ideology, i.e. the struggle for realizing certain goals. This is how, for instance, Marxist, i.e. communist parties emerged.

It is a general opinion that the way parties are formed has a strong impact on their further functioning. For instance, parties formed in an extra-parliamentarian way are more centralized, disciplined, ideologically more coherent and less influenced by parliamentary groups than parties formed in a parliamentary way.

Many political parties have emerged in states without parliamentary institutions, which is why this "general scheme" of Duverger is a very narrow view that should be relativized in its meaning.

The much broader views on party emergence promoted by La Palombara and Weiner are in fact in direct correlation with **the emergence of the crises of the sys-**

tem related to: legitimation, integration and participation.

1. Legitimation crisis of the system is related to the first crisis that the monarch had in relation to liberal forces in society. The retreat of the king and the monarchy against the sway of liberal demands were the first foundations of the legitimation crisis initiating the **first division of political parties – into conservative and liberal**. Conservative parties would defend the power and might of the monarch, giving legitimacy to the power and authority of the monarch, opposed to the liberal parties that would delegitimize the power and might of the king and his supporters, insisting on total liberation from the grips and pressures of the monarchy while creating liberal relations between the state and power, on the one hand, and the citizens on the other. This crisis also happened in economically undeveloped countries of the world (particularly in Africa and Latin America) in the second half of the 20th century, when national liberation movements highlighted the need for eliminating colonial power.

2. Integration crisis happens with the dissolution of the great and powerful empires and the emergence and organisation of the first nation states in the world. The first national and nationalistic political parties emerged as a result of the crisis of imperialistic integration and the occurrence of numerous new nation and sovereign states. Thus, in the second half of the 19th century, the first parties were formed in Italy, Austria, Belgium, Germany, and other countries.

3. Participation crisis stimulates the emergence of the first labour parties as a result of the dissatisfaction of the workers with their influence in the decision-making processes in the companies where they are employed, but also due to the dissatisfaction that workers had because of the small participation in wider social decision-making processes. This crisis created the first labour parties but also the first parties of

marginalized groups who were oppressed by the bourgeoisie class until then.

These three mentioned crises of the system function as catalysts for the process of the emergence of certain parties, in accordance with other processes of the modernization of party systems.

The liberation of society from feudal pangs, as well as the development of human rights and freedoms, and foremost, the right to vote, are important preconditions for the emergence of contemporary parties in the world.²

Today, it is hard to imagine that there are contemporary states without political parties. **There are several states in the world where political parties have never been organised: Kuwait, the Maldives, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Tonga, the United Arab Emirates, Oman, West Samoa, Yemen, and the Arab Republic.**

History has shown **examples of states where parties were banned from legal functioning.** Party activities were managed and implemented by certain military structures or authoritarian leaders who did not need parties.

In political theory, there are authors who are skeptical about the parties. For instance, Jean Jacques Rousseau states that the "general will" should not be surrendered to the individual interests of the parties. The creator of the American

² Thus, in England, the expansion of the voters' rights was initiated with the Reform Election Act in 1832, and in Austria in 1867, and 1884, in France in 1848, in Germany in 1867, although the authority of the parliament in this country was insignificant in relation to the rights of the ruler, in Belgium in 1893 etc. The voters' rights as a foundation of the system of civil, parliamentary democracy, at the beginning of the 19th century were narrowly defined. Thus, for example, in France, prior to the reforms, the status of a voter was granted to only 3%-5% of the adult population, while in the USA, prior to the election reforms, only 40,000 voters participated on the elections. There are authors who claim that parties are "offspring of the industrial revolution" and that it was industrialization itself that stimulated citizens to establish associations on more massive scale as that of the political parties. See: Daadler, H. (1966), *Parties, Elites and Political Development*, Political Parties and Political Development, Eds. La Palombara, M. Weiner, Princeton University Press, Princeton, (p.52).

constitution, J. Madison, shared the same view. In his opinion, parties always place their interests before the common good of the citizens and the state. In each party, individual interests feed off the community's resources. The totality of the individual interests quite often imposes over the general interests of the citizens, due to which, according to the theoreticians and party critics, parties cannot be trusted. They easily impose themselves on the state and the state becomes their prey.

In the US, there was a long-term distrust towards parties expressed in the form of anti-party sentiment, evident since the very creation of the federation. In the period of this so-called "anti-partism", there were reactions manifested in the direction of limiting party activities. For instance, at the beginning of the 20th century, the progressive reformists in many American federal states were striving to introduce laws that would ban parties from participating on local elections. With these solutions the parties would not be totally removed from the election process, but their influence would be reduced at least on the local level. However, modern American theory has gradually managed to affect the process of dissolution of anti-partism, since modern American democracy itself is based on the legitimacy of the interests and distinctions. Therefore, it is quite normal to see the parties in the American system as an inevitable segment.

It is believed that democracy is an essential form of political governance in a state with political parties. Quite often, political parties are a constitutional category. Thus, for example, in Article 49 from the **Constitution of Italy from 1947, political parties are recognized for their significant role in "determining the national policy"**.

Even the **Constitution of Spain from 1978 defines parties as components of the system, as well as the Constitution of Sweden which declares the great role**

of parties in shaping the democratic will in the state.

Defined this way, parties differ from interest groups (or pressure groups), as well as from social movements. Parties differ from interest groups in that the latter do not aim to come to power, nor participate in the government, but to affect the government indirectly, externally, by delivering their requirements to the parties and by influencing party policies through their interests.

It is more difficult to make a difference between a party and a social movement. Of course, this difference can be found in the scope of the social foundation for inclusion, as well as in the way of internal organisation.

It is typical for these movements not to have a strong formal internal organisation as parties do. **The term social movement implies a special form of collective behavior in which the motif for action derives considerably from the standpoints and wishes of its members.**

As a rule, they have a weaker organisational structure than the parties since the essence for the existence of these movements is in the dedication to the ideas and their realization through social activism, and not in formal membership and organisational structure. The very term movement reminds of an organisational form that is in a state of constant movement and not in a static condition, nor in a state of tranquility.

Unlike spontaneous actions (demonstrations, uprisings, etc.), **social movements have planned, directed and fully set activities.** Their further development and functioning does not exclude the possibility of establishing a political party. However, the basic difference between parties and social movements is the fact that the former have internal organisation, while the latter do not. It is typical for these movements to have hundreds of thousands, even millions of people acting in the same direction even when they are not members of parties, trade unions or other organisa-

tions. Their functioning can be explained with the fact that members of movements accept the same integrative ideas and values as their “cement”.

The fact that a great number of people act in the same direction, without any organisational connections or hierarchical relations is what gives movements iconic strength. Parties mainly dissolve when the vital centre (the party leadership) is abolished, which is impossible to happen to movements because of their diffuseness. A movement is characterized by its great vitality when struggling to attain its goals. It continues its action with unconstrained intensity, regardless of the losses suffered in reality. Inside a social movement there typically is a network of institutions and organisations (parties, trade unions etc.) aiming to influence the movement’s orientation.

2. DEFINING A POLITICAL PARTY

In political theory there are **numerous and various definitions of political parties.**

In contemporary theory, **a party generally is defined as a team of people, or a team of politicians, whose most important organisational goal is to come to power.** This team makes promises to the citizens in order to gain their trust, which is the most important thing in winning the power. In addition, it is important to mention that citizens either support or do not support the programme of the team, and not any individuals in the team. In this direction it can be said that the **party is a collective form of organised citizens with political goals and ambitions.**

In American political theory, very frequently, political parties are defined as coalitions of interest groups and activists whose goal is to come to power and to achieve their interests through the government – starting from the most personal, material interests, to interests related to national goals and

ideologically set tasks. The coalition of these political interest groups develops an agenda, and creates a programme with mutually acceptable policies; it accepts candidates for the political functions that demonstrate the closest relation to party policies and works actively in the field to have these candidates win the elections. In this centrist group view on parties, the candidates, if selected appropriately, play the key role in promoting their party programme and putting their party policies into effect. Most party research shows that voters can best decide which party offers the things they want most, which is why each party should strive to monitor the level of (dis)satisfaction of the voters with the party's field work.³

However, there are some considerations that claim that parties are no great friends of national sovereignty. According to these, parties mainly create their agendas and programmes and "force" citizens to accept and join them in the election contest. While the mid-20th century American literature on political parties was largely promoting the view that interest groups play the central role in parties as a "raw material for politics",⁴ now, in the 21st century, these views have changed radically. Parties are studied separately from interest groups through specific party features and as a dominant segment of the legislative and executive power in a state.

Thus, according to **Benjamin Disraeli**, "the party is an organisation with organised thinking". In the view of **Charles Chope**, "the party is an organised structure of citizens who share the same views on statehood", and according to **Jean-Paul Sartre**, "the party is a means to come to power. The goal is always the same: power."

³ See: **Adams, James, Samuel Merrill, and Bernard Grofman (2005), A Unified Theory of Party Competition, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press**, as well as in: **Aldrich, John H. (1995), Why Parties?, Chicago: University of Chicago Press**, **Aldrich, John H. (2011), Why Parties? A Second Look, Chicago: University of Chicago Press**.

⁴ See: **Schattschneider, E.E. (1942), Party Government, Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, Chapter 2**.

Reine-Olaf Schulze defines “the party as a political group of citizens who share the same views and whose goal is to implement common policies in the system”, while **Besson** thinks that “parties are free citizens’ organizations that provide programme suggestions as solutions to the country’s problems, who determine candidates for MPs and other candidates for public state functions in order to realize their programme”.

Edmund Burke considers “the political party as an organisation of citizens united to achieve common national interests on the basis of principles acceptable for all of them”. The modern understanding of a party, articulated for the first time by **Joseph Schumpeter in his work “Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy”**, considers “the party as a group of members in synchronized action whose goal is to come to power in a competitive struggle”. Schumpeter himself studied the degree to which the election contest drives politicians’ and party activities. “What businessmen cannot understand is that the way they treat oil, politicians treat votes”.

Contrary to Burke, who claimed that different parties could not adopt the same political programmes and action platforms, Schumpeter believed that this is possible and happens quite often. On the other hand, Antony Downs consequently related these views and imposed the position that the differences in party programmes and action platforms among the parties are a logical consequence of the pressure of the election contest of the parties.⁵ Therefore, leading contemporary theories on parties continue to further develop this intellectual tradition. The parties, and the politicians who lead them, play a very significant role – they compete to win the political positions and functions in the system.

It is interesting to note that even European continental theorists accept this relation between the parties and the

⁵ See: **Downs, Anthony (1957), An Economic Theory of Democracy, New York: Harper and Row.**

election contest, although they study in detail the rest of the organisational activities of importance for the parties' functioning. Thus, for example, in the German Law on Political Parties, they are defined as "associations of citizens that permanently or in the long run affect the formation of the political will, who represent people's interests, and who according to their position in the system, their greatness and organisational strength, as well as according to membership can offer enough guarantee for the seriousness of the set goals...".⁶

Table No.1: Other definitions for political parties⁷

David Hume	"Parties are groups of people who are connected personally, on a (1741) friendly basis or for some specific interests."
Edmund Burke	"The party is an organisation in which people are connected because of (1770) certain national interests, in accordance with specific principles respected by them."
Walter Bagehot	"The party is the essence of the parliament: there have never been elections (1889) without political parties."
Max Weber	"Parties live in the home of power and government. Their (1922) activities are directed towards attaining the social power, in order to influence the joint action in the system."

The contemporary political party is generally defined as a **voluntary, relatively permanent, political organisation whose goal is to come to power or if in power, to stay there as long as possible.**

⁶ See in the German Law on Political Parties, Article 2, Line 1, from 1967. And in the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Germany, in Article 21, which states, "the parties take part in creating the political will of the people. They should be established as voluntary organisations, and their internal organisation should be in accordance with the democratic principles. They have to show their property and their financial sources transparently and publicly, as well as their use of the financial resources. The party that, regardless of reason, aim or behavior, would like to undermine, or abolish the freely established democratic order, or to threaten the existence of the Federal Republic of Germany will be considered against the Constitution. In such a case due measures will be taken by the Constitutional Court." See: <https://www.btg-bestellservice.de/pdf/80201000.pdf>

⁷ See: **Caramani, Daniele editor (2014), Comparative Politics Third Edition, Oxford University Press, (p. 201)**

The political party is a **relatively permanent, voluntary political organisation, inspired by a certain ideology upon which it constructs its political programme and the aims for its functioning, whose goal is to come to power, individually or in a coalition with other parties**, or to stay in power as long as possible for the interests of its members, sympathizers and civilian supporters.

Therefore, according to the author Joseph LaPalombara, the contemporary definition of a political party consists of four elements:

- 1. The political party is a political organisation with an internal party structure (organs, bodies, etc.);**
- 2. The party aims to come to power or to stay in power as long as possible;**
- 3. The party has accepted an ideology upon which it constructs its political and election programme; and**
- 4. The party always intends to secure greater legitimacy from the citizens, greater public support by satisfying as many of the citizens' interests as possible.**

2.1. Party structure (organisation) – main traditions

Each political party has its own party structure, i.e. internal organisation that is stipulated in detail in the party statute. In political theory there are **three main traditions studying how and why organisational aspects of a party differ from the other.**

- 1. The first tradition** analyses the differences between political parties in their structure, i.e. the **party organisation as a result of the different application of the models of**

election party contests. Maurice Duverger and Leon Epstein provide the best reviews of this tradition.

Thus, **according to Duverger, there are two kinds of party structures: direct (horizontal) and indirect (vertical).**⁸

The direct party structure, and the way it is arranged, differs in parties according to the degree of the party's unity and centeredness, while the indirect party structure according to the degree of their internal dispersion and decentralization.

According to Duverger, **there are four basic organisational forms in the party structure, including: caucus, board, cell, and militia.** The electoral success of a party depends on the acceptance of these organisational forms. Thus, it seems that the board is becoming a greater challenge to the caucus, since it seems that with it the party can secure more political resources in the election and political contest.

The election contest constantly stimulates the parties to change their organisational forms in the interest of their own competitiveness. Depending on the selected model of election contest, quite often there are certain readjustments to the organisational forms within the party as well. If the party has chosen a model of an election contest that demands great mobilization of the party membership, for instance, organising mass gatherings in every city or every major settlement, then the party needs to redesign the party organisation as well. This requires greater engagement of party members and sympathizers in the field and a more intensified organisational commitment than in cases where the party has chosen a door-to-door model of an election contest, or a contest through greater media presentation of the party programme and promises, with less membership mobilization and where no major changes in the internal party structure are needed.

⁸ See: **Duverger, Maurice (1951), Political Parties: Their Organization and Activity in the Modern State, New York: Wiley.**

Unlike Duverger, **Epstein** considered party organisation as nothing else but a response to the contest for gaining as many citizens' votes as possible. While Duverger speaks of the need to harmonize the party structure to suit the selected model of election contest, Epstein held the opposite thesis that the contest, and the party race for citizens' votes, is a response to the question of what form of internal party organisation each party needs. Epstein demonstrated his thesis with American parties, which are pretty informal and decentralized and which, according to him, are the best solution for running modern election campaigns.

In circumstances of modern and contemporary Internet and computer technology, as well as with numerous research centres of public opinion, etc., political parties do not need crude internal party structures nor a large membership to mobilize the electorate, as Epstein concludes. What parties need is a lot of money to buy the services they require. Money, on the other hand, comes to a much greater degree from strong and concerned interest groups, as well as from rich individual donors, rather than from the membership fee of party members.

2. The second tradition studies the organisational structure of the parties through the institutional models, i.e. through the dynamics of establishing the organisation and through the relations between different elements in the party. This tradition does not deny the importance of the election contest for the party structure reforms but puts emphasis on the role of the internal party relations. **Angelo Panebianco and Max Weber** are some of the most prominent representatives of this tradition.

This tradition is more limited than the previous since it "excludes the parties functioning outside Western Europe". In fact, Panebianco's analyses refer only to parties functioning in France, Germany, Italy, and the United

Kingdom. In his view, **the party's organisational structure can be explained through the interaction of two variables:**

- » The first variable is **the genetic model that answers the question how a party is formed**, and
- » The second variable is **the degree of the party's institutionalization.**

According to this author, there are **three factors that determine the way of forming the party's organisational structure:**

1. The party is formed according to the principle of "territorial penetration" or the principle of "territorial diffusion" (or in combination of the two principles). While the first principle animates local and regional party organs and decentralizes party power, the second principle centralizes local party elites and directs them to the party center on a national level.

2. The presence or absence of external institutions that "sponsor" the party. This is an important issue related to the legitimacy of the party, i.e. whether the leadership gets its legitimacy from within the party, in conditions when it is not financed by external organisations, or the legitimacy of the leader and the leadership is created by external organisations by financing the party and leadership structure, and

3. The party's leader was or was not part of its forming.

Panebianco, also, explains the relation that exists between the two variables, the genetic model and the degree of institutionalization. According to him, parties that develop through the process of territorial penetration often acquire strong internal party organs, unlike those who develop through the principle of territorial diffusion and have weak internal party organs due to the competition between the local party elites for gaining more control over the party resources.

3. The third tradition is known as a social tradition and explains the relation between the party organisation and the resources available to the party.

In this tradition, the organisational structure is a reflection of the approach that parties have towards the required resources. Parties implement various kinds of activities: running election campaigns, maintaining contacts with members, creating new policies and strategies for selected party officials, mobilizing public support for the party programme, etc. All of these activities require means and resources to be exploited. The degree and the quality of the organisational profiling of the party itself depends on the available resources and the accessibility to larger or lesser financial funds. If the means are greater in quantity, this could, of course, affect the quality, but also the kinds of organisational forms in the party. And vice versa.

Some theoreticians, such as **Maurice Duverger, Robert Michels, Moisey Ostrogorsky, and Selznick** define the party organisation as a basic element for its study. Thus, Duverger thinks that contemporary parties differ by their internal organisation or party structure. Regarding this, **Michels and Selznick claim that party organisation has a much bigger advantage in relation to other elements. They particularly highlight the hierarchical aspect of the organisation** that enables them to draw conclusions on the nature and character of the party.

In his work "Democracy and the Organisation of the Political Parties", Ostrogorsky , claims that representing individual interests of party members has lost its significance due to the increased influence of the party machinery and the control that party boards practice over the most significant party officials. This viewpoint is further studied by **Robert Michels in his work "Political Parties" through the notorious "iron law of the oligarchy"**, which is known by the statement "the one who says organisation says oligarchy".

Michels is one of the most prominent theoreticians who tried to analyze the power structure through the party elite in the German Social Democratic Party. He confirmed that the power in the party, regardless of the formal organisation for the democratic party, was concentrated in the hands of a small group of party leaders. **In Michels' view, "the iron law" explains the inevitable failure of democratic socialism and destroys the myth of political democracy.** ⁹

The contemporary version of Michels' theory is presented by **Robert McKenzie in his book "British Political Parties"**, where he disputes the viewpoint dominant in British society that the Conservative Party is elitist and leading, while the Labour Party has a high degree of internal party democracy. In McKenzie's view, the division of power in both parties is almost the same, regardless the model of their internal organisation. In both parties there is a dominance of power of the parliamentary leaders.

2.1.1. Models of party organisation

The models of party organisation are tightly related to the types of political parties. Thus, in theory there are several types of parties, including: **clientelistic or elite parties, mass parties, catch-all parties, cartel and anti-cartel parties, and business parties.**

1. The oldest "modern" parties are the clientelistic (elite or caucus) parties that were established within the frameworks of national parliaments. That is why clientelistic parties are considered to have a parliamentary background. There is also a theory that says that the

⁹ See: **Hejvud, Endru (2004), Politika, Clio, Agora, (p.478).** Michels' critics highlight that his conclusions are based on disputable psychological theories, and that they are too general, as well as that they are based on analysis of a political party in a specific moment. In reality, party elites are divided in fractions, while the larger membership is less obedient and less active than what Michels claimed was the case.

English parliament is the first to have established and developed caucuses within its internal organisation. In the era of highly limited voters' rights, all MPs who have created the clientelistic (caucus) parties owe their selection generally to the mobilization of their clients, or the clients that support them, who have no need for an intensified party action in the field besides the regular activities within the MPs electoral unit. Therefore, there has never been a need for larger party organisation in terms of establishing a specific party infrastructure (party's head office, local branches, etc.). The activities of these parties used to be directed exclusively within the parliament in order to strengthen the parliamentary group. However, as the voters' rights expanded, elite parties started developing their local organisations. The most famous organisation of this kind was the "Birmingham caucus" of Joseph Schumpeter in England¹⁰, as well as the forms that enabled better coordination between the MPs and their clientelistic party (establishing the famous "info points" in parliament). In the 21st century, parties in the US, and to a certain degree the Liberal Democratic Party in Japan, as well as the right wing in France, have accepted and further developed this caucus party concept.

2. Mass parties were developed in the second half of the 19th century in opposition to elite parties That is why these parties are considered to have an extra-parliamentarian origin. The mass parties start their organisation through the so-called **leadership corps that initially organises the party's head office and then the other parts of the party structure in order to win the elections and gain as much public support in the field as possible.** Unlike the clientelistic parties, which focus on attaining "national interests", the mass parties focus on the protection of the interests of a specific social group, which is why they quite often supplement the exist-

¹⁰ See: **Schumpeter, J.A. (1943), Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy, New York: Harper&Row.**

ing organisation of that group (for instance, the trade unions). The members of these organisations are their primary political source. The national congress is considered to be the highest decision-making body that elects the party executive committees, the president, as well as the party secretary. In reality, things work rather differently than what theory suggests. The dominating element in the internal party structure is the elite which, in fact, are the founding body of the party, posing an open dilemma whether the true authority of mass parties derives from bottom-up or from top-down processes.

3. Catch-all parties emerged as a result of the expansion of voters' rights and the changes that took place in the mass parties as a result of party pressure on public services, by increasing the responsibility and legitimacy of the direct connection with the electorate, in opposition to the mediating role of the parties in the society until then. The result of these changes was the weakened role of party members against the strengthened role of professionals and the loss of mutual interdependence between the parties and privileged interest groups (particularly the trade unions).

These changes, according to Kirchheimer, identify this type of parties, which to a great degree resemble the old clientelistic parties in their organisation and action strategy. As the catch-all parties developed they became exceptionally dependent on professionals in the sphere of media, interviewers-researchers of the public opinion, political consultants, etc., as well as on the idea for creating an electoral professional party as an alternative to, or as a variant of, the catch-all party model.¹¹ Although almost all electoral professional parties have an organisation with formal membership, their essence started changing as a response to the requirements of the political "market" and the need for engaging professional consultants.

¹¹ See: **Panebianco, A. (1988), Political Parties: Organization and Power, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.**

4. Cartel parties are a result of increased globalisation and the decreased ability of governments to truly maintain control over their economies. The financial crisis, prevailing mostly in the 21st century, or more specifically, in the second decade of this century, has undermined citizens' trust in the parties, reflecting a crisis in party loyalty and discipline among party members.

The change of technology in election campaigns increased the expenses of the electoral competitiveness. These processes introduced many changes on the party stage. Thus, **according to Katz and Mair, catch-all parties are intensively going through their own transformation into cartel parties.** These processes introduce at least four major changes in the relations between parties, citizens, and the state, as well as between parties and their members.

1. The parties in power, or those who stand the best chance to winning the elections, create a so-called cartel that should protect them from electoral risks (i.e. transferring or bypassing the responsibility from the parties to politically responsible agencies, or by minimizing the differences between the electoral winners and losers), as well as to compensate for their scarce resources with direct subsidies from the state.

2. The parties minimize the significance of their representative role on behalf of their governing role. Defending their policies in the state (including those created by bureaucrats, the "non-political" agencies, such as central banks), they actually become agencies of the state rather than agencies of society

3. Cartel parties intend to increase the formal power of the party members and, in certain cases, they allow increased participation in the promotion of their party policies to supporters who are not formal party members. They allow this political strategy as a way to keep the intra-party democracy alive.

4. Cartel parties often replace party members in central party organs with hired consultants due to the advantages of professional expertise in relation to political experience and activism, thus removing another possible source of danger for party leaders.¹²

5. Anti-cartel parties have a different philosophy of action from cartel parties. They are particularly extant in Scandinavian countries, represented by green parties in the left wing and by Scandinavian progressive parties in the right wing.

6. Hopkin and Paolucci were those who introduced business parties in political theory. Forza Italia, also known as Silvio Berlusconi's party, is considered a prototype of this kind of parties. Berlusconi is a businessman who became Prime Minister of Italy mainly due to the capital he owns in Italy and the help of his employees who were fully engaged in the elections. Besides the party organisation he created in the field, his employees played the main role of mobilizing the electorate to the advantage of Berlusconi. Thus, according to the authors, these parties are "strictly functional and aiming" at elections.

¹² See: Katz, R.S. and Mair, P. (1995), "Changing Models of Party Organization and Party Democracy: The Emergence of the Cartel Party", *Party Politics*, 1 January, (p. 5-28).

Table No.2: Models of party organisation¹³

	Elite, caucus or clientelistic parties	Mass parties	Catch-all-parties	Cartel parties	Business parties
Period of dominance	With the strengthening of parliamentarianism until the massive expansion of the voters' rights	Since the expansion of the voters' rights until 1950	Since 1950 until today	Since 1970 until today	Since 1990 until today
Place of organising	Parliamentary origin	Extra-parliamentary origin	Evolution of previously existing parties	Evolution of existing parties	Extra parliamentary initiative of political entrepreneurship
Organisational structure	Minimal and local party head offices subordinated to the party in public authority	Members are organised in local branches, and the central organ of the party answers to the elected party congress	Members are organised in branches, but are marginalized in the decision-making process. The central party organ is subordinated to the party in public authority	The central organ that is dominant from the party in public authority, often replaces party members with consultants. Party decisions are ratified in a plebiscite by members and sympathizers	Minimal formal organisation, with hierarchical control from an autonomous corporation and its employees

¹³ See: **Caramani, Daniele (2014), Comparative Politics, Third Edition, Oxford University Press, (p. 205).**

The nature and role of member	The elite are the only "members"	Great and homogeneous members. Leadership that is formally accountable to the membership	Heterogeneous members primarily organised as a support to the leaders of the elites	Difference between members and supporters. Members are seen more as individuals rather than organised structure	Minimal and irrelevant party membership
Primary basis of resources	Personal wealth and connections	Membership fee and donations from organisations	Donations and contributions from interest groups and individuals	State subsidies	Corporate sources

2.2. The desire to come to power or stay in power as long as possible

The most important goal for every party that exists is to come to power, or stay in power for as long as possible. The government, regardless whether on a local, central, or maybe even supranational level, is the key energy that drives each political party to operate, create projects, draft policies, provide solutions, and design a vision for the state or the system in which it exists.

All democratic political systems **are founded on the category change of government.** It is a standard and most desired constitutional category which, at least in democratic systems, does not happen via coups or revolutions, but rather through regular, democratic and free elections. The various forms of government takeover that are not in accordance with the democratic concept and the existing constitutional norms for government takeover can be defined as a **political coup.**

Moreover, a state coup is a narrower form of a political coup. The state coup is directed towards the centre of political power, towards the central seat of the government. The

state coup is organised by a certain number of people who have been installed into the institutions of the system, often by the opposition, who intend to form a new political elite, i.e. to take over the government, with the assistance of the security structures or secret agencies and without direct public participation.

The conclusion is that a state coup is a violent way of government takeover. It is characterized by a relatively small but highly organised group of people who appear as elite executors, who without including the people, i.e. outside the electoral confrontation with the citizens, aim at taking over the government and change the whole political elite in power. A state coup is also defined as a "top-down revolution" or even as a "court revolution". **Some political theoreticians define a coup d'état as "a kind of conspiracy, or even as its highest form..."¹⁴ иако многу попрецизно е да се одреди како збир на сложени општествени и политички појави, отколку само како конспирација.**

It is necessary to make difference between a state coup on the one, and a putsch on the other hand. A putsch¹⁵ is a special military form of state coup which is carried out exclusively by the national armed forces. An important feature of the putsch is that the highest authority is either taken over by army officers, or these people participate as a dominant factor in establishing a mixed military-civilian government. The putsch organisers are often affiliated directly or indirectly with certain foreign structures, and the technique for carrying out the putsch is relatively the same as with the other forms of a state coup.

It is important to highlight that all forms of political coups are directed towards the violent overthrow of the government.

¹⁴ See: **Hobsbawm, E.J. (1977), Revolution un Revolte, Frankfurt am Main, (p. 149).**

¹⁵ The putsch is present in the African countries, but also in the countries of South America. Direct interference of the army in overthrowing government state officials, and taking over the highest state authority through a putsch can be seen in many European countries as well. For instance, in Greece in 1967, in three occasions in Turkey (1960, 1971, and 1980), in Portugal in 1974, in Romania in 1989 etc.

And what, in fact, is government? How do we define government?

In encyclopedias and in theory, government is defined in various ways. Thus, for instance, in the **Merriam-Webster Dictionary there are three definitions of government:**

1. According to the first definition, **“government is defined as the possibility for a group of people to control a state** and make decisions for a country.”
2. According to the second definition, **“government is defined through the system (institutions, organs, etc.) used for controlling a state”,** and
3. According to the third definition, **“government is defined as a process or manner of controlling a country”.**

The political power, or the government, is defined as a collection of political processes assumed and implemented by party members who have come to power through elections, within the system and its institutions, in accordance with the promises made in the winning electoral programme of the party, i.e. the parties.

Professor Damerow gives another, more precise, definition for the **government that he relates to with its “primary responsibility in creating the public policy for the whole society”.** In addition, the professor highlights that the government is “a control mechanism for each society”. The government creates policies that keep the society functioning in a certain direction.

According to the **Black’s Law Dictionary’s** definition, the government is explained through the institutions that regulate the relations between state members, on the one hand, as well as between society and other segments, on the other.

The government is also explained through the authority of the persons involved in the decision-making process on behalf

of the whole state in order to implement the drafted policies and other goals, as well as to maintain the constitutional order.

The government, whether observed from the aspect of the system or from the functioning of the institutions, from the aspect of the people responsible for implementing the assumed obligations or from the aspect of the processes happening within, **is related with both power and authority at the same time.**

The government is an institutionalized power and capability to influence the system and determine the rules (the constitution, the laws, and other acts) in the state, to assist the citizens in maintaining relations with each other and to enable a continuous, secure and safe realization of the relations and processes within the state.

The concepts of government and politics are mutually related and interdependent in a sense that politics, whether **governmental** (observed from the aspect of the party's and interest groups' actions), **economic** (observed through the work of the bureaucracy, the normative organisation of the work position, etc.) or **interpersonal** (encompassing the relations between men and women, children and adults, etc.), is always related to power.

According to Giddens, power is defined as an ability of individuals or a group of people to impose themselves on others for their own interests and needs, even in conditions when the others refuse this imposition. Power, in certain cases, involves direct use of force, although it mainly imposes itself by developing and imposing ideas and ideologies that justify the actions of the powerful.

According to Max Weber, power is a probability that one individual within the social relations with the others is in a position to execute his or her will, whether there is resistance to it or not, and regardless of which

foundation this probability is based on. According to the typology of power by Weber, there is a difference between power gained by use of physical force or coercion, and power based on authority.

Table No.3: Types of power according to Weber’s typology¹⁶

Types of power			
Power gained by use of force or coercion		Power based on authority	
People are forced to do as they are told under the threat of punishment (for instance, power exercised in prison).	<p>Charismatic</p> <p>People “yield” due to the personal qualities of the person telling what should be done. The most famous charismatic people in history are: Jesus Christ, Hitler, Napoleon Bonaparte, Mao Zedong, etc.</p>	<p>Traditional</p> <p>People base their power in accordance with the traditional authority due to the need to continue the tradition and support its protection and its continuation within the frames of the existing values and social relations (for instance, the power of the royal family in Britain).</p>	<p>Legally rational</p> <p>Power based on this type of authority gives orders and expects people to obey in accordance with their position in the system achieved in a legal and legitimate way. This form of power is typical for today’s modern functioning of the state, and is quite often recognized as “bureaucratic” power, because it is based on the individual position in the social hierarchy, rather than the person him/herself.</p>

¹⁶ See: **Power and Politics, Basic Concepts**, www.sociology.org.uk.

According to **Oppenheim, power is the ability to influence, limit or punish, which shows that the political power is an ability to determine, execute and legitimize each object of power in its domain.**¹⁷

Power seen as supremacy always contains a certain form of violence in its essence, which is effected by the manifestation of power. Violence can also be seen as a manifestation of the lack of power, or as a sign of weakening of the authority and its decline, where, according to Mills, violence is seen as "the ultimate form of power".¹⁸

The use of force is a means for achieving and maintaining power, while violence is a way of expressing and exercising power when the entity exercising power maintains its influence through the force of communication with the entity submitting to power.

According to **the content**, political violence can be: **physical and psychological**, while according to **the manner of its perpetration: direct and indirect**. According to **the perpetrators, there is individual and collective violence**, and according to **the criterion of distribution there is: mass and located violence**.

According to the length of time, political violence can be **short-term or long term, i.e. violence resulting from long-term activities and processes**.

In addition, **according to the criterion of rationality violence can be rational, directed only towards the entity subjected to it, as well as irrational**. On the other hand, there is institutional violence which differs from structural violence in its regulations and actions encompassing everyone in society.

¹⁷ See: **Oppenheim, F.E. (1961), Dimensions of Freedoms: An Analysis, New York, (p. 7).**

¹⁸ See: **Mills, C.W. (1956), The Power Elite, New York, (p. 171).**

Otherwise, in political theory there are several **basic emergent forms of political violence: threatening with the use of force, coercion, pressure, psycho-physical abuse, political murder, assassination and diversion.**

Besides the basic, there are also **complex emergent forms of violence,¹⁹ including: violent protests, riots, unrest, terrorism, subversions, repression, terror, uprising and war.** These complex forms of violence do not simply represent a sum of several basic forms, but their interdependent and dynamic connection.²⁰

Thomas Hobbes, in Chapter 10 of his book "Leviathan", specified an interesting condition, that in fact the very perception of someone's power by the genuine and potential subjects can contribute significantly towards the real increase of the potentials of that person's power. The bigger the perceptions of the subjects of power the better the chances for their obedience and willingness to realize the interests and goals of the assigned orders. **If political power is institutionalized and rests on the principles of legal capability for decision-making, where the holders of these positions have institutionalized opportunity to make decisions, then it is called political authority. Therefore, political authority is a form of power.**

According to Sven Papeke, each form of authority is specific in its own way. Thus, for instance, the political authority in industrial societies "has a complementary function with the economic conditions in the state, while the function

¹⁹ Every use of coercion is seen as violent activity, no matter whether there is direct or indirect use of force (direct or indirect violence). Coercion is a condition in which force is imposed by the fact that those subjected against their own will, have to conduct certain actions. On the other side, pressure emerges as a form of violence when the interest of the entity putting pressure is to preserve the power resources. Moreover, pressure can be open or concealed. As a form of open pressure, threatening with the use of force can emerge in an institutionalized and informal kind, as well as in the form of legal, legitimate, or as illegal, and illegitimate violence.

²⁰ See: **Simeunović, Dragan (1994), Osnovi političkih nauka-praktikum, Izdavačko preduzeće "Ferko", Beograd, (p. 128).**

is not identical. The administrative authority, which is formed after winning the elections, remains secondary in relation to the true pressures...".²¹

2.2.1. Differences between the concepts of authority and governance

In political theory the **concept of authority is often confused with the concept of governance**, which, just as authority, is defined as an institutionalized form of power. In accordance with this, each group of people organised around the mechanisms for realizing certain goals and for controlling the mutual relations can be defined as governance. Political governance is one of the "political orders" functioning together with the orders of the church, the university, the corporations etc. It differs from the rest by the fact that the state is a community where membership is not based on voluntary basis. This kind of perception is dominant in the Anglo-Saxon political culture.²²

In the narrow sense of the word, the concept of governance is used to describe institutions in political authority, which is closer to the traditional concept of the state. On the other hand, in European continental tradition, the concept of governance denotes the activities of the main levers of state authorities, management of state affairs, or even more precisely, **the way the legislative, executive and judicial organs are functioning**.

The renowned theoretician **Hennis** considered that the concept of governance does not only denote institutional order but also "special and goal-directed action".²³ According to **Brunner** too, the concept of governance in the narrow sense of the word denotes the whole of state organs and their sepa-

²¹ See: **Papeke, S. (1985), Machtfragen, "Marksizam u svetu", 1/85.**

²² See: **prof. d-r Milan Matić, prof. d-r Milan Podunavac, Politički sistem, Teorije i principi, Fakultet Političkih nauka, Beograd, (p.135).**

²³ Ibid

rate divisions, while in the broader sense, governance is related to the political system, defining it as “a political order in which the community founds its public action”. This order is established on different elements that represent the whole.

According to Brunner, governance has three major components:

- 1. Empirical** elements of governance that represent the political power’s matrix. This includes the **holders of political power** as a real structure of the political system;
- 2. Normative elements of governance integrated in the constitution, and the laws;** and
- 3. Ideological components,** which contain the values and behavior of community members and secure the legitimacy of the order.²⁴

Governance that has legitimate institutionalized power is considered legitimate. Contrary to this, illegitimate governance is possible only through repressive violence that should secure absolute obedience.

2.2.2. Party coalition and types of coalitions

A democratic government is a coalition government by definition. In many countries governments are explicitly comprised of several political parties. Even in countries with one-party governments (as, for instance, the United Kingdom), the winning political party that has gained parliamentary majority, almost without exception, is a coalition of interests.

The difference is that in certain cases majority parties form coalitions after the elections, while in other cases prior to the elections. The main question that arises in relation to the coalitions is whether establishing coalitions and the electoral contest are the key elements to satisfying citizens’ interests in society?

²⁴ See: **Brunner, G. (1979), Vergleichende Regierungslehre, Paderborn, (p. 15).**

What is the difference between governments established by one party and those established by several parties when it comes to representing citizens' interests in society?

One consideration is that the number of parties involved in the coalition is a significant parameter for the government's efficiency. The coalition of parties behaves differently from, for instance, the coalition party. The key difference seems to be in the nature of electoral responsibility. **The separate electoral responsibilities of each party in the coalition government result in making different political decisions, contrary to, for example, the governments comprised of only one party.**²⁵

Furthermore, in political theory, a coalition is defined as a relatively permanent alliance between two or three political parties in order to gain greater influence, better political positioning, or bigger political power than the other entities on the political stage. Coalition partners should have common goals stipulated in the agreement that the coalition is legally founded on. They establish the coalition to strengthen their force, influence, and power, as well as to gain certain advantages in relation to issues of general interest, with special focus on winning more votes in elections, introducing certain legislation, establishing a coalition government, etc. All parties in the coalition should feel that their participation is a winning combination.

The main reason for establishing a new coalition, joining an existing, or upgrading a functional coalition is to gain more influence and power in the system. This goal is often achieved by joining votes on the elections, as well as by combining this activity with the other resources used in the political campaign. Through a joint appearance on the elections, the political parties can achieve much more than when appearing individually.

²⁵ See: **Kathleen Bawn Department of Political Science UCLA&Frances Rosenbluth Department of Political Science Yale University (2003), Coalition Parties versus Coalitions of Parties: How Electoral Agency Shapes the Political Logic of Costs and Benefits**, <http://www.yale.edu/polisci/rosenbluth/BawnRosenbluth2003.pdf>.

Furthermore, the parties joining a coalition should have a clear and precise goal for establishing the coalition. The coalition prior to the elections could have one set of goals, and the coalition emerging after the elections could have another.

The pre-election coalition is focusing on winning as many votes as possible in the elections for their own benefit, while the post-election coalition is focusing chiefly on establishing a coalition government and filling the positions in the state structures. In most cases, the pre-election coalition has the same goals as the post-election coalition, i.e. winning as many electoral votes as possible for full control over the governing structures, establishing a coalition government, but also filling other segments of the government with their own candidates.

There are many open issues that require consensus between the coalition partners when discussions are held to form a new coalition, or when a certain party wants to join an existing coalition. Of course, among the most important issues that require urgent consensus is the relation of forces among the political parties in the coalition and the distribution of the “winning cake”. The coalition agreement can contain other important issues, such as, for instance, exchanging information on a daily basis, mobilizing the members, informing the public on current issues, financing of the coalition, etc.²⁶

Therefore, **the coalition agreement can be a framework (general) or detailed**, with precisely determined elements in it for all major or less important issues. In politics, **the three most important resources available to the parties and the coalition are: time, money, and human resources.**

It is very important to determine the quantitative share of each resource available to each coalition partner, and,

²⁶ See: **Joining Forces: A Guide for Forming, Joining and Building Political Coalitions**, National Democratic Institute for International Affairs, https://www.ndi.org/files/2143_polpart_guide_political_coalitions_100204.pdf.

based on this, how each partner can get the biggest benefit. Moreover, it is important to determine the methods, according to which it will be determined whether the coalition partners, in accordance with what is invested, will be fully dedicated to accomplishing the responsibilities. Time is a very important resource that should not be wasted unreasonably.

Therefore, planning and outlining the responsibilities and their accomplishment deadlines is a key segment for the success of the coalition agreement. Money, also, is a key element that determines the positioning of the coalition partners in the agreement. An important factor that affects the achievement of the coalition's goals is the realistic determination of the combined budget, as well as the financial plan. In the end, the people too, party members and volunteers who are to realize the coalition's plan should be devoted people, good workers, who will be put to efficient use for achieving the coalition's goals.

Besides the criterion **time of forming the coalition**, in political theory there are other criteria for the kinds of coalitions. Thus, according to the **kind of entities forming the coalition there are:**

1. Coalitions between two or several political parties;
2. Coalitions between elected representatives, MPs who have decided to join forces in order to work together, or not to obstruct each other for their common interest. **These coalitions are also known as coalitions of parliamentary groups of various parties in the legislature.** There are also coalitions of various individual politicians from a specific region who are willing to work together in order to achieve a specific goal;
3. Coalitions between a political party and a civic organisation. The civic organisation can enter a coalition with a certain party or parties in order to assist the party to implement a certain agenda;

4. Coalitions between civic organisations. Civic organisations can agree to join their forces on the political stage in order to affect the final results when voting on a specific law.

When the parties form a coalition with the civic organisations the degree of cooperation in the established coalition should be determined. These are the open options:

1. Agreement not to compete – the parties and the candidates can decide not to compete for the same mandates and positions or in the same areas (electoral units). They can decide not to vote against the draft laws delivered by them. This kind of cooperation can be publically announced, or kept in secrecy.
2. Agreement to join forces with the party, parties, and civic organisations, which publicly declare support for them. This agreement does not have to obligate to work together or distribute resources beyond the visibly demonstrated support;
3. Agreement for distribution of resources in order to secure a victory for the coalition candidates.²⁷

What are **the advantages of creating a new or joining an existing coalition?**

There are numerous potential advantages of working in coalitions for the parties, but also for the civic organisations. By joining forces in a coalition, there is an opportunity for both parties and organisations to gain more benefits than by working alone. Coalitions can achieve better results by obtaining certain influence and power. Coalitions can provide more ways to their group or party members for capacity building of their organisations, as well as the expansion of the base that supports them. Part of the coalition members can focus

²⁷ See: **Kathleen Bawn, Martin Cohen, David Karol, Seth Masket, Hans Noel, and John Zaller, A Theory of Political Parties: Groups, Policy Demands, and Nominations in American Politics,** <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/csdi/TheoryofParty.pdf>.

on strengthening their capacities in a certain area while their partners in the coalition can strengthen their capacities in other areas. In this way, by dispersing their influence they can achieve much greater results than without the coalition. The partners in the coalition are able to learn from each other's experiences and gain new skills and abilities. Coalition members can increase their knowledge and abilities by joining forces and exchanging experiences.

The different parties or partners in the coalition enable diversity, which contributes towards satisfying more interests of the citizens.

On the other hand, there are certain potential disadvantages of joining a coalition. Instead of starting from certain common and general positions when acting together, the coalition can be directed towards making compromises to determine the priorities and principles of their actions. This can be seen as a potential weakness. Moreover, another potential weakness of the coalition could be the lack of control when sending specific messages, as well as when making tactful decisions.

Another potential disadvantage of the coalition is the loss of individual identity of the coalition members, including their names. When joining other members of the coalition, the party or group can be related to or associated with the negative aspects of the other members, which can be seen as a weakness of the coalition.

Due to these advantages and disadvantages of coalitions there are numerous challenges to joining or forming a coalition, which should be kept in mind and should be overcome. For instance, one of the key challenges for each coalition is whether there is an agreement between coalition partners on the common goals for action. The lack of a clear focus for the coalition's actions, as well as the lack of realistically determined goals that should provide the basis for the joint ap-

pearance can contribute towards the manifestation of stronger internal discrepancies, resulting in further divisions within the coalition itself.

At the same time, the very motivation between the coalition partners, as well as different reasons for the coalition's survival, or different levels of motivation, can contribute towards the (lack of) success of the coalition. Certain coalition partners can be promoted for work, as opposed to others with less motivation. Another challenge could be the need for showing understanding for the way decisions will be made in the coalition, and which partners will monitor the use of resources. A very important challenge for the coalition's survival is finding suitable mechanisms for overcoming the mutual problems.

The partners should have a clear and acceptable method for resolving conflicts within the coalition, which will be outlined in advance and approved by everyone. Maintaining confidence between the coalition partners is the key challenge in every coalition. The partners have to trust, be open and devoted to each other. Any form of mutual distrust can seriously affect the coalition's survival. In order to avoid distrust, the coalition partners should develop open and transparent work procedures. The separation of duties is an important challenge as well.

The feeling that all members have equal duties and that they have an equal share in working for the coalition's wellbeing is an important moment for the success of each coalition in the long run.

Good communication between the coalition partners, but also between them and the public, is an important segment for the success of the coalition and equally important as finding a strategy for resolving the conflicts when determining the coalition priorities. Different priorities bring the consistency of the coalition's actions into question, which is why all partners should determine their common priorities and agree on working together to achieve their common goals.

Therefore, it is necessary to reject the so-called “hidden agendas” that undermine the confidence between the partners. Another thing that should be accepted in advance is that unanimous decision-making on all issues within the coalition is an impossible task. The coalition partners should agree in advance that different opinions regarding specific issues are possible, and that respecting the different positions is an advantage, and not a drawback for the coalition. Mutual respect, respect for the partners’ interests, as well as the mutual understanding between coalition partners are the key advantages of each coalition. The credibility of the coalition, as well as its efficiency can be strengthened by clearly understanding each partner’s role within the coalition, as well as their internal duties.

2.3. Ideology as an element of defining a party

Ideology is perhaps one of the most disputable concepts in political analysis, although today the term itself is used in a neutral way, as a worldview or as a specific philosophy for society.

Coined in 1796 by the famous French philosopher **Antoine Destutt de Tracy**, the term “ideology” was initially used to denote the new “science of ideas”, which goal is to discover the sources of conscious thinking and those of human ideas. With the rationalist zeal he possessed, which was typical for the enlightenment period, **de Tracy believed that the origin of ideas can be detected objectively, and that this new science of ideas would gain the status of exact science just as, for instance, biology or zoology.** His valuable assumption is that ideology will be recognized as the queen of sciences, since all forms of research are based exactly on ideas.

The concept of ideology was assigned a more permanent meaning in the 19th century in the works of

Karl Marx. Namely, according to Marx, ideology actually is the second name for the ideas of the “ruling class” that support the class system in society and the exploitation of the workers.²⁸

The Marxist theory of ideology was further developed by **Antonio Gramsci**, who supported the thesis that the capitalist class system is not only sustained through unequal economic and political power, but also with the help of what is known as “hegemony” of bourgeoisie ideas and theories. Hegemony implies leadership or dominance, and ideological hegemony implies an ability of bourgeoisie ideas to replace the contrasted views, and in fact, to make them the common sense of the epoch.

The various implications of the term ideology can be rendered down to two basic concepts. According to its **first implication, ideology represents a totality of social consciousness of all forms of social unification** (nation, state, social groups, interest groups etc.), while according to the **second implication, ideology is a specific phenomenon in the social consciousness, which is more or less an inaccurate, illusory, limited consciousness that emerges as a consequence of many social factors.**

Ideology today can be **defined as a more or less unique collection of ideas that provide the basis for or-**

²⁸ See: **Hejvud, Endru (2004), Politika, Clio, (p. 83-84). See also: Marks, K.-Engels, F. (1974), Dela, Tom 6, Prosveta, Beograd, (p. 43).** “In its epoch, the thoughts of the ruling class are the ruling thoughts, i.e. the thoughts of the class that represents the material force of society, which at the same time are thoughts of its ruling spiritual force. The class to which the means for material production are available, at the same time has access to the means for spiritual production, so that in this way, on average, they are compliant with the thoughts of those who do not have the means for spiritual production”. The Marxian concept of ideology contains several key characteristics. First, ideology is in the circle of illusions and mystifications; it forms a false or incorrect worldview, which Engels later named “false consciousness”. Marx used ideology as a critical concept, which goal is to unveil the processes of systematic mystification. He classified his own ideas as scientific ideas, since they were precisely conceived to unveil the historical and societal deeds. Thus, the contrast between ideology and science, between lie and truth, is vital for the Marxian concept of ideology. Second, ideology is related to the social class system. Third, ideology is manifestation of authority.

ganising political action, regardless of whether its purpose is to preserve, change or destroy the existing system of power relationships. To study “ideology” means to analyze the contents of the political thought, to be interested in the ideas, the doctrine and the theory that advance the ideological tradition and develop within the different political traditions.

Moreover, as **David McMillan** says, “ideology is the most unaccepted concept in social sciences”. There are not many political concepts that are the subject of such a deep and intense dispute, as ideology is. There are two main reasons for this condition.

The first reason is related to the intensity of the debate about the role of ideas in politics, and the link between beliefs and theory, on the onehand, and material life or political behavior, on the other.

The second reason for the dispute is that the view on ideology cannot remain detached from the current clash prevailing among political ideologies themselves. Throughout most of history, the term ideology was used as a political weapon, as a means of condemning or criticizing the opponent’s ideas or belief systems.

It was not until the second half of the 20th century that a broadly applicable concept entered political theory, aiming to cover **all the various meanings of ideology, defining ideology as:**

- » a system of political beliefs;
- » a collection of action-oriented political ideas;
- » ideas of the ruling class;
- » a worldview of certain social classes or social groups;
- » a collection of political ideas articulating class or social interests;
- » a collection of ideas that put the individual in the social context and produce the feeling of collective belonging;

- » a collection of ideas used for granting legitimacy to the political system, or the regime;
- » a whole political doctrine that has the right to monopolize the truth;
- » an abstract and highly systematic collection of political ideas.²⁹

All ideologies typically provide a general outlook on the existing order, often in a form of “worldview”, they define the model of the vision for the “good society”, and explain how a certain political change can and should be made, i.e. how to reach the vision for the good society, starting from a specific worldview. Ideologies offer the intellectual map of how the society and the general worldview function. **Ideologies should be treated as paradigms, the way Thomas Kuhn treats them in his work “The Structure of Scientific Revolutions”.** Namely, he sees ideology as a collection of principles, teachings, and theories that help structure the process of intellectual research.³⁰

The ideological and political project of the party, by rule, is stipulated in a written form (programme, statute, declaration, etc.). **Ideology in the project contains two parts: an explicit and an implicit, “unuttered”, part.**

The explicit part is the part of the ideology that clearly and precisely contains all elements that should be realized (goals, tasks, and values), while the implicit, the unuttered part, is manifested with concealment and vagueness.

The ideological and political project of the party has so-called standards or paradigms that specifically determine the meaning of the individual standpoints contained in the project, and provide clear instruction for action to party members

²⁹ See: Hejvud, Endru (2005), *Političke ideologije*, Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, Beograd, (str. 6).

³⁰ See: Kuhn, T. (1962), *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.

and followers. "The relationship between the ideology and the paradigms, as Gouldner states, is similar to the relationship between the abstract and the concrete". Both the ideology and the paradigms serve as standards to help people make decisions and formulate policies. The paradigm is a relatively concrete view on what is desired and required, while the ideology is relatively general and abstract. According to Gouldner, the paradigms are the second level of concretization of the ideological project of the party; they mitigate between the ideology and the political culture in society. In fact, through the paradigms, party ideology is transformed into a specific policy. Therefore, an indicator for the degree of influence of party ideology in a specific system is not only the number of followers and supporters of the specific party, but also the degree of acceptance of their paradigms in society.

Considering the fact that they deal with abstract ideas and theories, the ideologies are very much alike the political philosophy. Although the term "ideologist" is often reserved for the followers of certain ideologies, however, in history there are examples of prominent political philosophers, such as John Steward Mill, John Loch, and Friedrich Hayek, who acted within the frameworks of certain ideological traditions, contributing towards their development.

It is interesting that on an operational level, ideologies take the form of broad political movements that mobilize the people and struggle for power. Ideologies are used to create election slogans, to build political rhetoric, to write party manifestos, as well as to frame the party programme. However, all ideologies lack clear form and internal consistency of the political philosophy. All of them are more or less coherent, due to the fact that ideologies are not hermetically confined systems of opinions, but, primarily, a fluid collection of ideas that overlap with other ideologies and transit from one to another. Such fluidity stimulates the ideological development, and leads to the emergence of hybrid ideological shapes, such as, for ex-

ample, liberal conservatism, socialist feminism, conservative nationalism, etc.³¹

Moreover, each ideology contains many divergent, or even contrasted traditions and viewpoints, which is why polemics between supporters of a same ideology can be much fiercer and contrasted than between supporters of opposed ideologies. However, what is undoubtedly true is that each ideology has one point, which, if crossed loses its identity.

Can liberalism, if detached from freedom, still remain liberalism? Would socialism, if inclining towards violence and war, still remain socialism?

According to **Michael Freeden**, the key concepts of an ideology shed light on its morphology, form and structure in an identical way to how it is done with the blueprint of a house, which clearly indicates the position of the kitchen, the living room, the bedroom, and the toilet.

Therefore, each ideology typically represents a collection of key, bordering, and peripheral concepts, which do not have to be present in total in a certain theory or teaching on how to recognise a supporter or follower of a certain ideology. For instance, a kitchen does not stop being a kitchen only because the oven or the fridge is moved from one position to another. The kitchen will remain a kitchen besides the new appliances installed in it, like a dishwasher, a microwave oven, etc. For instance, individualism, freedom and human rationality can be identified as a chain of key concepts of liberalism. The absence of any of these concepts does not necessarily compromise liberalism as a teaching, although the absence of two concepts can represent the basis for creating a new ideological configuration.³²

³¹ See: **Ratković, Radoslav (1983), Ideologija i politika, Institut za političke studije, Beograd, како и делото на: Manhajm, Karl (1968), Ideologija i utopija, Nolit, Beograd.**

³² See: **Freedon, M. (2001), Reassessing Political Ideologies: The Durability of Dissent, London and New York: Routledge, како и во: Ideologies and Political Theory: A Conceptual Approach, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.**

2.3.1. Types of ideologies

2.3.1.1. Liberalism

Each more detailed review of political ideologies has to begin with liberalism, which is often described as a meta-ideology that is capable of encompassing a wide spectrum of contrasted values and beliefs. Liberalism emerged as a result of the decline of feudalism and the development of capitalism, as a direct expression of the need of the middle class and its interest to free itself from the restraints of the monarch, and the monarchist and feudal aristocracy.

The ideas of the traditional liberals were very radical. They demanded profound, and in certain cases, revolutionary reforms. The English revolution from the 17th century, as well as the American and the French revolution at the end of the 18th century, all introduced specific liberal values to the system. The liberals were those who brought the absolute power of the monarchy and the theory of the "God-given right of the monarchs" into question. Instead of absolutism, liberals first defended the constitutional, and later the representative authority.

The term liberalism itself, implying political belonging, developed in the 19th century, first in Spain in 1812, and then in other European countries. Liberalism slowly but gradually became a dominant ideology of the industrialized West. Certain political theoreticians promoted the thesis that there is an inevitable and crucial link between liberalism and capitalism. They even promoted the thesis that economic freedom (the right to own, use and have private property at one's disposal) is an essential guarantee for political freedom.³³

Liberalism emerges in two basic forms: classical and modern liberalism, while the basic elements of liberal-

³³ Thus, Friedrich Hayek claimed that the liberal democratic political system and the respect for citizens' rights and freedoms can only be developed in the context of the capitalist economic order. See: **Hayek, F.A. von (1960), The Constitution of Liberty, London: Routledge&Kegan Paul.**

ism are: individualism (the individual has the central position), freedom, reason, equality, justice, tolerance and pluralism, agreement, and constitutionalism.

Classical liberalism is the oldest liberal tradition that developed earlier in England and the USA, and which has many things in common with: the theory of natural rights, utilitarianism, economic liberalism, social Darwinism, and ne-liberalism.

Modern liberalism, often described as the “liberalism of the 20th century”, is related to the development of industrialization. In theory, it is also known as “the marriage between the new and old liberalism” because it contains many ideological and theoretical tensions. The ideas that form the basis of modern liberalism are: individuality, positive freedom, social liberalism, and economic governance.

Table No.4: Tensions between classical and modern liberalism³⁴

Classical liberalism	opposed to	Modern Liberalism
» economic liberalism		» social liberalism
» egoistic individualism		» developmental individualism
» much bigger benefit		» personal development
» negative freedom		» positive freedom
» minimal state		» protective state
» free market economy		» economy that is managed
» justice based on rights		» justice as equity
» strict meritocracy		» care for the poor
» individual responsibility		» social responsibility
» safety net		» social welfare
» social welfare		» from the cradle to the grave

In theory, liberalism gains an even more important position in the 21st century with its most prominent representa-

³⁴ Taken from: **Hejvud, Endru (2005), Političke ideologije, (p. 66).**

tive, the American theoretician **Francis Fukuyama**, who stated in 1989: "We are witnessing the end of history, i.e. the final point of the ideological evolution of humanity and the universalization of the western liberal democracy as a final form of human authority".³⁵

However, what becomes more evident is that liberal triumphalism should be diminished by acknowledging the new challenges posed to liberals to review their own centennial positions. Therefore, quite often, liberal ideology is said to be suffering from a confidence crisis, which is evident, due to which it happens that its ideas, which used to be considered universal, are now rejected.

There are various sources of crisis, as well as attacks against liberalism. Thus, for instance, the supporters of communitarianism **Michael Sandel and Alasdair MacIntyre, reject individualism as a gullible and impossible concept** due to the fact that it observes human identity only from the inner human aspect, rather than from the social, historical and cultural context. "The liberal society that sees the human being as a subject that should have a good life, actually, threatens to degenerate the human being into an infinite egoist, incapable of cooperation and promotion of the collective good."³⁶

On the other hand, feminism too has developed its own version of "policy of differences" as a liberal element. Feminists attack liberalism as inappropriate ideology for improving the social role of women because, according to them, liberalism cannot recognize the importance of gender differences, and seemingly innocent, defends the concept of the human being with dominant male features and characteristics.

Moreover, multiculturalism, which is based on the collective concept of identity based on ethnic, racial, linguistic or any other ground, poses another challenge to liberalism. In

³⁵ See: **Fukuyama, F. (1989), The End of History, National Interest, Summer.**

³⁶ See: **MacIntyre, H. (1981), After Virtue, London: Duckworth.**

other words, according to multiculturalism, the values that are important for the group identity should be accepted as valid regardless of whether they are liberal, neoliberal, or even anti-liberal. In more recent times, even fundamentalism has become a more dominant challenge to liberalism, particularly in so-called developing countries, where political Islam is gaining dominance over liberalism. Even in Asian countries, the political systems owe their ability to sustain social stability to Confucianism rather than the influence of the liberal ideas and values, such as entrepreneurship, competition, etc.

This is why political Islam, Confucianism, as well as authoritarian nationalism are all considered to be rivals of western liberalism. It is not by accident that **John Gray states that the true heir of liberalism is pluralism**, its advantage being that it accepts both liberal and neoliberal values and institutions with equal legitimacy.³⁷

2.3.1.2. Conservatism

Conservatism is an ideology opposed to liberalism. This ideology defends the traditional values and is often explained as a negative philosophy that opposes changes in the world.

Its key elements are: tradition, pragmatism, human imperfection, organic society, hierarchy and authority, government, and ownership.

In political theory there are **several kinds of conservatism: paternalistic conservatism, the new right in a liberal and conservative form, neoliberalism, neo-conservatism, and libertarian conservatism.**

1. **Paternalistic conservatism** was developed by **Benjamin Disraeli** in accordance with the increasingly evident danger threatening to divide England in "two nations: rich

³⁷ See: **Gray, John (2000), Two Faces of Liberalism, Cambridge: Polity Press.**

and poor”, which increased the danger and fear of continuous social revolutions. Disraeli’s idea was to make an open call to the privileged and rich to recognise their interests and respond massively to the principles of duty and social responsibility in order to help the weaker and poorer citizens. This is the basis for the English principle of “a single nation”, which later became the foundation for one of the key political positions of the Tories. The rich and powerful should carry the load of social responsibility, which is actually the price for the privileges that the rich are enjoying in the system. These ideas of Disraeli affected the forming of the so-called “Tory democracy” of Lord Churchill, which was constructed on the foundations of the monarchy, the Upper House and the church, as foundations with broad social support

In fact, **the conservatism of a single nation and Christian democracy are the two main traditions of this kind of conservatism.**

The peak of the single nation tradition in the United Kingdom was achieved in the 1950s and 1960s, when the conservative government started applying a version of Keynesian social democracy, managing the economy in accordance with the goals for full employment and support for increased social welfare.

This tradition imposed itself as a balance between the universal individualism, on one side, and the collectivism of the oppressed, on the other. It is also known as an idea of the “middle way” that defended the “planned capitalism” as a mixed system, which combines the state ownership, the regulation or control of certain aspects of the economic activities with the rush of the initiative of private entrepreneurship.

Christian Democracy, as a tradition, developed after the Second World War with a greater intensity in Germany and Italy as a form of abandoning the authoritarian values of classical conservatives. This new form of conservatism ac-

cepts political democracy, but also the tradition of Catholicism. Unlike Protestantism, which promotes the idea for salvation through individual effort, Catholicism concentrates on the social group, and instead of the value of competition, it highlights the value of balance, or organic harmony.

Thus, during the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century, Catholic parties like the famous Centrum Party in Germany promoted the concepts of constitutional power, political democracy and social reforms in opposition to the Papal firm support for the aristocracy. After 1945, the newly established Christian Democratic parties started practicing a form of **democratic corporatism**, which highlights the importance of intermediary institutions, such as the church, business groups, trade unions, etc., which are related to the concept of "social partnership".

2. The new right is considered a kind of counter-revolution, particularly present after the Second World War in Europe and in the US. Namely, its basic goal for action is to direct itself against overall state interventionism in the economy of the system. The new right has reached its strongest manifestation point during the rule of Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan's policies, which shifted the focus from the state to market-oriented forms of organisation. The New Right's goal was to join the two different traditions, neo-liberalism and neo-conservatism, besides the evident tensions between them.

Moreover, the term "new right" has a broad scope and is used to encompass both the ideas for tax reduction and the requirements for greater censorship of broadcasting services or the media in general, including campaigns against immigration. In fact, the new right is a "marriage" between two contrasted ideological traditions: classical liberal economy and traditional conservative social theory. That is why in theory there is a difference between **the liberal new right and the conservative new right.**

The liberal new right fully derived from the values of classical liberalism, and particularly from neoliberalism. This tradition is anti-state. It sees the state as an “empire of coercion and lack of freedom”. Authority, no matter how successful and beneficial, is always harmful for the human being. The individual and the market should be upheld more than the state and the authority. The ideas of the free market are later abandoned on behalf of Keynesianism, whose goal was to prove that a capitalist economy is not regulated on its own, but the process of demand does it. On the other hand, **the conservative new right** or neo-conservatism considers the authority, in any sense of the word, as a solution for social disorder and fragmentation. The conservative new right is often interpreted as a form of “authoritative pluralism”. Law and order, the public morale and a national identity are the three key values that serve as a basis for this tradition. Social authoritarianism is achieved through the desire to create a strong state that reflects the firm attitude towards law and order.

Table No.5: Tensions between the liberal and conservative new right³⁸

Liberal new right	opposed to	Conservative new right
» classical liberalism		» traditional conservatism
» atomism		» organicism
» radicalism		» traditionalism
» libertarianism		» authoritarianism
» economic dynamism		» social order
» personal interest/venture		» traditional values
» equal opportunities		» natural hierarchy
» minimal state		» strong state
» internationalism		» mediocre nationalism
» pro-globalisation		» anti-globalisation

³⁸ See: **Hejvud, Endru, ibid. (p.105).**

3. Neoliberalism is the contemporary variant of the classical political economy developed in the works of Friedrich Hayek and Milton Friedman, where the key pillars that serve as a foundation of its philosophy are the market and the individual. The main goal of neoliberalism is to suppress the borders of the state, which will secure greater efficiency, economic growth and an increase of wealth. According to the supporters of this tradition, the state has a “dead hand” that suffocates private initiative and hinders entrepreneurship. In their view, the state’s nurturing role stimulates a culture of dependence and undermines individual freedom.

4. Neo-conservatism strives to restore the traditional values in the state, particularly those related to family, religion, and nation. Supporters of this tradition believe that authority, particularly in power, secures the social stability, the discipline and the unity in the country. Neo-conservatives do not accept multi-cultural and multi-confessional societies, which in their view are unstable and always filled with internal discord.

5. Libertarian conservatism believes in the economic individualism and in the “things that the government got off its back”, although it is evident that this principle of individual freedom is not likely to spread to other aspects of social life. Libertarian conservatives have a pessimistic attitude towards human nature, which is why they believe that the individual requires certain direction from the state, including respect for state authority.

2.3.1.3. Socialism

Socialism appeared as a reaction of the social and economic conditions emerging in Europe with the development of industrial capitalism. Socialist ideas started spreading widely as a reaction to the growing class of industrial workers suffering from poverty and working in inappropriate

conditions. Although socialism and liberalism have common roots in the enlightenment and uphold the same principles, such as reason and progress, however, socialism developed as a criticism of the liberal market society, as an alternative to industrial capitalism.

Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels are the most influential and prominent representatives of socialism, whose ideas were the basis for the emergence of communism in the 20th century. On the other hand, at the end of the 19th century, there was a reformist socialist teaching that conspired the gradual integration of the working class, the development of trade unions and socialist political parties. In addition, reformist socialism is based on two sources: the humanistic tradition of the ethical socialism of **Robert Owen, Charles Fourier, and William Morris, and the revisionist Marxism of Edward Bernstein.**³⁹

While **Robert Owen and Charles Fourier** are famous for their utopist ideas, because they promoted establishing utopian communities based on cooperation and love instead of competition and greed, **Marx and Engels developed a more complex theory for the inevitable end of capitalism.**

With the gradual improvement of working and living conditions, as well as the development of political democracy, the character of socialism transformed as well. Namely, with the development of Trade Unionism, the emergence of labour parties on the stage and the strengthening of civic society, the socialist movement can be felt in everything with increased intensity, as well as the creation of a socialist world of states in which there were, on the one hand, socialist parties aiming to gain power on elections and reforms, and socialist parties that proclaimed continuous need for a revolution, on the other. Thus, socialism appears **in two forms: revolutionary and evolutionary.**

³⁹ See: **Hejvud, Endru (2004), Politika, ibid. (p.102).**

In the 20th century, socialist ideas spread outside of Europe (in Africa,⁴⁰ Asia,⁴¹ Latin America ⁴²), as anti-colonial movements. It seems that socialism suffered many twists at the end of the 20th century. The most dramatic, of course, was the collapse of communism after the revolutions in Eastern Europe from 1989 to 1991.

Socialism is based on **several values and elements: community, cooperation, brotherhood, social equality, social class, joint ownership, and distribution according to needs.**

On the other hand, the main elements that serve as the basis for Marxism as the biggest enemy of western capitalism are: historical materialism, alienation (of people), dialectic problems, class struggle, proletarian revolution, and added value.

2.3.1.4. Social Democracy

The original meaning of social democracy is related to the orthodox Marxists, whose main goal was to differentiate between the narrow goals of political democracy and the much more radical task of collectivization, or democratization of the commodity wealth. Therefore, the Marxist parties that were formed in the 19th century were quite often called social

⁴⁰ Socialism in Africa is a specific kind that is influenced by the communal values of the traditional tribal life.

⁴¹ In China, socialism was accepted after the 1949 revolution and later started spreading to North Korea, Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. Milder forms of socialism are applied in the Indian politics through the actions of the Congress Party that was dominant in the politics several decades after the independence in 1947.

⁴² In 1960s and 1970s South and Central America, the socialist revolutionaries were at war with the military dictators, who were thought to be working for the interests of the imperialists and the USA. Thus, Castro's regime, which took power after the Cuban revolution in 1959, developed tight connections with the former USSR, while the Sandinista guerrilla that took power in Nicaragua in 1979 remained an unallied government. In Chile in 1970, Salvador Allende became the first chief of state elected in a democratic way in a Marxist state, who was later killed in 1973, in a coup backed by the American CIA.

democratic. The most famous example is the German Social Democratic Party (SDP), established in 1875.⁴³

By the start of the 20th century, many parties of this kind started adopting the parliamentary way of a peaceful transition towards socialism, which is why in theory the term democratic socialism was more common than the term social democracy. A positive turn on behalf of social democracy happened towards the mid-twentieth century as a result of the desire of the social democratic parties to review their socialist goals. Thus, the western social democracies did not demand the abolition of capitalism anymore, but rather its humanization.

Social democracy as an ideology strives to reach a compromise between the acceptance of capitalism as the only safe mechanism for commodity production and its distribution in accordance with moral, and not with market principles.

The main feature of the modern social democracy is the care for the marginal, weak and vulnerable citizens in society, although this kind of care does not define them as parties that respect socialist traditions. Moreover, compassion, joint humanity, liberal dedication to positive freedom and equal opportunities for all citizens in the state, social welfare, redistribution of power and social justice, are considered main values of social democracy as well.

Social democratic ideology is based on the views that political change in the system can and should be carried out peacefully and in accordance with the constitution, that capitalism is morally impure since it creates a structural inequality and poverty, that the drawbacks of the capitalist system can be overcome only through a state that has undergone social and economic engineering, i.e. that the state should be the

⁴³ This party, particularly under the influence of Eduard Bernstein, formally denounced Marxism at the Congress in 1899 by accepting the principle "competition where possible, planning where necessary".

biggest guardian of public and general interest, and that the nation-state is a significant unit of political governance, and that the state has a substantial capacity to regulate the economic and social life within its borders.

All social democrats accept the fact that capitalism should be modified in accordance with the principles of social justice, although it should be highlighted that there are many different views among them in relation to the ways how to achieve this. For instance, the Keynesian social democracy is conflicted due to its simultaneous inclination towards economic efficiency, on the one hand, and egalitarianism, on the other.

The recession that took place in Europe in the 1970s and the 1980s created true tensions in this ideology due to the fact that the recession accelerated the “fiscal crisis of the welfare state”, on the one, while due to the increased unemployment, it boosted the demand for social welfare, on the other hand. This is why social democracy reached its peak crisis point in the 1980s and the 1990s due to the processes of deindustrialization and the reduction of the traditional working class, due to the relation between Keynesianism with the economic logic “tax and spend”, and due to the diminished importance of the welfare state, particularly among employees.⁴⁴

The economic sustainability of a social democracy is also diminished due to the processes of economic globalisation, and the failure of the Keynesian policy is primarily a result of the unsuccessful project to manage a national economy with the power of the government. In a situation of intensified international competition, accelerated processes of reforms in the welfare state, tax reduction, etc., social democracy is facing the risk of losing its intellectual credibility. This kind of loss, in particular, is a result of the collapse of communism.

⁴⁴ In the period between 1979 and 1992, the Labour Party in the United Kingdom lost the elections four times in a row, while the SPD in Germany was not in power from 1982 until 1998. Even the French Socialist Party suffered catastrophic electoral defeats in the period between 1993 and 2002.

Table No.6: Differences between social democracy and communism⁴⁵

Social democracy	Communism
» ethical socialism	» scientific socialism
» revisionism	» fundamentalism
» reformism	» utopianism
» evolution/gradation	» revolution
» "humanization" of capitalism	» abolition of capitalism
» redistribution	» joint ownership
» diminishing the clash of classes	» classless society
» relative equality	» absolute equality
» mixed economy	» state collectivism
» economic management	» central planning
» parliamentary party	» avant-garde party
» political pluralism	» dictatorship of the proletariat
» liberal and democratic state	» proletarian/ people's state

The crisis of social democracy stimulated the development of neo-revisionism, or the ideology of the "third way" as an alternative worldview to the old form of social democracy, on the one, and neoliberalism, on the other hand. The former is rejected due to the link with the state structures that are inappropriate for the development of modern economy, while the latter is inapplicable because it stimulates freedom for all those who undermine the moral values of society.

The "third way" promotes intense reforms in the social sector, in opposition to the social democratic motto for social welfare "from the cradle to the grave". This ideology rejects the neoliberal strategy for "standing on one's feet". Therefore, the main values of the "third way" are equal chances for everyone in the state, an increased value of responsibility as a principle, and a quality community.

⁴⁵ See: Hejvud, Endru, *ibid.* (p.151).

Although the “third way” is seen as an ideology that is quite imprecise and subjected to various interpretations, there are, however, several key topics of analysis that can be defined. The first topic is related to the conviction that socialism is dead, at least in the form of the state “top-down” intervention. The second topic is the acceptance of globalisation, the development of the “information society”, and the “knowledge economy” with a special accent on information technology, individual skills and greater labour dynamics. The third topic is the highlighted importance of the community as a “field of consensus and social harmony” and moral responsibility. The fourth topic is the society’s concern for greater inclusion of the citizens. The equal chances, the meritocracy, the right to access property and opportunities for reaching greater potentials, are just part of the values promoted by this ideology. The fifth topic is related to the new role of the state, seen as a competitive or market-oriented state.

Therefore, each government’s priority should be a good education, which should not only look after the personal development of the individual (which is a modern liberal viewpoint), but also an education that will advance the chances for employment and will be beneficial for the economy (utilitarian viewpoint). In this view, **the government is seen as a cultural factor, its main goal being to shape and reshape the positions, values, skills, beliefs and knowledge of the citizens.**

2.3.1.5. Nationalism

A French priest, an opponent to the Jacobians, used the term “nationalism” for the first time in 1789. However, it developed into a political doctrine and ideology in the 19th century, primarily in Europe. In France, nationalism was considered a revolutionary and democratic belief that stimulated the citizens’ faith in the liberation of the citizens from the “subordination to the crown”. The nation, ac-

ording to this ideology, should be the only master. Nationalist ideas quickly spread from Europe to Latin America,⁴⁶ the US, etc.

The tide of nationalism during the entire 19th century outlined the borders of the new map of Europe. There were numerous national uprisings in Italy, Hungary, Germany, Austria, Czechoslovakia, which resulted in the creation of new nation states with their own nations drawn by the ideas for national unity and constitutional power. There was a decline of the great empires (Austrian and Hungarian, Russian, and German). **Nationalism is considered to have become a true popular movement by the end of the 19th century, in which the language of mass politics created greater social cohesion, order and stability.** Many independent nation states were created corresponding to the geography of existing national or ethnic groups.

During the 20th century, the doctrine of nationalism spread among the peoples of Asia and Africa as a process of decolonization and anti-colonialism. There are three problems emerging in theory when nationalism is viewed as an ideology. **Namely, nationalism is qualified as an ideology and as a political doctrine.** First, the essence of nationalism is not in its close links with the nation state, but rather its far-reaching connections with the movements and ideas that recognize the central significance of the nation. Second, nationalism is often considered a psychological category, often seen as loyalty to a certain nation, or antipathies towards other nations. Third, nationalism has a different character that varies from period to period. In the beginning, nationalism had a revolutionary, progressive character that was attractive for both liberals and conservatives. However, in time, nationalism has gained a negative connotation and significance.

⁴⁶ The most famous liberator in Latin America is Simón Bolívar, who started a revolution against the Spanish dominance, in the area called New Grenade at that time, which today represents the states of Columbia, Venezuela and Equator, as well as Peru and Bolivia.

The most important values of nationalism are: the nation, the organic community, self-determination and identity policy.

The most important traditions of nationalism are: liberal nationalism, conservative nationalism, expansionist nationalism, and anti-colonial post-colonial nationalism.

Table No.7: Differences between civic and ethnic cultural nationalism⁴⁷

Civic nationalism	Ethnic cultural nationalism
» political nation – inclusiveness	» cultural/ historic nation – exclusiveness
» universalism	» particularism
» equal nations	» distinctive nations
» rationally/consistently	» mystic/emotional
» national sovereignty	» popular “spirit”
» volunteerism	» organic
» based on citizenship	» based on ancestry
» civic loyalty	» ethnic bonds
» culture of difference	» cultural unity

2.3.1.6. Other types of ideologies

2.3.1.6.1. Anarchism

The term anarchy implies unruliness.⁴⁸ Therefore, anarchism believes that political authority in all its shapes, and particularly in the shape of state authority, is an unnecessary and evil category. The anarchistic inclination towards a society without a state in which individuals,

⁴⁷ See: **Hejvud, Endru**, *ibid.* (p.176).

⁴⁸ The first signs of anarchism, according to some claims, can be seen in the ideas of Taoism and Buddhism, as well as the Stoics in Ancient Greece, as well as the diggers from the English civil war. William Godwin first elaborated the classical expression of the anarchist principles in his work “Researching Political Justice”, although Godwin never described himself as anarchist.

freely and without restraint, regulate their mutual relations with agreement and cooperation, is in fact developed from two contrasted traditions: liberal individualism and socialist communitarianism.

Anarchism is the point where liberalism and socialism merge. **Anarchists believe in a society without laws and without authority. They believe in a society where a natural and spontaneous social order is developed in accordance with the citizens' free will.** Or as Proudhon says, "the society is looking for an order in anarchy". According to Proudhon, ⁴⁹"the community of independent villagers and craftsmen is capable of regulating their lives by constructing a system of justice and equal exchange, thus avoiding the injustice of capitalism and exploitation".

Relating anarchists to violence is a wrong representation of this ideology. Most anarchists believe that violence is wrong and counter-productive, and many followers define it as a morally unacceptable category.

During the 19th century, anarchism became a significant component of the growing socialist movement. One of the main features of this ideology is that even in the countries where it had major success and acceptance (France, Spain, Italy), it never succeeded in taking power on a national level.

Moreover, anarchism has a dual character. It can be interpreted both as a form of "ultra-liberalism", which resembles an extremely liberal individualism, or as a form of "ultra-socialism".

The main principles that serve as the basis for anarchism are: anti-statism, natural order, anti-clericalism, and economic freedom.

⁴⁹ See: **Proudhon, P.J (1970), What is Property? Translated by Tucker B.R., New York: Dover, (p. 210).**

2.3.1.6.2. Fascism

Fascism⁵⁰ is the negation of the ideas and values of western political thought that developed after the French revolution in 1789. The proof can be seen in the Italian fascist slogan "1789 is dead". Fascism is simply defined as an ideology⁵¹ with an anti-character: it is a form of anti-capitalism, anti-liberalism, anti-individualism, etc. It was mostly embodied in the actions of the Fascist Party in Italy, established in 1919 under the leadership of Benito Mussolini⁵² and the Nazi Party in Germany, which was established the same year under the leadership of Adolf Hitler.

There are certain views in political theory, according to which no other political term has been used with such an ideological and terminological imprecision, as it is the case with the term *fascism*. For instance, the terms "fascist" and "dictator" are often used as synonyms describing individuals with intolerant and illiberal views and standpoints. However, fascism should not be equated with plain repression. Fascist thinkers were often inspired by cer-

⁵⁰ The term Fascism derives from the Italian word *fascis*. This term denoted the authority of the magistrates in the imperial Rome. Until the 1890s, the term *fascia* in Italy was used to denote the political parties or associations of the revolutionary socialists.

⁵¹ There are theoretical doubts whether fascism can be defined as ideology at all, considering the fact that it lacks a rational and coherent nucleus. Thus, **according to Hugh Trevor-Roper, fascism is a "badly messed up complexity of ideas"**. On the other hand, Hitler preferred to describe his ideas as a "worldview". Therefore, there is a view that perhaps, fascism should be defined as a political movement, or even a political religion, rather than ideology.

⁵² **Benito Mussolini** was appointed Prime Minister of Italy in 1922. Mussolini established the Fascist Party in 1919, and, in the coming three years, turned Italy into a one-party fascist country. Mussolini called himself the founder of fascism, although it is evident that other scholars wrote his main speeches and correspondences. His political philosophy is based on the faith that human existence is meaningful only when it supports and determines the community. This basic orientation implies that the state is a "universal ethical will", a concept that is popular in totalitarianism. On the other hand, **Hitler was appointed German Chancellor in 1933**. In almost a year Hitler transformed Germany into a Nazi dictatorship. The foundations of his actions were laid out in his book "Mein Kampf" (1925), which represents an attempt to link German expansionist nationalism and the intense anti-Semitism into a historical theory, as a constant struggle between the Germans and the Jews, with the holocaust policy and the outbreak of the World War II.

tain other theories and values, while fascist regimes aimed at developing new forms of political governance. This ideology was booming in the period between the two World Wars as a response to the dissatisfaction among the citizens of the modern age, and against the ideas of the enlightenment.

The main motif of fascism is to secure organic unification of the national community. The individual is nothing. The most important is the mission of the community and social groups. **The fascist ideal is to create a “new human” who is ready to sacrifice his life for national glory, and for the defense of the human race, and without any comment to subordinate to the will of the national leader.**

However, it should be highlighted that not all fascists share the same views. **The Italian fascism, unlike the German, is essentially the final stage of statism where the individual should show absolute respect for the state**, and should demonstrate utmost loyalty to the state. On the other hand, German National Socialism was based on racism, i.e. the **Arianism** as a belief that the German race is a “master race”, and that as such it is preordained to rule whereas the **anti-Semitism** represented Jews as the true evil which should be destroyed.

Fascism in theory is defined as “extreme center” that turned out to be the haven for many citizens from lower social layers who were dissatisfied with their status, as well as with the government’s treatment in the new industrial society. World War I did not succeed in providing solutions for international conflicts and the mutual rivalry between the strong alliances, which served as an excellent foundation for the frustrated nationalism and the desire for vengeance. Military experience created a specific militant kind of nationalism which was built on militant values. Fascism is a remarkably complex historical phenomenon considering the diverse opinions of theoreticians, with regards to its key elements. **Thus, according to Nolte, fascism is a “resistance to transcend-**

ence”, and according to Gregor, it is a construction of “total charismatic community”, while according to Griffin, fascism is the “rebirth of ultra-nationalism”.

2.3.1.6.3. Feminism

The terms “feminism” and “feminist” were first used in the 19th century as a medical term describing the feminization of men, or masculinization of women.

In a modern sense, feminism is always related to women’s movements and the attempts to promote the social role of women in the state. Although the very concept of feminism has a more recent origin, its ideas and roots can be traced even in ancient Greek civilization, but also in ancient China.

“The Book of the City of the Ladies” by Christine de Pizan, published in Italy in 1405, is a true account of the deeds of famous women from the past, defending the right of women for education and political influence, which represents a true foundation for the development of modern feminist ideas.

The “first wave of feminism” emerged in the mid-19th century in the form of a movement for the protection of the right for women to vote in many western European countries, but also worldwide, while the “second wave of feminism” took place in the mid-20th century as a more radical movement for women’s rights related to the activism of the Women’s Liberation Movement. The main thesis of both waves for the development of this ideology is that western society is basically discriminatory towards the representatives of the gentler sex in relation to the representatives of the stronger sex, and that the state should do everything to terminate the order that is based on the domination of male power and strength.

Women have to enjoy the same legal and political rights as men. The right of women to vote is the main goal of femi-

nism because it was believed that if women had the equal right to vote as men, other forms of gender discrimination or prejudices would quickly disappear. However, it should be noted that the goal of the “second wave” could not be achieved only through political reforms.

There are at least **three feminist traditions**:

1. The first is known as a tradition that defends the liberal dimension of feminism. According to this tradition, inequality between men and women is a result of women’s subordination to men, which is due to the unequal distribution of rights, opportunities and possibilities between men and women in society. This kind of feminism is also known as “feminism of equal rights”, which is reformatory in its essence and plays such a role in the system. It seems that the feminist movement is best organised in the US, partially inspired by the struggle to abolish slavery. The famous Seneca Falls Convention, held in 1848, marked the birth of the women’s rights movement in the US. With the adoption of the Declaration of Sentiments, written by Elisabeth Cady Stanton and directly influenced by the Declaration of Independence, the feminists demanded the equal right to vote for women. ⁵³

2. The second tradition can be found in socialist, Marxist feminism, which is based on the link between the subordination of the woman, on the one hand, and the capitalist way of production, on the other. The woman is subordinated and dependent on the man due to her primary role in the family and the household.

3. The third tradition is known as radical feminism, which believes that the division of labour between the sexes is a very important political division in society. The main slogan

⁵³ In Great Britain, the women’s right to vote was extended in as late as 1918, although it is considered that it took another decade before women managed to secure true electoral equality with men. In the USA, the 19th amendment of the Constitution guarantees equal voting right for women.

of this kind of feminism is “the personal is political”.⁵⁴ In its ultimate form, this kind of feminism depicts men as the enemies of women, who should withdraw from society.

Each of these three mentioned traditions has internal rivaling tendencies. It is interesting that after the 1980s, new feminist traditions emerged with their “common foundation” in: the division of public and private, the patriarchy, sex and gender, as well as equality and difference. The feminists of the new era, observed through the works of De Beauvoir, Betty Friedan, Kate Millett and others, fiercely criticized Sigmund Freud’s theories, for instance, about “castration anxiety”. Psychoanalytic feminism is especially interesting due to its views that the creation process of men and women, and in particular their gender difference, should be observed as a psychological, and not as a biological process.

2.3.1.6.4. Ecologism

The ideology of environmental protection, or in modern sense known as environmentalism, emerged on the stage with the first ecological green movements with roots in the 19th century, as a revolt against pollution caused by the accelerated industrialization processes in the countries.

The term “green” enters into use in the 1950s in order to promote a policy that shows greater inclination towards environmental protection. The main idea of its programme is based on the belief that human life can only be understood in the context of the natural world.

The basis of political action of the green parties can be seen in the reformist approach of politics in general towards the natural world. The value of the “ecologists” and “ecological parties” lies in the fact that dedication and care for the

⁵⁴ The development of the radical feminism is also known as post-modern feminism, psychoanalytic feminism, black, lesbian and other forms of feminism.

environment is in the center of their political action. Environmental care has increased as a result of the economic growth of the countries, which is a direct cause of all dangers threatening planet Earth, its animal life, its vegetation, and human beings. Due to the increased awareness for environmental issues among citizens, **the World Wide Fund for Nature was established, which intensified its influence on the emergence of powerful movements for the protection of the environment with much greater publicity.** This ecological policy turned public attention towards the increased pollution of planet Earth, the so-called acid rain, the greenhouse effect, the depletion of the ozone layer, as well as problems with global warming, although it should be noted that the green parties do not accept that environmental care is the only point on their political agenda.

Among the rest, **they define themselves as parties that protect the interests and rights of women, who fight against militant policies and global armament, who strive for a strengthened position and role of the state in welfare, and fight against the phenomenon of unemployment, particularly among younger people.**

Ecologism represents a new style of politics. Humankind is not and should not be the center of attention as in other ideologies, but should be observed as an indispensable part of nature. Unlike other ideologies, which are basically anthropocentric because they place humans in the center of their attention, ecologism considers that humans should assume a mild, moderate, and respectful attitude towards nature. This is why the central themes of ecologism are: ecology, holism, sustainability, ethics in environmental protection and self-realization. Otherwise, in a political sense, there are green parties that accept either the so-called "light green" strategy, according to which the human common sense should accept the ecologically healthy policies and living conditions, or parties that accept the "dark green" strategy, according to which it is necessary to restructure political priorities, as well

as the political will to put the interests of the ecosystem above the interests of the individual. It is interesting to note that these parties often qualify themselves as “anti-party” parties of the green that are existing in Germany, Austria and other European countries.

2.3.1.6.5. Fundamentalism

The term fundamentalism is very controversial and complex.⁵⁵ According to many it implies repression and intolerance considering the fact that fundamentalism is observed as an enemy to liberal values and, first of all, an enemy to human freedoms and human rights.

With the collapse of communism, there was a widespread viewpoint in most countries of the western world that religious, and in particular Islamic fundamentalism, emerged as a replacement of Marxism and that it is the main cause for the “clash of civilizations”.⁵⁶ Religious fundamentalism views politics as a secondary activity. In its view, religious doctrine is more dominant in life than politics.

In theory there are various forms of fundamentalism, including:

- » Islamic;
- » Christian and
- » Other.

1. Islamic fundamentalism is based on Islam as a second, by extent, world religion. It is interesting to highlight that Islam was never observed solely as a religion but rather as a whole way of living, with specific directions for the political, economic and moral behavior of people or the nation. The “Islamic way” is based on the Quran, or specifically, on

⁵⁵ It derives from the Latin word fundamentum meaning foundation. Fundamentalism is a way of thinking where certain principles are considered to be substantial “truth” with immutable and inviolable authority. Although often related to religion, it can be seen in political doctrines as well.

⁵⁶ See: Huntington, S. (1993), “The Clash of Civilizations”, Foreign Affairs, Vol. 72, No. 3.

the teachings of the prophet Muhammad, which are seen by all Muslims as the truth of the "trodden path of life". The Sunnites represent the majority of Muslims (around 85%), while the Shiites are about 1/10 (10%) of Muslims, mostly settled in Iran and Iraq. The division of Muslims is a result of the different answer they provide for the question: "Who can take Muhammad's place as a leader of the Muslim community?"

According to the Sunnites, no one could take Muhammad's place in his nature and function as a prophet, because he finished the Quran and perfected the revelation of the divine guidance and proclaimed that Muhammad is the "last prophet". Muhammad's heir could only be a protector of the prophet's legacy. He would be a caliph with subordinated authority and would have responsibility for managing all matters within the community per se, obeying the Quran.⁵⁷

Through a consensus, the community would choose its caliph amongst the male members of the Quraysh tribe, to which Muhammad belonged. After Muhammad's death, the caliph's legacy was passed on to "four righteous caliphs" (Abu Bakr, Omer, Osman and Ali), who were considered to have been closest to the prophet, and their example is considered a custom to be followed by all following generations of Muslims. The Sunnites gradually developed a complete legal community system, known as the shariat. The caliphate became an institution, a protector of the shariat.

On the other hand, Shiites recognise the imam as the leading figure of religious authority. Shiite Muslims believe that Muhammad established the "cycle of initiates" to lead the community further by appointing an imam as his heir. The imam is bestowed with the power of inspired and infallible interpretation of the Quran. The Shiites speak of themselves as "people who are named and recognized". The first imam was Ali (Muhammad's son-in-law who married his daughter Fa-

⁵⁷ See: **Nov Lajonov priracnik, Religii vo svetot, Mladinska knjiga, Skopje 2009, (p. 363).**

tima). He was infallible in the interpretation of the Quran and in leading the community. The Shiites believe that the cycle of welayah will continue until the end of human history, when on Judgment Day humanity will resurrect and when it will be judged what afterlife awaits each and every one.⁵⁸

In fact, Sunnite and Shiite Islam reflect the answer of God's revelation. While Sunnite Islam is predominantly occupied with the creation and preservation of the higher structures in society, because with them the community can fulfill the responsibilities before God, Shiite Islam started with the martyrdom of Ali and his son Hussein, and has always been aware of the sufferings and alienations of the human condition.

From another point of view, there is a **third variant of Islam, Sufism (love for God)**, which denotes the inner spiritual life of both divisions. The Sufis are not a separate group or sect, but they are simply Muslim Sunnites seeking intimacy with God through the discipline of spiritual cleansing.

Islamic fundamentalism gained importance mostly after the Iranian revolution in 1979, when the world's first Islamic state was created (also known as "Islamic Republic") under the leadership of Khomeini. Later, it spread to the countries of the Middle East, North Africa, as well as parts of Asia. In 1981, the Muslim brotherhood assassinated the Egyptian president Sadat, while the leaders of several Muslim states, for instance, Pakistan and Sudan, introduced the Shariat law under the pressure of fundamentalism. In the 1980s, Islamic fundamentalism was very evident in Lebanon, which was divided between Christians and Muslims after the civil war, occupied by Israel to the south and by Syria to the north. Parts of Beirut were under the control of fundamentalist groups, such as Hezbollah, backed up by Iran.

Iranian Shiite fundamentalism is considered the most radical form, which is evident in its struggle

⁵⁸ Ibid. (p.365)

against western philosophy and western regimes, and is firmly set against neocolonial western powers. The Taliban regime in Afghanistan (1997-2001) is a true example of radical Islamic fundamentalism. On the other hand, the Taliban too are an example of truly radically positioned Islamic fundamentalism, which opposes the idea of reaching compromise with any kind of ideas that do not fit their worldview. And their worldview is a rigid and violent interpretation of the Shariat law, according to which women are excluded from educational or any other public role, and the Taliban government is authoritarian and merciless. This new form of radical fundamentalism is also reflected in new "jihadist"⁵⁹ groups, the most notorious of which is al-Qaeda, led by Osama bin Laden.

2. Christian fundamentalism started developing as a movement within Judaism. It is a teaching according to which Jesus is a Messiah prophesized in the Old Testament, while his life and teachings are depicted in the New Testament. Although all Christians recognise the Bible's authority, they are divided in three main churches: catholic, orthodox, and protestant. Roman Catholicism is based on the mundane and spiritual guidance of the Pope in Rome. The Eastern Orthodox Christianity emerged with the separation from Rome in 1054, when a certain number of autonomous churches developed, among which the Russian and the Greek Orthodox Churches hold the most significant positions. Protestantism encompasses numerous projects that rejected the authority of Rome during the Reformation of the 16th century and established a reformed national form of Christianity⁶⁰

⁵⁹ The affiliation of these groups to Islam is marked with the term "Jihad", which implies holy war against the US and Israel, and the elimination of foreign influence in Saudi Arabia. It is interesting that in the teachings of the prophet Muhammad, the great jihad is not explained as an inner struggle between the believers, but as a struggle in which through moral discipline and inclination to Islam, the believer should become a better human being.

⁶⁰ The most significant protestant movements were **Lutheranism in Sweden** and parts of Germany, **Calvinism in Scotland and Anglicanism in England**. According to Martin Luther, the whole issue about how we enter into a true relationship with God should be radically revised in the light of the Bible. It is interesting to note that Luther created a reformist community outside the church, instead of reforming the Church from within. Even Jean Calvin and his reformation was a serious threat to the Catholic Church.

The French Bourgeois Revolution from 1789 publically excommunicated Christianity from society. All subsequent revolutionary movements in Europe tried to repeat the success of the French revolutionaries, creating difficulties for the Catholic Church in many parts of Europe, and particularly in Italy. The advance of liberal constitutionalism and the separation of the church from the state (secularism and laïcité) introduced a thorough secularization of political life. Therefore, Christianity started adapting to these new conditions by promoting itself as a personal religion devoted to the spiritual salvation of the individual. This position caused the formation of the character of Christian fundamentalism.

In the US, Christian fundamentalism gained importance in the 1970s as a consequence of the emergence of the "new Christian right", which aims to ban abortion, introduce prayers in American public schools and restore traditional family values. The term "new Christian right" is considered an umbrella-term that encompasses a broad coalition of groups that initially dealt with moral and social issues directed towards sustaining and restoring "Christian culture".

3. Other forms of fundamentalism are Hinduism, the main religion of India, the fundamentalism of the Sikhs, Zionism, Jewish and Buddhist fundamentalism, etc.

Hinduism is considered a foundation of the national Indian identity, which in general opposes multiculturalism and the multiethnic mosaic of India. Hinduism calls for the so-called "hinduization" of Muslims, Sikhs and other communities in India. The World Hindu Assembly preaches that "India belongs to the Hindus" and that a "Great India" should be created from Burma to Iraq.

The fundamentalism of the Sikhs struggles to establish an independent nation state, recognizing the nation as a religious entity. Sikh nationalists fought to establish a separate state "Khalistan" located in today's Punjab, with Sikhism as a

state religion and a government that should respect its intact existence. The nationalism of the Sikhs is defined as having great antipathy for the Hindus.

2.4. Political legitimacy and public support of political parties

A specific feature of every political power is to have a certain source of political legitimacy, as well as specific reasons because of which the people, i.e. the citizens, respect the political system willingly, as well as the political authority in the institutions of the system.

In the broadest sense of the word, **legitimacy implies harmonizing political power with the principles and regulations that are generally accepted within the political community. Moreover, the concept of legitimacy aims to denote the lawfulness of the system, to determine the compulsory character of the order and to transform power into authority.**

Legitimacy always implies respect for political authorities and accepting citizens' responsibilities willingly. In political philosophy, legitimacy is explained as a moral and rational principle based on which the authorities can require civil obedience from their citizens. Therefore, referring to legitimacy is a much more significant moment than the very obedience.

However, political scientists assign greater importance to the sociological, rather than the philosophical implications of legitimacy, since according to them legitimacy implies the willingness of citizens to subordinate to the system of authority. According to Weber, this is more a case of having faith in the legitimacy rather than having faith in the "right to rule".⁶¹

Therefore, a political authority and a political order will be considered legitimate if they maintain a certain relationship with the principles of law, justice, equity,

⁶¹ See: **Hejvud, Endru**, *ibid.* (p.401).

and if they represent a “well arranged order”.⁶² This condition is contrasted to anarchy, lawlessness, insecurity and willfulness. Legitimacy always contains the “idea of living together in the state” which approximates the concept of legitimacy to the concept of politics.

According to **Heller**, legitimacy contains **two key aspects: the social legitimization of the legally founded authority and the normative legitimization of the state through the constitution.**⁶³

Both **Spinoza and Montesquieu** accept these two aspects. **Spinoza** states that “obedience makes the ruler”, while **Montesquieu** states that “lucky is the state which citizens are good subjects”, and that the authorities exist to “guide the subjects to the most optimal goal”.

Moreover, the issue of legitimacy is always an issue of respect for the political institutions by those who are governed, i.e. their kind of symbiosis. **Legitimacy is related to sovereignty, thus legitimate is the authority that is founded on the free choice of the citizens, the people and the care for the common good.**

In its narrow sense, legitimate is the authority that cherishes freedom in society, cares for the well-being of the nation, and is in accordance with the nation’s will.

The legitimacy of each political system consists of its normal functioning without the existence of additional violent and risky political endeavors. Considering the fact that democracy is a necessary precondition for legitimate power, it emerges as its distinctive political tradition.

The theoretician Beetham has interesting views on the legitimacy of political power. Namely, in his views, power is legitimate if it fulfills at least three conditions:

⁶² Quoted according to **prof. d-r Milan Matić, prof. d-r Milan Podunavac, Politički sistem, ibid. (p. 163).**

⁶³ See: **Hejvud, Endru, ibid. (p.401).**

1. Power should be exercised in accordance with existing constitutional and legal rights;
2. These rules should be justified and trusted by both authorities and citizens;
3. Legitimacy should be expressed through a clearly articulated agreement of the citizens.⁶⁴

The constitution is used to create legitimacy within the state, being respected by both citizens and authorities.

3. FUNCTIONS OF POLITICAL PARTIES

Political parties have **several important functions** in the political system of the country:

First, **promoting candidates for representatives in political institutions and state organs**. Parties recruit and train staff to carry out political functions in the country.

Second, **parties directly implement party policy as governmental policy**, through its direct identification with citizens' interests and needs.

Third, there is **the integrative role or the function of aggregation and relating the interests of the various groups** in broader, universal demands. Parties have a creative role, which is evident in the transformation of the individual interests of groups and citizens into universal political demands and strategies for the development of the state. This practically enables a choice, i.e. a citizens' determination for certain options, and in this way, the rationalization of political processes. These demands have a certain political burden, and that way,

⁶⁴ See: **Hejvud, Endru**, *ibid.* (pp.404-405). For instance, the legitimacy of the British system in 1990 was maintained only thanks to the fact that the public considered that governments should be chosen in elections, regardless of how unpopular party leaders and authorities can be. Which means that leaders win and lose power in elections. This momentum emphasizes two main features of the legitimacy process. The first feature is the existence of elections and the competition between political parties, and the second is in the existence of constitutional regulations, which generally direct the citizens' will towards the desired way of governance for the citizens.

greater chances for realization because there is a certain party power behind them.

Fourth, **parties are focused and recognizable carriers of political activities, responsibilities and effects**, which enable citizens to give them or take away the support and trust from them on elections.

According to the **representatives of the pluralist theory of democracy, parties** carry out the following functions:

1. Reconciliation of conflicting interests – Parties represent the interests of different groups in society. Therefore, they represent the means to overcome, harmonize and balance the conflicting elements of similar interests with the political system.

2. Participation – Political parties should create conditions and opportunities for citizens to participate in politics, i.e. to participate in the selection of candidates for local or parliamentary elections, as well as in organising elections, and in influencing politics through party organs.

3. Recruiting candidates – Parties are the main entities in charge of the process of recruiting party leaders as well as party candidates for office in local or national organs.

4. Exercising democratic control – Elected party members carry out different functions to affect and monitor important segments of the system.

5. Choice – By introducing political programmes, parties enable the voters to have a choice among several competitive political solutions and options. The existence of more parties in the system is an essential element and test for democracy in the system.

6. Representation – Parties represent the citizens' interests, but also wider national interests. This is a basic func-

tion of the parties, since in accordance with systems theory, parties are the most important means for providing inputs for the government to operate in the interest and for the needs of the citizens in society.

7. Communication – Parties communicate with citizens and the institutions of the system on a daily basis through various means of informing, in order to get familiar with the citizens' interests as much as possible and to direct their activities towards meeting those interests.

8. Responsibility – Parties shape the structure, physiognomy, and the work of the political institutions in the system, through which they are directly responsible for the actions taken during their mandate. The political responsibility of the office holders should be the key feature of political power.

9. Determining goals – Traditionally, parties represent the instrument through which societies determine their collective goals and secure their implementation.

10. Articulation and aggregation of interests – parties articulate and unite the interests of citizens. Parties represent the means for citizens to defend their interests.

11. Socialization and mobilization – parties represent an important agent in the political education and in the process of political socialization of citizens. Parties have a significant role in stimulating a democratic political play.⁶⁵

⁶⁵ See: **Vučina Vasović, Savremene demokratije, Edicija Sinteze, JP Službeni glasnik, Beograd, 2006, (p.115).**

CHAPTER 2



HISTORICAL REVIEW OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE POLITICAL PARTIES IN THE UNITED KINGDOM, THE USA, FRANCE, AND THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

1. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE PARTIES IN ENGLAND (THE UNITED KINGDOM)

The political parties in England actually started developing and organising **right after the Glorious Revolution from 1688**, although there were certain reforms of political organisation even in the Restoration period from 1660, as well as in the period of the conflict between the king and the Parliament (1640-1660).

The process of forming political parties in England happened slowly and gradually. Parties were preceded by primitive forms of political organisation like coteries, caucuses, fractions and various types of political groups, which fought for dominance in Parliament. They were neither tightly organised, nor had a precisely determined programme. **Among them, there were two clubs with the greatest influence: the Carlton club** and the Reform club, their main goal being to monitor the work of the Parliament.

In this way, first the **political clubs** were created in Parliament, and later local party clubs (caucuses) were established, as well as national party organizations. The strong role of the Parliament on behalf of the regal duties and the gradual establishment of the cabinet caused the polarization of the forces around two embryos of the future political parties: **the Wigs**, who took their name from the **Scottish Presbyterian villagers**, and **the Tories**, named after the **Irish outlaws who were considered to have been Catholics**.

It seems that the conception of the Wigs can be found in the family link of big landowners who created a vertical oligarchy. They were joined by the protestant sects known as nonconformists, who opposed the Anglican Church together with the tradesmen. On the other hand, the Tories were close to the Anglican Church.

The Wigs and the Tories both are significant elements of the English party and political system. It was these two parties that affected the establishing and the functioning of the two-party system in England to a great extent. This is a system that has two great and strong parties, approximately equal in size, struggling with each other and alternating in power.

Throughout most of the 18th century, the Wigs were in power while the Tories took over at the turn of the century. They stayed in power until 1830, when the biggest reform of the electoral legislation took place, which was the idea promoted by the Wigs, thus strengthening the role of the House of Commons. **The Representation of the People Act from 1832 initiated the development of the modern history of the parties in England.**

The Wigs, supported by representatives from Ireland and left-oriented radicals, were the party of tradesmen and the new industrial class. The Tories strongly supported the Anglican Church and agricultural interests until the moment when Sir Robert Peel, the Tory Prime Minister, brought the party closer to the industrialists. However, in 1846, his **conservative government split in two** when he decided to protect both the industrialists and the demands of the farmers on determining protective measures for wheat. **The first part of the government** comprised of his followers, while **the second part comprised of the unnaturally acquired members under the leadership of Benjamin Disraeli, a young Jew.**

After the death of Sir Peel the Wigs took over his followers, which served as a basis for the establishing of the Liberal Party of England. The Liberals narrowed their interests towards the industry and trade, while the Tories soon abandoned protectionism and remained in the position to protect the interests of the Anglican Church and the landowning aristocracy.

It is clear that **in this period, there were four party unions in England:**

- » **The union of the Wigs with the supporters of Sir Peel;**
- » **the union of the Radicals;**
- » **the union of the Irish and**
- » **the union of the Conservatives, who were in opposition.**

This period was concluded with the enlargement of the two main parties and with the new Reform Act for Elections from 1867.

The Conservative Party of England was established in 1867 as a party protecting and supporting the interests of the aristocracy, the king and the high bourgeoisie. On the other hand, the Liberal Party was established in 1877 to represent the interests of the petty and middle bourgeoisie, and to a certain extent of the workers as well. The Liberal Party adopted its first political programme in 1891. Corruption, the buying and selling of political services were accompanying elements of party politics. In this period, political parties did not have any consistent political ideologies. If the Liberals were interested in election reforms, the Conservatives were striving for social reforms and vice versa.

Therefore, the existing differences and the contrasted programmes of action created different directions in creating party policies. With the extension of the voting rights, the legislation put an end to the different political groups. The parties started a true battle to find and organise new voters. The modern party structure in England is thought to have started with the 1868 elections.

The period between 1868 and 1886 was the period of struggle between Gladstone, the leader of the Liberals, and Disraeli, the leader of the Conservatives. This was the period of strengthening the parliamentary system

with a government responsible to the House of Commons. The governments, which were one-party by rule, were more stable and long-lasting with more disciplined majorities. The Liberals demonstrated greater homogeneity in relation to the Conservatives. When Joseph Chamberlain with his Radicals joined the Liberals, they abandoned their old Wig aristocracy and left Gladstone in trouble trying to recover his wing.

The growth of Irish nationalism, under the leadership of Charles Parnell, caused a drastic change in the party unions. Parnell extracted his Irish party from the union with the Liberals and created an independent force. In 1886, Gladstone decided to promote the Land Law Act (Ireland), which resulted in the regrouping of the left-oriented (Chamberlain radicals) and the right-oriented (old Wigs) on the other side of the House of Commons. With these events, Gladstone put an end to the rule of his government, which initiated a period in England known as **“unionist governance”**. **The Unionists were supporters of the Acts of Union between Ireland and Great Britain, adopted in 1800.**

The Unionist group comprised of the original Conservatives together with dissident members of the Liberal party. They actually established the Conservative and Unionist Party, which is the official name of the contemporary Conservative Party of the United Kingdom.

The Conservatives grew into a party that was striving for a union with Ireland, for imperialism and protection. Their politics were dominant until 1906, when they suffered a great defeat by the Liberals who then stayed in power from 1906 until 1915. Thus, the period until World War I saw both political parties alternating in power, with the Conservative Party remaining in power for a longer period.

This was the period of Queen Victoria’s reign (1837-1901), whose position, differing from the position and the reign of her predecessors to a great extent, contributed significantly

to the formation of the parliamentary system with its modern features. This was the period when current constitutional conventions were created, which regulate the relationship between the Monarch, the Parliament and the Cabinet.

The proof for the adjustment of Queen Victoria's role as a Parliamentary Monarch is the fact that, besides her personal intolerance towards the leader of the Liberal party, she gave him the mandate to constitute the government and maintained specific official relations with him as Prime Minister.

The period when trade unions started reducing their dependence from the Liberal party initiated the struggle of workers for the improvement of working conditions, greater salaries and a general improvement of their economic and social position.

In 1900, some trade unions established Labour Representative Committees in order to maintain the independent position of the representatives of the working class in the House of Commons. This step was taken by the trade union and forced the Liberals to start negotiations with the Labour Committees. In 1906, 29 Labour representatives were elected, which caused the Labour Representative Committees to change their name into Labour Party.

This gave birth to a third party in England.

The Labour Party emerged on the political stage in England at the beginning of the 20th century, and the number of its supporters rose rapidly so that after the end of World War I, it gradually suppressed the Liberal Party and became the second strongest party in the country.

After the elections in 1910, the Liberal Party was in a position to hold the majority in the House of Commons only with the support of the Labourists and the Irish, who reestablished the union with the Liberals after Parnell's death. World War I

introduced an odd coalition in England. In 1915, the first joint coalition between Conservatives and Liberals took place. The coalition lasted until 1922, when the new Labour Party appeared on the elections.

Whenever we study the English two-party system it is inevitable to ask the question which circumstances have affected the existence of this system. It is clear that in many bourgeois countries (excluding the US) there are multi-party systems, where three, four, or even more political parties take part in the struggle for power. However, these countries too, initially had two parties, only to increase the number of parties in their party system in a relatively short period of time.

England remained faithful to its two-party system. There are several reasons for this.

The first reason can be found in the nature of the electoral system with single-member constituencies and the application of a majority model with relative majority.

The chances for greater party representation in Parliament are higher if there are multi-member constituencies where the proportional representation system is applied⁶⁶ In England, after the reforms from 1832, the single-member constituency system had been applied in a combination with the relative majority model. This electoral model is not inclined towards a multi-party system. A general opinion is that the voters do not want to lose their votes, which is why they very seldom decide to vote for a third political party that has no chances of success. Only the big and strong parties have chances of success.

⁶⁶ The electoral system is created in such a way that it favours the big parties, which in the case with Britain implies favouring the Conservative and Labour parties. In the United Kingdom, the electorate is more or less divided, so it is unlikely to expect some spectacular changes. In 1959, the Labour Party secured victory in 64% of the constituencies where this party traditionally elects their representatives, i.e. secures positions, while the Conservative Party had 85% of the constituencies. This division implies that there were only $\frac{1}{4}$ of fluctuating constituencies where the electoral result was uncertain or varying.

The second reason is related to the numerous systemic mechanisms that exist in this country, which enable the so-called severing of conflicts, or in other words, which disable the process of further divisions among the citizens.

The third reason has psychological elements. Namely, the fact is that there are 'for' and 'against' positions that can be taken for each political standpoint and action. Depending on the viewpoint, each issue in politics can be either attacked or defended. Therefore, the two-party system often positions political forces depending on whether those forces accept the advanced and radical, or the conservative and traditional forces.

In the political history of England, particularly in the 19th century, there were many struggles around certain issues. As a rule, the positions of the two parties were always in discord in relation to these issues, and for some of them the affirmative position of one party would always provoke the opposite position with the other party. There are specific examples: the electoral reform in the state, the regime of foreign trade, the Irish issue, social reforms, etc.

The division of the two big parties in this period corresponded to the division of the citizens into aristocracy and bourgeois, who have achieved a compromise for governing the country.

This compromise begins to decline in importance with the emergence of the organised Labour movement. The consequence from this is the gradual weakening of the Liberal party.

Thus in England, a new polarization occurred between the Conservative party, which acted as a representative of the interests of the bourgeoisie, and the Labour party, as an

authentic representative of workers' interests.⁶⁷ In this way, in accordance with the social changes, the two-party system was imposed anew.

Due to various reasons, the two-party system is a permanent reality on the English political stage. Its consequence is the occasional change of the party in power, because every time one party wins the elections with a majority of mandates in the House of Commons, the other party remains in opposition. The party with the parliamentary majority gains the right to establish the government, which is a one-party government by rule.

The only exception from this rule happened in the period between the World Wars, when in a state of war, **several concentration governments were established (with representatives from all three parties: Conservative, Liberal and Labour party)**, as well as in the period between the 1920s and 1930s, which was marked by two coalition governments in two cases.⁶⁸

Thus, in normal conditions, the party that wins the majority of votes in the elections establishes the government, while the other party remains in opposition. They represented two mutually juxtaposed fractions.

The opposition is not able to bring down the government in the House of Commons. Its goal is to win the sympathies of public opinion for the next elections. In order to achieve this, it should provide constructive criticism to the work of the

⁶⁷ After World War II, the Labourists divided into Bevanite socialists and Gaitskellite social democrats. In more recent times, the new Labourists started introducing elements from Margaret Thatcher's policy. The divisions were present inside the Conservative party as well, particularly during the premiership of John Major and Hague, as representatives of the Euroskepticism on one hand, and the Europhiles, on the other.

⁶⁸ In the period between 1874 and 1922, the **presence of the Irish nationalists** was intensified in the House of Commons, who won around 80 mandates. Similarly, in the period between 1910 and 1935, until the final strengthening of the Labour party, by suppressing the Liberal party, the three-party system was evident in England. During these short periods of time, the coalition governments were quite frequent. See: **Vasović, Vučina (2006), Savremene demokratije, Tom 1, JP Službeni glasnik, Beograd, (p.374).**

government, and sustain from irresponsible statements and actions, and should not make unrealistic promises.

One of the phenomena related to the functioning of the two-party system is the relatively balanced strength of the two great parties. By rule, there is not a big difference in the number of votes won in the elections. This actually means that it only takes a relatively small change in the opinion of the electorate (2-3% of the voters) to affect the outcome by transferring majority from one side to another.

The results of the post-war elections confirm that, in accordance with the famous theory from the bourgeois political science of "losing power" of the political parties, parties in England changed power quite often.

Thus, after the unexpected victory in the elections in 1945, the Labourists stayed in power until 1951, after which the Conservatives stayed in power for the next 13 years, and the Labourists took power again in the period from 1964-1970.

In the period from 1970-1974, the Conservatives were in power, from 1974-1979 the Labourists, etc. It is interesting that in the period between 1950 and 1970, both parties were winning a minimum of 87.5% of the votes and receiving 98% of the parliamentary mandates in all the seven election periods. With the divide in the Labour Party and the separation of one of its wings after 1970 (the forming of the Social Democratic Party), and due to other reasons in the system, the percentage of secured votes and parliamentary mandates of the two great parties fell below 80%.

From 1908 until the beginning of the 21st century, there was only one Liberal government, while eight Labourist governments, nine Conservative, three coalitions and three national governments were established. After World War II, the Labour Party took turns in power in the following periods:

1945-1951; 1964-1970; 1974-1979; 1997-2005. The Conservatives were in power in the following periods: 1951-1964; 1970-1974; 1979-1997. In more recent times, **the Liberal Democratic Party has been winning a respectable number of votes (particularly in the 2001 elections, winning 28.5% of the votes)**. Besides the two traditionally dominant parties, as well as the Liberal Democratic Party, there are other parties in the United Kingdom's party system: the UK Independence Party, the Scottish National Party, the Green Party, the Democratic Unionist Party, the British National Party, Sinn Fein, the Ulster Unionist Party, the Social Democratic and Labour Party, the Respect Party, the Scottish Socialist Party, the Party Alliance of Northern Ireland, the Scottish Green Party, the Liberals, etc.

2. POLITICAL PARTIES IN ENGLAND (THE UNITED KINGDOM)

2.1. The Conservative Party

The beginnings of this party can be located in the 18th century, when it was founded as a key factor for the political stability of the country. Its supporters often call this party a national institution. Historically speaking, the Conservative Party is also known as the Crown's Party, of the aristocracy and the Anglican Church, which from the very beginning cherished imperial expansionism, the interests of the landowners, and at the same time, the party has had a paternal approach in looking after worker's interests.

Some authors consider that this party was created under the influence of Disraeli in 1867, exactly when the National Union was formed, i.e. in 1870, when the Central Office was formed. According to other authors, the Conservative Party emerged in 1830 when the party group in Parliament called the conservatives to unite, and Sir Robert Peel became the first conservative leader. In some views, it was not until the second great electoral reform when the Conservative Party

gained political importance, after a small portion of the lower and middle bourgeoisie were given the right to vote.

After World War II, the Conservative Party was considered one of the greatest, not just British, but also European parties, with approximately three million members. This party had its true political boom in the period between 1979 and 1997, when it stayed in power for 18 consecutive years.

On the elections in May 2015, the Conservative Party, under the leadership of David Cameron, won 310 out of 650 mandates in total in the House of Commons, against 228 mandates won by the Labourists. After the victory, Cameron reaffirmed the traditional idea of the Conservatives – single nation, single United Kingdom, by conferring obviously much greater power to Scotland and Wales. In addition, Cameron obtained the mandate to establish the British government for the second time in a row.

The main programme and ideological commitments of the Conservative Party are based on the following pillars:

1. The individual has an absolute right to freedom;
2. private ownership is the safest and strongest foundation of individual freedom, independence and individual opportunities;
3. the party strives for free market and competition;
4. freedom presumes responsibility towards the family, the neighborhood and the nation, as well as the “co-operation of capital and labour”;
5. the role of the government and the state is to strengthen individual freedom and the right to a choice, at the same time protecting the weakest members of the society;
6. the economic policy of the state should be directed towards creating and sustaining a favorable climate for the development of companies, without directing or hyper-regulating business;

7. the party strives to maintain the existing party and electoral system;
8. the state should have a strong military and should function as a constituent of the Western Alliance;
9. the party takes significant measures to reduce income tax, as well as additional taxes in order to allow capital more space, to reduce social expenditures, to lessen the reasons for the emergence of strikes and other forms of trade union organisation of workers, etc.

Besides the above mentioned, it should be highlighted that the Conservative Party, however, is not a completely monolithic party, having in mind that its programme and ideological matrix cover various interests and viewpoints on the processes and phenomena within the system.

Those who are familiar with the historical development of this party point out the existence of **two basic currents** in it:

- » **one is the Tory or the conservative, which promotes the motto one nation conservatism, and which emphasizes the positive role of the state in securing wellbeing, complete employment and care for impoverished citizens,**
- » **while the second is neo-liberal, which emphasizes the importance of a free market economy and the reduction of state activities in the market. It promotes the idea of low taxes and low public expenses.⁶⁹**

2.1.1. The internal organisation of the Conservative Party

The internal organisation of the **conservatives consists of three basic organisational elements:**

⁶⁹ See: **Butler, D. and Stokes, D. (1974), Political Change in Britain, London.**

- 1. The parliamentary faction, i.e. the Committee from 1922;**
- 2. the party national leadership, and**
- 3. the basic, local party organisations located in the electoral districts and in most part adjusted to the electoral requirements.**

1. The parliamentary faction, i.e. the Committee from 1922, consists of conservative MPs. The aim of the Committee is to organise MPs in order to enable better orientation and management of debates and sessions in the Parliament, as well as an appropriate adjustment of their conduct in accordance with party policy. This Committee has its internal organs: an executive committee and an administrative mechanism.⁷⁰

2. The Conservative parliamentary party has **twenty-four special committees for parliamentary affairs and seven regional groups**. The party leadership is organised in several highest party levels, out of which the party conference is the place to display the strongest party unity, to demonstrate the greatest party strength, as well as the biggest enthusiasm of the party members.

Other significant positions within the organisational structure of the party:

1. **The National Union of the Conservative Associations**, established in 1867 to coordinate the work of the local associations in the electoral districts of England and Wales, and there is a similar organisation for Scotland and Northern Ireland as well. The Union has a central council and an executive committee. Their main task is to provide good management of the yearly party conferences.

2. At the party's top there is a **National Council with its own executive committee as the most powerful party organ**.

⁷⁰ See: Ibid. **Vasović, Vučina (2006), Savremene demokratije, (p.381).**

3. **The Narrower Committee** for executing daily party activities.

4. The **Central Office of the party under direct control of the party leader**. This office is an important factor in the communication among party activists, on one hand, and party MPs, on the other.

5. **Party associations operating in electoral districts**, and

6. The **party leader** who, since 1965, has been elected by MPs of the party lines. The competition for the election of a new party leader is held in three rounds. In the first round, the candidate who wins 50% of the MPs votes is considered elected, as well as 15% more than the votes of the second in line candidate for a leader. If this condition is not fulfilled, a second round is organised where more than two candidates can appear. But again, MPs have to vote with absolute majority for the candidate for a party leader. If absolute majority is not achieved even in the second round, then there is a third round of voting for the first three candidates only by applying the Alternative Vote system. Since 1975, a new regulation has been introduced that stipulates a yearly re-election of the party leader. The formal electoral body for the party leader elections consists of members of the party parliamentary group, members of the individual electoral districts, and members of the executive committee of the party.

Moreover, the Conservative Party also consists of other organisations that exist to unite interests and party members on various grounds. Thus, young people are organized in the Young Conservatives Organisation, women in the Conservative Women's Organisation, students in the Federation of Conservative Students, etc.

The Conservative Party also has the famous coordination centres of the internal party organs and organi-

sations that should secure a consistent implementation of party policy – **the famous whips organised as the chief whip, the deputy, seven whips and five assistant whips**, whose role was to “put oil into the parliamentary business machinery”.⁷¹

In relation to candidacy procedures of the party members for conducting certain state functions, we should highlight the fact that in **1998, the Conservative Party reviewed the regulations for candidacy procedure and election**, according to which all candidates should come from confirmed national party lists, comprised by the regional college of selection. It should be noted that each candidate who wants to come out in elections should first be on the confirmed party list, coordinated by the party administration.

The party administration is a coordinative body that consists of 60 members from all associations in the electoral districts. The system for selection of candidates for the elections varies from one electoral district to another, while the most famous is the model of Alternative Vote. The regional colleges of selection consist of 50 members representing the numerous organisations and different party regional committees. The sub-committees of the party associations in the electoral districts interview around 20 candidates and comprise a list of six candidates. After that, the executive committee interviews the rest of the candidates and suggests two who should attend the general meeting of the associations of the electoral districts. On the general meeting discussions are held with the candidates, and then there is voting in order to select the narrower circle of candidates. The final results are ranked and a decision for the selection is made on the final meeting for elections that are open to all party members in the region. The goal of such a complex election procedure is to highlight the party’s dedication for the election of personnel with the highest quality and the highest level of acceptance.

⁷¹ See: **Gamble, A. (1979), “The Conservative Party”, Drucker, M.H. ed., Multy-Party Britain, MacMilan, (p. 40).**

2.2. The Labour Party

Established in London in 1900, the Labour Party developed slowly but gradually, so that today it can be seen as an equal political opponent of the Conservative Party. At the very beginning, this party was called **Labour Representation Committee**, only to change the name into the current one in 1906.

Its beginnings are linked with the unification of the trade unions, the Fabian Society, and some other pro-socialist organisations. Therefore, in literature it is quite often said that the Labour Party is an amalgam of socialist and trade union elements.

This party, unlike the Conservative Party, has no unitary character but it represents a true federation of "societies" and trade unions. In 1918, the Labour Representative Committee transformed into the Socialist Party by adopting a kind of party constitution that is still in force.

The party headquarters organise the electoral districts of the Labourists who cover the whole state. Today, the Labour Party is the second in size in England.

The main difference between Labour and the Conservative party is that the Labourists, in relation to their own origin and development, favour the bottom-up principle of formation by associating trade unions, cooperative and pro-socialist groups. Whereas the Conservative Party favors the top-down principle of formation by grouping members within Parliament.⁷²

The Labour Party strives for changes in the system in opposition to the Conservatives, whose endeavors are directed towards maintaining the status quo in the country. The Labour Party acts on the party stage as a federation of a larger number of organisations, unlike the Conservative Party which is a single party.

⁷² See: **Towney, R. (1964), The Radical Tradition, London.**

Although the Labour Party's programme is mainly socialist oriented, it is considered that the Labourists have never been true captives of Marxist ideology, as was the case with many socialist parties in other European countries. The Fabians have been promoting the transformation of the industry under public domain and control, as well as the redistribution of national wealth to the benefit of all citizens.⁷³

On the other hand, Trade Unionism strives for expanding workers' rights and monitoring employers.

There were different opinions within the Labour Party dominating in different periods of the party's history. Thus, for instance, in the 1920s, the idealistic desire prevailed for friendship and co-habitation between all citizens in the country. In the 1930s, the party was under strong influence of Marxist ideology, while during the 1940s, the main accent of party action was put on the need for economic planning, which attached crucial importance to the nationalization of the main industrial capacities. The Labourists have always put their faith in the left-oriented forces of England, who continue the traditions of a non-systemic, inconsistent kind of Marxism.

Unlike earlier, when the main philosophy of the Labourists was the philosophy of "democratic socialism", today it is basically a **variant of the reformed social democratic doctrine**. In the last few decades in particular, the Labour Party has undergone a process of fast de-radicalisation. The difference of the Labourists' viewpoints from earlier and today really is obvious.

The creator of the new Labourism, the former British Prime Minister Tony Blair, explained the main points of the new Labourism in a few words: "The most important things you could have today in an economic plan are related neither to nationalization, nor to the strength of the trade

⁷³ See: **McKenzie, R. (1963), Britain's Political Parties, London.**

unions, but to the power of education. Education itself is the strength of the new Labourism. We have to prepare people for these changes. We have to educate people to use new technologies. This is how it is done in the modern world".⁷⁴

Old and new labourism have several core differences.

New labourism is obviously inclined towards abandoning the old ideological platform of the Labourists that rested on the ideas of justice and the redistribution of wealth.

The new labourism transforms the Labour Party from a classical workers' party into a modern social democratic party, i.e. from a classical left-wing party into a party of the left centre. That is why Tony Blair is considered to be more of a follower of Thatcherism and the model of neo-capitalism, entrepreneurship, privatisation and de-unionisation, rather than the classical British social democratic tradition. The new Labourists achieved what Margaret Thatcher once aimed to achieve, but failed

The project and the strategy of the "third way" (unification of the democratic socialism and liberalism) mark the new beginning of Labourism in England.

The next significant difference between the old and new Labourists is in their views on the concept of statehood. The new, milder, social democracy reduces the state's functions, which is evident in the absence of central state planning in the area of economy, as well as in the processes of nationalization. It goes to that extent that this process is explained as eliminating the state's wellbeing.

One of the greatest differences between old and new Labourism can be seen in the nature and meaning of social ownership. If the general view in the past was that without social ownership there was no socialism, the Labour

⁷⁴ See: **Garner, R.&Kelly, R. (1993), British Political Parties Today, Manchester University Press, Manchester.**

Party today considers social ownership as one of the many means to a more social economic functioning and more economic capital. Therefore, the party's position on the necessity for introducing a so-called "mixed economy".

The key point of new Labourism is the emancipation of the party from the trade unions. This is evident in Tony Blair's speech at the Blackpool Convention in 1994, when he explained the process of the party's detachment from the traditional ideological basis and the link with labour unions. Blair clearly positioned the new platform of the Labourists, which was supposed to set a broad social foundation of the party, left from the centre. The new Labourists moved the party much closer to the middle social layers, towards business-oriented citizens, and further away from the trade unions, which used to be a traditional party force. The new Labourists, instead of seeking support in the traditional circles of the industrial and other kinds of workers, are increasingly redirecting themselves to the trust of service providers in the public and service sector, as well as towards the middle social layers of citizens.⁷⁵

The new labourism had its doors wide open to the processes of privatization of the public services too. It provided a strong stimulus to the so-called "dynamic economy" in which the entrepreneurship of the market and the cruelty of competition unite through the power of partnership and cooperation.

The new Labourists' programme still contains the essence of traditional Labourist philosophy, which rests on the faith that a human being is good by nature, but that society and the institutions are to blame because they make him/her behave badly and live miserably. The economic institutions are to blame, particularly those who have strong influence on determining the range of the national income and on social priorities, which they de-

⁷⁵ See: Toni Bler, "Moj treći put", *Corriere della sera*, September, 1998, *Politika*, 6. oktobar.

termine as economic goals. Therefore, democracy needs to be expanded from political to economic relations. By applying the processes of parliamentary and local democracy, in which the Labourists put their trust, the electoral body should bring enterprises under citizens' ownership or control.

It is interesting that the new Labourism has gone through a lot of criticism by the system and citizens. Thus, Blair was remarked that by introducing private companies in the public sector (school management, hospitals, public transport, etc.) his party detached itself from the principles of social justice, as well as citizens' equality, which has always been promoted by the labourists. The new policy did not suit the trade unions as well.

These inner discontents were the reason for the division of the Labourists in 1981, i.e. the extraction of one group of party officials from the Labourists to establish the new Social Democratic Party.

2.2.1. Internal organisation of the Labour Party

There are three organisational parts within the internal organisation of the Labour Party:

1. Parliamentary faction, which consists of labourist MPs, whose main goal is to prepare MPs for actions to be taken in Parliament in accordance with the party's policy and the party leadership.

2. National leadership (the national party bodies and organs), out of which the most significant is the annual conference, as a formally highest party organ. The conference elects the national executive committee as the highest party organ. The leader is the head of the party, who is elected on a yearly basis by a special electoral body, the Electoral College, in which the trade unions are represented with 40% of their representatives, the parliamentary group is represented with 30% of its members, just like the local party organisations that are represented with 30% of the votes,

3. Local party organisation. The membership in the Labour Party can be individual or collective. What is evident from the works of the experts in the British party system is that **neither the Conservative, nor the Labour Party can boast with quality inner-party democracy.** Both parties are considered to have strong presence of concentrated power and authority of the party leadership, and that the party organisation, particularly that on the local level, rather has a supportive role.⁷⁶

With regards to the procedure for candidacy of party members for electoral functions, the Labour Party has introduced certain changes in the regulations, i.e. in the **so-called National Panel of Candidates, which is under direct control of the party's executive committee.** There are numerous bodies that have the right to nominate their candidates for the panel (trade unions, "socialist" societies, local executive committees in the electoral districts, etc.). What is interesting is that Labour Party activists are not obliged to elect only those candidates who are on the panel. However, every external candidate, before being accepted to compete with the panel's candidates, should go through a "screening interview" in front of a special organ, where a decision can be made to prevent a certain candidate from further procedure. In short, each MP candidate should pass the National Panel. Although they should gain the trust and support of local party organisations, the National Panel, with the help of the General Committee, drafts a shortlist and it is the final filter to determine which party members will be considered MP candidates.

The emphasis here is that the party leadership can impose itself on the MP candidates, or the voters. The independent position of the government in relation to the party represents a factual independence of the leadership from a good portion of the party basis, considering the existing personal union between the party leadership and the government. The party

⁷⁶ See: **McKenzie, R. (1963), Ibid. (p.639).**

whips, who maintain party discipline, are also prominent in this party. The balanced warnings to the party members with one, two or three lines, which the whips direct to their MPs, do not leave even the strongest party officials impartial.

2.3. Other parties in the United Kingdom

Although the British party system is defined as a two-party system, it does not mean that there are no other political parties in this country. **Statistics show that there are around 150 parties or semi-parties in the British party system. Out of which several, mainly with a regional character functioning in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, are represented in the National Parliament as well.**

The Liberal Democratic Party, which is known as the party of Social and Liberal Democrats, was established in 1988 by merging the Liberal and Social Democratic parties.

The Liberal Party, which is the successor of the Whigs, was established in 1861; while in the period from 1867-1918 it was one of the two governing parties in England.

The Social Democratic Party was formed in 1981 with the separation of a group of right oriented members from the Labour Party. Its 29 MPs, who separated from the Labourists, formed a partnership with the Liberals that they called the Alliance with a common electoral programme and a mutual leader. In the 1983 Elections, the Alliance won 26% of the votes but only 3.5% of the Parliamentary mandates. In 1988, the Alliance of the Liberals and the majority of the Social Democrats formed the unified Social Liberal Democratic Party with the temporary name Democrats, and after the 1989 Elections with the official name Liberal Democrats.

The Liberal Democrats were striving for individual freedom and the state's role directed towards the protection of the free market and entrepreneurship,

towards better education, environmental protection, constitutional reforms in direction of better protection of freedom, etc.

In addition, in 1920 the Communist Party was registered in the United Kingdom, which never had its representatives in the Parliament.⁷⁷

3. THE POLITICAL PARTIES IN THE US

3.1. Periods in the historical development of the parties in the US

Political parties have been considered a key element of the American political system since 1970. In all presidential elections in the US so far, the two largest parties, in the beginning the Federalists and the Anti-federalists, and later the Republicans and the Democrats, promote their candidates for the US Presidential Elections, as well as their own members for the federal Congress.⁷⁸

American party history goes through **four periods of development:**

1. The period from 1780 until 1830;
2. the period from 1830 until 1890;
3. the period from 1890 and 1960 and
4. the period from 1960 until today.

1. In the first period, the parties in America were in the so-called embryo stage, with the initial forms of party organisation into caucuses and without any stronger party organisation.

The embryos of the two parties are evident in the old forms of gathering of the politically like-minded, in the so-

⁷⁷ See: Ibid, **Vasović, Vučina (2006), Savremene demokratije, (p.397).**
⁷⁸ See: **L. Sandy Maisel & Jeffrey M. Berry, The Oxford Handbook of American Political Parties and Interest Groups, Oxford University Press, New York, 2012.**

called caucuses of the clubs in the correspondence board, where political debates were held and decisions were made regarding important political issues.

The two strongest and greatest parties in the US emerged directly after gaining independence and introducing the US Constitution from 1787. Although parties were not anticipated in the Constitution, they rapidly started organising soon after it came into force. In this early stage, the division of the people into aristocrats and democrats left a strong mark on American politics, and it represented a common feature of the parties themselves. The first period crystallised the polarity of the forces around two of the most important political persons and concepts, **Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton**, and the ideas they represented.⁷⁹

Jefferson attracted the so-called Anti-federalists, who promoted the ideas of a weak central government and of the fighters for the rights of the federal states. They opposed protectionism and promoted the idea of free trade. Jefferson was a leader in promoting the constitutional idea, according to which the constitutional authorities of the federal political institutions should be strictly stipulated in the Constitution. This idea brought Jefferson to power in 1800. The Anti-federalists, also known as the Jefferson's Republicans and later as Democratic Republicans, had the support mainly from landowners and farmers in the South.

Later, they gave birth to the Democratic Party. Jefferson is important for his anti-party mood because he believed in the American "brand of individualism". It was Jefferson himself who considered that the political parties are fractions that act as a strong disintegrative factor for society and the nation. Similar viewpoints were presented by the founder of the Democrats, Andrew Jackson, known for his letter to Monroe

⁷⁹ See: **Shefter, M. (1994), Political Parties and the State, The American Historical Experience, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.**

(1816), where he wrote: "...in every selection, party and party feeling ought to be laid out of view. For now is the time, he says, to put them down".⁸⁰

Such anti-party feelings in this period seem quite logical having in mind the fact that the biggest priority for politics at the time was the need to preserve national unity.

The Republican Party takes its roots from the so-called Federalists under the leadership of Hamilton, who supported the strong central government, the protectionism, and who later promoted the interests of the industry and fought against slavery. They, unlike the Anti-federalists, were much slower in organisation, encompassed various interests, and even accepted citizen dissidents from the Democratic Party, who after Jackson's defeat in 1824, fell apart into Jackson's Democrats, and the Whigs following the example of the English Whigs. The Whigs functioned on the political scene until 1852 and then disappeared, only to be united two years later by the Republican Party with former Whigs, dissidents from the Democratic Party, and members of the secret organisations Known Nothing and Free Soilers, who considered themselves harsh opponents of slavery.

Moreover, Federalists and Anti-federalists in the period between the adoption and ratification of the US Constitution cannot be defined as parties in the modern sense of the word. Hamilton strongly believed in the division of people into aristocrats and democrats, which, according to him, had its foundation in the division of people into rich, on the one hand, and poor, on the other. The famous theoretician Alexis de Tocqueville joined this view on the division of citizens, believing that the division into Democrats and Republicans in America is a normal thing. It is founded in the postulations of the two mainstream viewpoints that are as old as the world itself and

⁸⁰ See: Parton, J. (1960), *The Life of Andrew Jackson, Third Volume, New York, (p. 362)*.

can always be seen in various forms and opinions. One postulation restraining, while the other limitlessly expanding the power of the people.⁸¹

The Federalists (later the Republicans) had their supporters amongst tradesmen, financiers and industrialists from the North. Meanwhile, in the first decades of the 19th century, the Federalists went through several stages. They initially called themselves National Republicans, only to transform into the Republican Party.

During the first half of the 19th century, both parties were not fully shaped. The struggle between them was not founded in principles. Another impediment was the prevailing "anti-party mood" amongst citizens in this period that emphasized the damage parties do to people's life.⁸²

2. The second period of development from 1830-1890 is notable for the US's consolidated party system, in which the parties have a clearly constructed physiognomy, and start taking more effective action in the field. The specifics of this period are in the decentralized nature of the US party system, the decentralization of the parties themselves with weak local party organs. The hierarchical relations between central and local party organs were far from the strictly centralized relations existing in European parties. The power of the national party organs in the US was distributed to the organs of federal units, with a greater degree of autonomy for local party authorities.

3. The third period from 1890 until 1960 opened the road for reforms pointed towards the construction of the so-called parties of the electorate. Namely, at the beginning of the 20th century, the parties directed their attention towards the individual style of the can-

⁸¹ Interesting views, see: **Schlager, N. and Weisblatt, J. Editors, (2006) World Encyclopedia of Political Systems and Parties, Fourth Edition, Facts on File, USA.**

⁸² See: **Key Jr, O. V., (1967), Politics, Parties and Pressure Groups, New York, (p. 563).**

didates and towards developing specific party headquarters intended specifically for electoral campaigns only. In some parts of the US, as for instance, in California, where the parties lacked certain party infrastructure, the candidates had no other alternative but to organise their own electoral headquarters. Even in this third period of development, American parties remained what they used to be in the 19th century – organisations without any specific power or autonomous status.

4. The fourth period of development continues the course of weak American parties with further weakening of the party organisation. In this period, most theoreticians find it difficult to determine the borders between the party and other types of organisations, in times when the traditional party organisations carry out only certain more important functions, particularly on a local level.

In the period between 1928 and 1936, there was a redistribution of the electorate in the Democratic Party. The Republicans lost their dominance in the field. Such a redistribution of votes was an expected result, but also a consequence from the great economic recession in America.

The basic reason for the bipolar nature of the party stage from 1932 was the social difference between the people. The Republicans were identified more and more with the richer and more privileged social layers, while the Democrats were identified with the interests of the industrial workers, with Catholic minority groups, and the black populace. The expanded voting right to the benefit of the Democratic Party created the New Deal Coalition, which secured dominance of the Democratic option in the twenty years to come. After this period, the Republicans developed a new current in opposition to the New Deal, known as the “New Right”, which linked conservative ethics and economic liberalism oriented towards

defending the private economy. This new policy brought victory to Reagan's Republicans in 1980. With this victory, Ronald Reagan managed to attract a greater number of the supporters of the New Deal Coalition towards himself, i.e. to politically reorient a large portion of the middle class.

In the contemporary period, parties are considered to be an important element in the democratization process of power and democracy per se.⁸³

What are the reasons for the US's recent policy on strengthening party organisations?

The first reason can be seen in the more and more evident inclination to diminish the meaning of traditional party structures on the level of federal units. Belonging to a certain party does not mean voting for it by duty. The behavior of the American electorate cannot be compared to the disciplined party belonging of European citizens. This is the reason that compelled the American parties to increase the range and the professionalism of their party organisations. Winning the trust of the undecided electorate as a priority task imposes a responsibility to the parties to be constantly ready to fight. Parties are still very vulnerable when it comes to the selection of candidates. They have a very scarce influence on the process of nominating candidates, which is why they give little contribution to their electoral campaigns. However, today's American parties have a much wider activity than in previous periods.

The second reason is actually a consequence of the reform in the process of the presidential way of election that took place at the beginning of the 1970s, which aimed at strengthening the power of the national parties, particularly in relation to the way a selection of delegates is done for the national party conventions. Besides the two attempts, the national party organisations in the US remained very weak.

⁸³ See: **Bone, H.A. (1955), American Politics and the Party System, New York, (p. 274).**

3.2. Organisational structure of American parties

The Republican and the Democratic parties of the US have a similar inner-party organisational structure, which is often defined as a loose coalition of the party organisations existing in each of the federal units, rather than a solid, centralized and single party organisation.

In general, **the party organisation of the two political parties in the US consists of three parts:**

- » **party leadership;**
- » **party congress; and**
- » **local party organisations with party membership.**

The highest party body with both parties is the National Party Convention, consisting of several thousands of delegates. The delegates are chosen by party organisations of the federal states. The National Convention is organised each fourth year, mainly prior to the Presidential Elections, with its main task to introduce the political programme of the party and to determine the candidates for President and Vice President of the US for the elections. The number of delegates on the party conventions is an internal issue of each party and it varies from one to another convention.

In addition, **the delegates on party conventions are selected in two ways.** Around 1/3 of the delegates are elected on preliminary (primary) elections, on which party members directly elect their delegates, while the remaining 2/3 of the delegates are elected on the conventions organised by each federal state. Within National Party Conventions, later on, elections are organised to choose the presidential candidate of the party, who eventually delivers a speech, which to a large degree presents the electoral programme of the party.

There were a lot of disputes for the advantages and disadvantages of one or the other way of electing party delegates, but it seems evident that the compromise solution is to

have part of the delegates elected in one, while the other part in another way, which is still applied. In addition, it should be noted that the way of choosing delegates is agreed on the level of federal states. The aim of these federal party commissions and bodies is to construct objective and standardized rules of conduct and party loyalty.

The Party Conventions introduce the programme of the party and elect the National Committees that manage the party between the two conventions. There are two representatives from each federal state who enter the National Committees. **The heart of the central party machinery in both parties is the Central Party Headquarter with numerous party officials.**

The National Party Conventions have many functions ranging from ceremonial to electoral and political. They represent a gathering of the most faithful and active party supporters from all parts of the US in order to demonstrate unity, enthusiasm, party energy and massive party support. National Party Conventions are often organised in a form of political spectacles with the presence of many famous guests from the political and intellectual elites, guests from abroad, journalists, people from the show business, etc.⁸⁴

There are party conventions and central committees on the level of federal units as well. In the **districts, there are district committees established, while on a lower level of local organisation there are wards, as well as precincts.** The precinct counts 1000 party members and activists. Several precincts comprise the ward organisation, as the broadest social party foundation set mainly on voluntary basis. On all levels, the main word goes to the party machinery under the leadership of the local party bosses. Their influence is decisive, because they also hold the financial resources of

⁸⁴ According to the famous theoreticians **Michels Ostrogorsky, national party conventions are a big farce, mocking the national institutions.**

the party. The "bosses" stay in power mainly by bribing, corruption, or providing various forms of "protection", etc.

In the US, a party can be in power in two ways. The first way is if the US President is its member, and the second way is if the majority of the houses in the Congress are its members. It is quite often the case when the party of the US President holds the majority in the Congress, although it is not rare to see exceptions when the President belongs to one party, and the majority in the Congress (or at least in one of the Houses) belongs to the other party. Such a discrepancy is often a result of the various time lengths of the mandates. The President is elected to a four-year mandate, while the delegates in the House of Representatives are elected for two years, and senators for six years (each second year another 1/3 of senators is elected).

In addition, the most influential part of the party organisation is the work of the US Congress, to be more specific the **House of Representatives, where both parties have their own party conferences, while in the Senate, both parties have their party caucuses** comprised of all congressmen, i.e. senators. The function of the party conferences and the caucuses in the Congress is to choose party leaders, as well as to carry out tasks related to the legislative work. Before sessions of the Congress, each party organizes its conferences or caucuses and elects the leaders of the Congress (in the House of Representatives they choose the House's Spokesperson).⁸⁵

Having in mind the above, it can be stated that there is not a single Republican or a single Democratic Party, but 50

⁸⁵ In cases when the Republicans hold the majority they choose the Spokesperson, they choose the majority Whip and the president of the party conference, while the Democrats choose the minority leader, minority Whip and a president of the party conference. In the Senate, the Republicans choose a temporary President of the Senate, a majority leader, a majority Whip and a president of the political committee, while the Democrats choose their minority leader, minority Whip and a secretary of the democratic conference.

party organisations in each of them, which unite once in four years when they are supposed to select a mutual presidential candidate of the US, and then during the election campaign when they support their candidate to win the elections. Meanwhile, their activity is organised within the federal states. This is why the British author Finer, with all due respect, pointed at the “American parties as undisciplined groups of local interests”.

None of the two parties has its firmly shaped ideology or a long-term programme. Every four years, the parties adopt the so-called political platforms that represent certain **programmes for action** to be implemented in the forthcoming period. These programmes are a result of the various compromises that are made prior to the elections. In order to gain as many voters as possible, the programmes are carefully drafted in order to win more votes.

It is interesting to note that the election of the US President depends on the outcome of the primary elections, as well as the party caucuses as key tools in framing the procedure for his or her election. We should highlight that in certain American states there are only primary elections that are held before the US presidential elections, where in other states only party caucuses are organised. In third countries there is a combination of primary elections and caucuses. There is a rule that the primary elections and the party caucuses for the election of the US President are held in general between January and June, prior to the general presidential elections in November. The first state where the primary elections and caucuses are organised is Iowa, followed by New Hampshire, etc. **It is interesting to note that unlike the caucuses, which are always held by the parties themselves, the primary elections are held by the state and local authorities.** Americans define the caucuses as a sort of private events, which are under the direct leadership and management of the political parties themselves.

The state primary elections, as well as the caucuses, are often known as indirect elections, because instead of enabling American voters to vote directly for their candidate for US President, they through the primary elections first determine how many delegates from each party will be elected for the party national convention from each specific state, after which it becomes evident which presidential candidate has better chances to become the next US President.

Each party chooses its delegates who come from each separate federal state in the electoral collegium or college. Besides these delegates, who are elected during the primary elections and caucuses, state delegations from two conventions, the Democratic and the Republican, also include the delegates who usually come from the existing or formerly elected party offices or from the lines of the party leaders, who can vote for the candidate of their preference.

In the electoral, but also in political theory, there are opinions that this system of presidential primary elections and caucuses is quite controversial in its nature. Its greatest advantage is evident in the fact that the candidates can concentrate their resources on each area of the specific federal state, instead of running a campaign in each state. Although the overall results do not fully reflect the interests of the American electorate, however, it is interesting to note that the voters from Iowa, New Hampshire and other smaller states, who traditionally hold the first primary elections and party caucuses, have a strong influence on the development of the presidential candidacy race, while the voters in California and other larger states, who traditionally hold the primary elections in June, bear no significance whatsoever, since by then the presidential race is almost finished, i.e. everything is already known.⁸⁶

⁸⁶ In 2004, the party primary elections and caucuses were held for the first time in Iowa in the middle of January, while the preliminary elections for party delegates in New Hampshire were held eight days later. See: **Majkl Galager, Pol Micel (2009), Politika na izborni sistemi, Akademski pecat, Skopje, (pp. 207-209).**

As a result of such a condition in the field, most states, i.e. those where the primary elections are held earlier, are considered to have bigger influence on the electoral process than others. The two main parties in the US, Democratic and Republican, officially nominate their US presidential candidates at their national conventions. Each party convention consists of an appropriate number of delegates elected in accordance with the party's statute. Both parties have two types of delegates: regular and super-delegates. The so-called super-delegates are elected from the lines of existing or formerly elected officials and party leaders, who have the right to vote for any candidate proposed by the convention. In the group of regular delegates are those who represent the party committees in each state, and are expected to vote in agreement with the rules determined by their party. According to the law of the federal unit, as well as the statutory regulations of the party, when voters give their vote for a candidate in the presidential caucus or on the primary elections, they in fact empower the party delegates to vote for a specific party candidate in the state or on the national convention, i.e. they express the opinion that the party in the state is not obliged to follow the elected delegates by the national convention.

In all previous US presidential elections the nominated delegates were known prior to the party conventions. The last time when the great party nomination was not certain until the last moment before the convention took place was in 1976, when the President Ford had a tight victory over Reagan.

While in the majority of the states there are primary elections (closed or open) taking place, in many American federal units there are party caucuses held as well. Instead of having citizens going to the polling stations, voters participate on private local events organised by political parties and make their choice there. The advantage of the caucuses is that the state party runs the process directly instead of the state or local authorities doing it. The disadvantage, though, is the

fact that most of the electoral legislation does not apply to the caucuses.

Almost all of the states have compulsory primary elections and caucuses, in which the result from the elections legally binds all or some of the delegates to vote for a specific candidate on the national convention, with a specific number of votes. Some compulsory primary elections are in a form of competition following the principle "the winner takes it all", according to which all state delegates are obliged to vote for the same party candidate. In accordance with the proportional principle, the state delegation participates in proportion to the percentage candidates have won as a popular vote.

In many of the states which have proportional voting in the primary elections, the candidate has to win a certain percentage of the popular votes that are given through the delegates. Certain states, as for instance, Iowa, have an additional step in the process of the optional primary elections or caucuses where voters choose delegates of the district conventions, etc.

In many states, only voters that are registered through the party can vote in the primary party elections, known as closed primary elections. In other states, there are the so-called semi-closed primary elections, on which the voters who are not party members, i.e. are independent and can choose which party primary elections to vote in. In the so-called open primary elections, each voter can vote in any of the party primary elections. In all these systems, the voter can participate only in one primary election, i.e. the voter can give only one vote for a candidate who is nominated by the party of either Democrats or Republicans.

Both Democrats and Republicans change their rules for election of delegates between the two electoral cycles for presidential elections, including the rules for electing delegates for

each state and territory separately. In accordance with the existing rules of the Democratic Party, the delegates are elected in accordance with the proportional representation, **which requires the candidate to have won a minimum of 15% of the state votes of the citizens** in order to get delegates. The Democratic Party can prevent a certain candidate from participating in the election process with its own internal party rules.

Each state submits a plan for election of delegates, which determines the mechanisms for counting the number of delegates coming from a congress area, and how the votes are transferred from local conventions to state and national conventions. Since 2012, the Democratic primary elections and the number of delegates coming from each of the 50 states of the US and Washington DC have depended mainly on two factors:

1. The proportion of the votes that each state gives for the Democratic candidate in the last three presidential elections, and
2. The number of electoral votes coming from each state in the electoral collegium of the US.

The states that prepare their primary elections or caucuses at the beginning of the season can gain an additional number of delegates. It is interesting to note that the **Republican Party, with the regulations adopted in 2008, allows much greater discretion to the states on the choice of the method for distribution of delegates.** Thus, the states apply the method "the winner takes it all" in various ways, (as for example, in New York), or "the winner takes it all" method on a district or state level (the example of California), or the proportional distribution (the example of Massachusetts). With the change of the rules before 2012, the proportional representation was dominant in most of the United States.

In addition, three delegates come from each congress district. Each state gets approximately 10, plus an additional bo-

nus of delegates according to whether the Republicans have their own governor, whether they hold the majority in one or both houses of the state legislative body, etc.

4. THE POLITICAL PARTIES IN FRANCE

4.1. Historical review of the development of the parties in France

The ideological foundations of the first civic political parties in France were postulated in the works of the authors of the Enlightenment in the 18th century. The **Club of the Jacobins and the Club of the Girondins** are often considered predecessors of the first political parties. Although these two clubs are considered to be the predecessors of the first parties in France, however, in this period of the political development of the country we cannot speak of parties in the modern sense of the word. The political clubs played a major role in the political life of France. There used to be around 120 political clubs.

An interesting fact about France is that the French general Napoleon Bonaparte is related to the division of the parties into right-oriented, left-oriented and parties of the centre. Namely, **Napoleon, in 1789, with the intention to count his followers in the French parliament, ordered those representatives who accepted his politics to sit right of him, while those who did not accept his politics to sit on the left side.** Thus, the aristocracy found itself on the right side of the king, while the petite bourgeoisie and the supporters of workers' interests on the left.

Quite unexpectedly, this division became the basic criterion for distinguishing the political parties and their ideologies in the modern period as well.

It should be highlighted that the organisational development of the French parties emerges a bit later than the par-

ties in the Anglo-Saxon countries. Namely, in the 19th century, the political struggle to introduce the republic or to preserve the monarchy in France was followed with party divisions between the Monarchists and the Republicans. Moreover, these two groups did not have a completely homogeneous character.

Within the frames of the republican group there were the so-called opportunists, i.e. conservatives, on the one, and the liberals, as a more radical structure, on the other hand. On the side of the monarchists, there were also several groups, among which the most prominent were: **the Legitimists, the Orleanists, and the Bonapartistes.**

It was not until the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century that the contemporary parties in France were constituted. After the final victory of republican ideas, i.e. since the end of the 19th century, in France the influence of the classical right has weakened, so that only certain right parties have occasionally come to the surface (for instance, the pro-fascist organisation of the French Action in the 1930s or the so-called Poujadistes during the Fourth Republic).

The main struggle to win the political field was between the left (represented by the communists, socialists and the left wing of the radicals for decades), and the parties of the centre, who are more numerous, and among which there was a difference between those from the left and those from right of the centre. The parties of the centre were lacking a strong party structure and organisation. They took the form of occasional gatherings and organised themselves without any permanent and precisely defined programme, and without a large membership.

In addition, the political parties, as well as the party system of France, differ from those of the Anglo-Saxon countries in several aspects.

First, the French parties are considered to be more indoctrinated and ideological, and less pragmatic than the parties in the Anglo-Saxon countries.

Second, they are internally strong organised unlike the parties in the US or in Britain.

Third, the parties in France have a deeper social foundation unlike the parties in the US.

Fourth, in certain views, the developed individualism in France requires a wider range of political options that affect the character of the parties.

Fifth, the historical circumstances and the bloody conflicts on various grounds have had a strong influence on the extremist points of the wide range of political views and demands. As a result of these processes, during the 1930s, on the extreme far right the pro-fascist organisation Action for France was established, and later during the Fourth and Fifth Republic the Poujadistes were formed. On the other hand, however, to the far left another group emerged of even more left-oriented and more radical organisation than the Communist party, which was already divided into several fractions.

Sixth, in France the left parties have traditionally had bigger influence and strength in relation to other left parties in other European countries. Quite often, the main struggle happens between the parties from the left block, including the communists, the socialists, and the radicals from the left wing, and the parties from the right centre block, encompassing the main right-oriented parties and the parties of the right centre.⁸⁷

The multi-party system in France, as well as the existence of numerous parties in this country, is often seen as a reason for the political inconsistency of the system, the common political crises in managing the institutions, as well as the political instability of the authorities. It is interesting to note that in France there are various classifications of the parties in the system that can be found among current politicians, but also among scientists as well. Thus, for instance, the former French

⁸⁷ See in more detail, *ibid.*, **Vasović, Vučina (2006), Savremene demokracije, (p. 526).**

President François Mitterrand distinguished between communist, social democratic, liberal democratic, and conservative parties in France. Unlike him, Pompidou distinguished between the Gaullists, the Communists, the United Socialists, the Reactionary Left, the "European Right", and the "National" Right (both of which emerged under the influence of the US). After World War II, there were certain authors who classify French parties in six ideological families: Communist and Socialist; Radical Socialist and Catholic; Conservative and Gaullists. The class differences serve as a criterion for this division, as well as the various viewpoints that parties have on economic policy-making, the relations between the Parliament and the executive power, and the position of religion in politics.⁸⁸

There are certain authors who deliberately try to avoid the division of the parties into left and right due to the fact that contemporary parties cannot be easily divided based on ideological criteria only. Thus, for instance, the authors state that catch-all parties cannot be placed in a specific group based on ideological criteria only, since their programmes are intended for various social layers of citizen groups.⁸⁹

Today, in France there are several relevant political parties whose importance in shaping and functioning of the political system of this country is crucial. Thus, in the left wing, the Communist Party of France has a significant position, which was considered the strongest and the most organised party in France, established in 1920, then the Socialist Party, established in 1901, and the Movement of the Radical Left, while in the group of parties from the political centre the Gaullists have the most important position (the Gaullist Union for the Fourth Re-

⁸⁸ Taken from: **Hancock, M.D., Conradt, D.P, Peters, B.G., Safran, W., White, S. Zariski, R. (2003), Politics in Europe, Chatham, New York, (p. 119).**

⁸⁹ Regardless of the numerous inconsistencies this classification has, it is, however, true that it still dominates the political theory. Thus, the left is defined as a space encompassing parties whose programmes are more inclined towards equality, social justice, secular justice, broader social wellbeing, people's sovereignty, republicanism, etc. At the right side of the political spectrum there are parties that are more related to monarchism, exclusive private ownership, market deprived of social expenditure, etc.

public, which was later transformed into New Gaullist Right), then the Union for a Popular Movement established in 2002, the centre-right Union for French Democracy, established in 1978, the Popular Republican Movement, the Liberal Democratic Party, and the Green Party established in 1984, while in the group of right wing parties, there are the Movement for France (the conservatives), the National Front of Jean-Marie Le Pen established in 1972, and several minor parties. According to Elgie and Griggs⁹⁰ the political parties in France have four main features:

1. Many of them have their own historical and political predecessors, however, most of them have been established only recently;
2. All of them are striving to have small membership and powerful local elites;
3. They represent highly customized organisations centered around the party leader; and
4. There are numerous party fractions in each of them.

The parties are exceptionally disciplined, on one hand, but highly competitive within their respective memberships, on the other, which is considered to be a direct consequence of the strong influence of the Fifth French Republic's President.

4.2. Organisational structure of the parties in France

The Socialist Party of France, as all other parties in this country, has a very heterogeneous party infrastructure. It is mainly organised on three party levels. The first level represents the lowest level of local party organisations, the second level consists of departmental organisations, and the third level is the national level of party organisation.

The local organisation of sections of the Socialist Party are grouped in **departmental federations**. Within the

⁹⁰ See: Elgie, R. and Griggs, S. (2000), *French Politics: Debates and Controversies*, London: Routledge, (p. 99-102).

frames of each departmental federation there are five sections included, and around 100 party members are sent as representatives to the National Annual Party Congress. In accordance with the party's statute, **the Congress is the highest party organ** that defines and projects the main party philosophy and programme. Between the two congresses, the highest and most important party organ is the **National Council**, comprised of delegates of each departmental federation. The executive organ of the party consists of 45 members elected at the Congress with the majority of votes, and represents the most significant operational party organ. **The Executive Committee** consists of the secretariat and five members, the leaders of the party youth, as well as media editors. It is interesting to note that the Socialist Party of France cherishes the party fraction policy. Creating party fractions is characterized with their excessive independence, so that party fractions are often described as separate party subjects.

The Communist Party in France used to be the biggest and most firmly organised party in this country. Thus, in the period from 1946-1956, this party held a quarter of the votes of the electorate on its side, while in the period from 1944-1947 the Communist Party was the party with the best reputation and biggest power. It is a familiar fact that this party is an opponent to the idea of the EUs existence, which it considers a classic monopolistic capitalistic club.

Speaking of party organisation, it should be highlighted that the Communist Party maintains a high degree of party hierarchy with strict party discipline of its members. The smallest organisational unit in this party is **the cell**, where key cells are formed within the communes. Each cell has its **executive body**. The coordination of several cells is facilitated by **the selection**, and there is one for each department. The selections there are grouped in **departmental federations** that send delegates to the **party congress**, which is held every three years. The congress elects the central party

committee, which, on the other hand, elects the members of the **politburo** and the party secretariat under the leadership of the general secretary. The politburo is in charge of giving instructions for work and action to the communist representatives. With the loss of its power, the Communist Party reduced the degree of its democratic centralism, and opened the possibility of forming factions in the party, which is an evident exception from the theoretical views that the communist parties prohibit factions within their organisations.

5. THE POLITICAL PARTIES IN THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

5.1. Historical review of the development of the parties in the Federal Republic of Germany

The origins of the existing, contemporary party system in Germany are tightly related to the postwar party system of West Germany. Namely, unlike the previous historically negative experience related to political parties, which were mainly accused by the citizens of causing national division and protecting party -instead of national - interests, as well as the collapse of the Weimar Republic, the new constitution of the state meant turning a new page in creating a positive step towards parties and their position in the system.

Thus, Article 21 of the Basic Law of Germany stipulates that:

1. Political parties shall participate in the formation of the political will of the people. They may be freely established. Their internal organisation must conform to democratic principles. They must publicly account for their assets and for the sources and use of their funds.

2. Parties that, by reason of their aims or the behaviour of their adherents, seek to undermine or abolish the free democratic basic order or to endanger the existence of the

Federal Republic of Germany shall be unconstitutional. The Federal Constitutional Court shall rule on the question of unconstitutionality.⁹¹

3. Details shall be regulated by federal laws. The two largest political parties, who were active policy makers right after World War II, are still the key carriers of political activity in Germany – the conservative **Christian Democratic Union (CDU)**, and the centre-left **Social Democratic Party (SPD)**.

In general, today in the Federal Republic of Germany there are several bigger parties besides the two mentioned above, such as the **Christian Social Union (CSU)**, and then the **Free Democratic Party (FDP)**, which is considered as a smaller coalition partner to one of the two winning parties, the Green Party. It is interesting to note that the **Green Party** made a so-called small revolution in 1998 with Joschka Fischer as their leader, who openly helped the Social Democrats in the policy making of Chancellor Gerhard Schröder.⁹²

The name Schröder is also related to the start of the multi-party system in Germany. The result of the emergence of the new parties, both on national and on regional level, is that in Germany it becomes more and more difficult to predict the election results and their effects. In addition, the chances for establishing a coalition government are reduced as well.

⁹¹ The Federal Constitutional Court has decided twice on the unconstitutionality of the parties. The first time was in 1952 when the neo-Nazi SRP was declared unconstitutional, and the second time in 1956 when the Communist Party of Germany was declared unconstitutional. In the first case, the Court took the position that the party and its members did not accept the basic values of the liberal democratic system, and that the party rhetoric was full of racist statements and totalitarian views, which are against the provisions stipulated in the Basic Law. In the second case, the Constitutional Court determined that the actions of the Communist Party were against the liberal democratic order, and as such it is unconstitutional.

⁹² See: **Otto Kirchheimer (1966), "The Transformation of the Western European Party System", in: Joseph LaPalombara and Myron Weiner (eds.), Political Parties and Political Development, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, (pp. 177-200).**

1. The Christian Democratic Union (CDU) was founded after World War II, as the main conservative party in Germany. Five out of eight chancellors of the Federal Republic of Germany since 1949 have been members of the CDU. Its roots can be found in the CDU's predecessor, the centralist party founded in 1870. The first Chancellors from this party, Konrad Adenauer⁹³ and Ludwig Erhard,⁹⁴ who were in charge of the western German economic miracle of invigorating the principles of social market economy, rejected socialism and laissez-faire economy, by imposing a new role to the government to secure a framework for fair competition, reduced unemployment, and social wellbeing. The party continued to respect and apply these principles which became the pillars of the German economic system.⁹⁵ This party represents an excellent example of gathering members from heterogeneous groups of citizens: Catholics, Protestants, businessmen, trade unionists, conservatives, etc., all united under the idea to construct Germany in accordance with the humanistic and Christian principles and values, as an anti-Nazi and anti-Communist country, standing in defence of conservative values and a free market economy. This is why German theorists consider this party to be the one to have achieved the historical reconciliation and unification of the two Christian denominations.

2. The Christian Social Union (CSU) is a Christian Democratic sister party of the CDU, established in Bavaria by the

⁹³ There is a reason behind the saying "CDU was Adenauer, and Adenauer was CDU". This party is following the political preferences of Adenauer who transformed the party into catchall votes or people's party.

⁹⁴ After Konrad Adenauer left the party in 1963, the former Minister of Economics and the creator of the "German economic miracle", Ludwig Erhard, was out on the position. Besides his competencies in economic planning, however, Erhard could not create a new vision for the party, particularly after the postwar recovery. After the broad coalition between the CDU and SPD from 1966 to 1969, the CDU, after 20 years in power, became the opposition where it remained for the next 13 years.

⁹⁵ See: **Gordon Smith (1993), "Dimensions of Change in the German Party System", in: Stephen Padgett (eds.), Parties and Party Systems in the New Germany, Aldershot u.a.: Dartmouth, (p. 95).**

representatives of the former Bavarian People's Party, which was functional in the time of the Weimar Republic. This party is independent and autonomous and has been in a permanent alliance with the CDU ever since it was founded. In the Bundestag, these two parties always form a joint parliamentary group. Ever since the first regional elections in Bavaria in distant 1946, the Christian Social Union has not lost a single electoral process. In the regional parliament it has continuously been winning the majority of seats and its party leaders have been the presidents of the Bavarian government. Besides its regional character, this party has a huge national significance, when forming the majority in the federal Bundestag, but also with the elections for the German Chancellor.

This party is regularly more conservative than the CDU, particularly when it comes to issues related to abortion, the protection of family values, the rights of the LGBT community, the relationship between state and religion, immigration issues, etc.

3. Centre-left oriented Social Democratic Party (SPD), established in 1875. Initially, it started as a workers' movement in order to grow into a political party later. This is the oldest German political party, which has traditionally represented the interests of the working class. The largest portion of its supporters and sympathizers come from the big cities of the northern, mostly Protestant, part of Germany, as well as from the Ruhr region. Willy Brandt was the first Chancellor nominated by this party after World War II, who is also prominent for his concept for reconciliation that was achieved between Western Germany on the one hand, and the countries from Eastern Europe, on the other. The party has established many coalitions in the last 60 years of existence of the Federal Republic. In this regard, the SPD joined two great coalitions with the conservatives, in the period

between 1966⁹⁶ and 1969, as well as between 2005 and 2009, which is the best example to demonstrate that in Germany it is not uncommon to establish political coalitions between the two largest parties from the left and the right wing.

4. The Free Democratic Party of Germany (FDP) is defined as a business party that promotes the principles and policies of a free market economy and individual freedom. Moreover, it is also defined as a classical liberal party established in 1948 by uniting a dozen of regional liberal groups into a political party. Ideologically, this party is linked to the values and principles of the traditional German liberalism from the time of the German confederation. With its position in the party system, this party managed to become the third largest party in postwar Germany, which has entered government coalitions as a younger brother of the majority party. It is interesting to note that in the unification period of the two German states, the Free Democratic Party gained the strong support of the electorate thanks to the great role its leader Hans-Dietrich Genscher played in the unification process. In fact, Genscher was the Federal Minister of Foreign Affairs for 18 years.

Established in 1948, the Free Democratic Party appears in the role of a smaller partner in the coalitions of the two major parties. It has contributed towards the establishment

⁹⁶ In 1966, this party entered into a broad coalition with the CDU and became part of the government. The SPD turned out to be a very capable and responsible party and is credited for bringing Germany out of the economic recession. In the 1969 Elections, the SPD almost equaled its power with the CDU. The newly established coalition government under the leadership of Willy Brandt initiated the political, economic, and social reforms in Germany, including the modernization process in the country. The most dramatic change in German politics after the new government was established is related to the foreign policy, i.e. the change in the German foreign policy to the East, as well as the process of approaching the Eastern European nations without breaking the relations with the western, Euro-Atlantic surrounding. This is the period when some international agreements between Germany, the USSR and Poland were signed to settle certain disagreements from World War II and to establish intensified diplomatic and economic ties. At some point, in this period West Germany also signed an agreement with East Germany. The government of Willy Brandt is known for its reforms in education and particularly for extending the access to higher education for each German. New models of age and retirement system were introduced too, including systems for health insurance, and new social policies.

of numerous governments in the last 50 years of its political existence, more than any other party in Germany.

5. The Green Party, established in 1980, following preceding numerous social spontaneous movements in Germany, with the main focus on the social awareness for the economic development of the country and its impact on the environment, as well as the threats from nuclear energy, etc. From the very beginning, this party proclaimed as a party of a new kind, which will never be bureaucratized and strive to achieve harmony between the social needs on the one hand, and nature, on the other. Main supporters of the Green Party are younger generations of Germans, mostly students, but also farmers, as well as members of the middle class. The party has two internal party wings: the wing of the fundamentalists and the wing of the realists. While the former are against institutionalization of the party, since they strive to remain on the political stage as an informal political and protest movement, the latter are more pragmatic and accept the institutionalized approach in providing solutions to the problems as the only possible way.

Although at the beginning of the 1980s, the Green Party had only 1.5% of the total number of votes on a federal level, as the new election cycles progressed so did its support, particularly after the nuclear catastrophe in Chernobyl, when on the 1987 Elections the Greens received the biggest political support of 8.3% of the votes. Another interesting point is that this party stood openly against the unification of the two parts of Germany, which had a negative effect on its election ratings.

During the 1970s, there were certain relevant views from some prominent people in Germany that the federal state enters the sphere of a one-party system⁹⁷ as well as views that an era was approaching that could be qualified as the time of "the

⁹⁷ See: **Wolf-Dieter, Narr (1977), Auf dem Weg zum Einparteienstaat, Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.**

parties against the citizens".⁹⁸ The general public opinion was that the party system in Germany enters a legitimization crisis.⁹⁹

However, in truth, in the 1949 Elections there were as many as 11 parties that were represented in the first parliamentary composition of the German Bundestag, among which the Christian Democratic and Social Democratic parties, who secured over 50% of the votes. Konrad Adenauer was elected first Chancellor of the first German government. The process of intensified party concentration, which lasted from 1949 until 1953, culminated in 1957 when the CDU/CSU won the total majority of the votes on the in the elections for the national parliament for the first time in German history. In 1961, the process of the so-called two-and-a-half party system was over and a new period of complete domination of the two strongest parties began, which lasted until 1983, when the same process gained in importance by the emergence of the Greens in the German Bundestag.¹⁰⁰

More than two decades later, the so-called "core parties" were successful in securing the support in Parliament and gave their contribution towards the formation of relatively stable governments. The only exception from this rule can be seen in the period between 1966 and 1969, when the great coalition was in power. The party system in Germany experienced its maximum concentration when the three parties in the Bundestag won as much as 99.1% of the total number of votes in the 1976 Parliamentary Elections.

The emergence of the parties of the extreme right in Germany was prevented with German unification, when, in fact, the process of the so-called new equilibrium within the

⁹⁸ See: **Hermann Scheer (1979), Parteien kontra Bürger? Die Zukunft der Parteiendemokratie, München/Zürich: Piper.**

⁹⁹ See: **Jürgen Dittberner and Rudolf Ebbinghausen (eds.), (1973), Parteiensystem in der Legitimationskrise, (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.**

¹⁰⁰ See: **Thomas Poguntke (1993), Alternative Politics. The German Green Party, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, (p. 45-48).**

German party system began. On the one hand, a government in which the SPD includes the representatives from the Democrats and the Greens was no longer an imaginary category. Another significant point is that the red-green coalition (the coalition of SPD and the Greens) became a reality, and not only an arithmetical probability. The Social Democrats changed their programme commitments thoroughly, as well as their personal political solutions, while on the other hand, the Greens, after the fierce internal conflicts, accepted the course of reforms including the possibility to enter into a coalition with the Social Democrats. Right after the unification of East and West Germany, the so-called five-party system started functioning.¹⁰¹

Although the political stage in Germany is basically stable, there are, however, other political parties formed, part of which have a more significant impact on the overall processes in the state. In any case, the stability of the positions held in German society of the two oldest political structures, the CDU and SPD, have never been brought into question.

In more recent years, the **Left Party (Die Linke)**, as well as the party **Alternative for Germany (AFD)** found their place in the political array of Germany. These are basically political structures distributed on the far left and far right edge of the political spectrum. In this sense, although Die Linke is defined as a party that accepts the principles of Democratic Socialism, however, based on their actions and commitments it is seen as a political structure with the most left-oriented ideology from the more prominent parties in Germany. As a consequence to all of this, the party Alternative for Germany is qualified as a right-wing party by the public, as well as a conservative structure, particularly because of their Eurosceptic and anti-immigration positions.

¹⁰¹ See: **Oskar Niedermayer (1995), "Party System Change in East Germany", in: Max Kaase et al. Politisches System. Berichte zum sozialen und politischen Wandel in Ostdeutschland, Vol. 3, Opladen: Leske+Budrich, (p. 181).**

CHAPTER 3



A PARTY LEADER AND LEADERSHIP THEORIES



1. THE CONCEPT OF PARTY LEADER AND LEADERSHIP

In political theory, **there is a narrower and a broader understanding of the concept of leader. The concept of leader of a political party in the narrower sense of the word** implies a person who holds the highest position in the party hierarchy and who leads the party with regards to all the important issues for the party. **In a broader sense, the concept of leader of a party** involves all individuals who have a strong impact on the decision-making process within the party, regardless of their position within the party hierarchy. These individuals are often the founders of the party, intellectuals, scientists, journalists, etc.

The success of the party leaders is closely related to: their competencies, the patriotic sentiment, the morals, productivity, operability, mutual trust and respect, self-commitment, and the satisfaction of the citizens with their leader. **A successful leader is the one who can motivate, who can impose positive values when practicing politics and who can attain political goals in a most appropriate manner on the citizens' behalf.** The leader has to affirm evaluation of the work done, organisational commitment, innovativeness, and has to stimulate a positive working atmosphere, procedural and distributional justice, career promotion in accordance with the system of merits, and to promote a style and way of living in accordance with the positive and moral values of life, be empathic, charismatic, and a visionary at the same time, as well as strive to respect existing norms and standards.

If the party leader is the leader of the nation at the same time, he or she has to be able to demonstrate a flexible approach in accordance with the moral standards that are part of the character, the morals, and the conduct of the political leader. Leaders are expected to have a wide understanding of

many issues, which implies a lot of accumulated knowledge, experience, systematized facts and expertise, particularly in the area of the strategic and systemic disciplines. Leaders have to advance their good governance skills. The very steps and actions of the leaders reveal their virtues, but also their weaknesses. Leaders have to be brave, moderate, restrained, modest, just and truthful, controlled and correct, honest, faithful and loyal. Regardless of whether it is political or another kind of leadership, there are **several universally accepted leadership features and characteristics**.¹⁰²

- » Should be a trustworthy, just, and honest person
- » Should possess a visionary ability, and anticipation skills
- » Should have the ability to plan ahead and encourage others to action
- » Should hold a positive, dynamic and motivating position in the system
- » Should have the ability to instill confidence and inspire.

These are the key leadership features that each successful leader should possess. The party leader is always related to the **concept of leadership that is explained either as a behavior pattern, or as a personal quality. Leadership defined as a behavior pattern** represents the impact the individual or the group have on the larger body, in order to organise or direct the energy towards achieving the desired goals. On the other hand, **defined as a personal quality, or as a character trait of the individual, leadership refers to those features** that enable the individual-leader to influence, to impose him/her on the others and to establish certain manners of behavior. In this regard, leadership is equaled with charisma.

Leadership has its advantages and disadvantages. On the pro side, it can mobilize and stimulate people in achieving success and positive work effects, because in case of the absence of good leadership people become passive,

¹⁰² See: **Harvard Business Review on Leadership (1998) (Boston: Harvard Business School Press).**

apathetic, and indifferent to the success of the party and the community in general. It is leadership that integrates people and directs them to act in a specific direction, it strengthens the organisation, the individual motivation, and it establishes a system of responsibility and accountability, the distribution of duties and responsibilities. On the other hand, leadership can have certain negative aspects. Thus, leadership can concentrate power and can cause the appearance of corruption and an absolutist relationship between the leadership and the members. The leadership can stimulate obedience and blind subjection to the leader; it can limit the democratic debate with the fact that all rules and decisions come from the party's top, rather than from the basis, etc.

Political leadership is always related to certain problems and disputes in relation to the degree it is in accordance with democracy and freedom. In the centre of these issues are diverse viewpoints on the nature of political leadership and its theoretical foundations.

Leadership theories are a rather new phenomenon. It seems that they are a direct reaction to the rising interest in leadership as a dynamic, socially and politically open and coherent process, which appears not only among theoreticians, but also among politicians on a much larger scale, as a dire need to identify the characteristics, the mechanisms for action, as well as politicians' behaviour patterns. Namely, by becoming familiar with the leader's characteristics, his or her positive and negative sides, his or her successes and failures, the public becomes familiar with the matrix of his or her actions.

Leadership is an "universal phenomenon", and the leaders are agents of change – individuals who affect many other people with their actions.

Political leadership is primarily a political process, which should be observed from three aspects at least:

1. **Leadership implies organisation** or mobilization of people and resources (economic, political and other), which are directly put into function of achieving the political goals;
2. **Leadership implies power, authority and legitimacy**, which are categories shaped by the history, the institutions, the goals, and the political culture of a country and
3. **Leadership implies creating formal or informal coalitions of leaders and elites, vertical or horizontal**, whose goal is to solve collective problems that give the broadest definition to the challenges for the development and the progress of the community.¹⁰³

In political theory there are **four main leadership theories**:

1. **The theory that observes leadership as a personal gift;**
2. **The theory that observes leadership as a sociological phenomenon;**
3. **The theory that observes leadership as an organisational requirement;**
4. **The theory that observes leadership as a political skill.**

Leadership as a personal gift of the individual is often related to the charismatic theory of the leader. This theory places its accent exclusively on the personal qualities of the leader, and has an individual character. Or, as Aristotle once said, "the moment a person is born determines whether he will rule or be ruled". The most extreme kind of this theory is expressed through the fascist principle of leadership, which is based on the idea that the leader is a supreme male leader capable of imposing himself on the masses and lead them towards the fulfillment of their destinies.

¹⁰³ See: **Heather Lyne de Ver, "Leadership, Politics and Development: A Literature Survey", Developmental Leadership Program, Background Paper 03, April 2008, <http://www.dlprog.org>**

Leadership as a sociological phenomenon is directly related to the characteristics of the social and historical forces that exist in a society. The leaders are means, which manifest the historical forces in the community. Marxists, who believe that the historical development of a community is mostly affected by economic factors expressed in the process of class conflict, agree with this theory. Sociological factors also provide the basis for the viewpoint that political leadership is a consequence of collective behavior. Thus, in the most famous of his works, *Psychology of the Masses*, Gustav Le Bon analyses the dynamics of mass psychology and claims that leaders subject themselves to the collective behaviour pattern of the masses, and not vice versa.

According to the third theory, **leadership is a rational and bureaucratic means that is inevitably linked to bureaucracy or as Max Weber puts it, "the leader is a legally rational authority"** who is impersonal and formally established. With the development of the constitutional government, the political leadership gains a strong bureaucratic feature, since the power belongs to the political function and not to the individual who carries out that function. Such a view on leadership goes against the democratic principles of cherishing leadership with personal qualities and charisma.

According to the fourth theory, **leadership is a political skill** that can be mastered and learned in life, as anything else. This skill is very close to the art of manipulation that can be seen in the examples of Saddam Hussein, Gadhafi, Hitler, etc. The example proving that leadership can be learned is that of Hitler, who was previously told exactly what to say and what move to make to the very detail by his teacher Albert Speer.

There are different styles of political leadership. Thus, according to George Burns, a leader can have a:

1. **Laissez-faire,**
2. **Transactional or**
3. **Transformational style.**

The leader practicing a **Laissez-faire** style of political leadership is, in fact, a leader who does not deal with issues outside his personal responsibility. He does not “interfere” with the management of the political institutions. Moreover, he leaves the whole responsibility to his associates. The positive side of this leadership style is that it increases the harmony among the members of the working team, and relieves the leader from additional responsibilities that block his engagement in developing strategies, as well as the party vision, in order to take political action. However, on the other hand, such an apparently indifferent attitude of the leader could give too much space for manipulation by lower political figures. For instance, the Iran-Contra affair showed how negative this leadership style can be when it was publicly announced that the president of the US at the time, Ronald Reagan, had little information about the way of the functioning of the CIA and the administrative personnel in the White House, who are under the direct authority of the President.

In contrast to this style, the **transactional leadership** implies a style of direct involvement of the leader in policy making and implementation. His direct involvement in all political processes is, first of all, pragmatically motivated in the interest of preserving the party’s unity, strengthening the support among the electorate, and securing a coordinated and unified performance of the political institutions. **This leadership style is managerial and technocratic.** Its advantage is that it enables a large amount of information to reach the leader in relation to all important activities, but it also allows a greater degree of leniency and tolerance on his side in order to achieve better compactness among the political institutions.

The **transformational style** enables the leader to become a visionary and an inspiration with the political actions. The leader who possesses such a style is not a coordinator, a manager of the political activities, nor a person who scores political points by maintaining a tolerant attitude with his associates. On the contrary, his goal is "to inspire and create his own story". His success as a leader depends on how well he can "sell" his story to the public. For instance, Margaret Thatcher, the French General and former President De Gaulle, the former British Prime Minister Tony Blair, etc., are all leaders who had this leadership style. The transformational style is often related to populism, which, besides all its advantages, can deviate towards authoritarian and ideological rigidity

These leadership styles in political theory are mostly studied by Max Weber, George Burns, and Daniel Goldman.¹⁰⁴

Thus, **Max Weber describes three types of leaders: bureaucratic, charismatic, and traditional**, and he is one of the first theoreticians who discusses leadership and the need for a dynamic rotation from one type of leadership style to another. Weber suggests two basic paradigms of leadership action: **transactional and transformational paradigm**. Weber believes that the transactional leaders are those who work within the frames of the existing systems in order to achieve certain results. For instance, he says, the bureaucratic leader is, in fact, a transactional leader who is efficient in applying his know-how or authority to achieve certain political results.

On the other hand, charismatic leaders are transformational leaders who are often compared to heroes throughout

¹⁰⁴ See: **Heather Lyne de Ver, "Conceptions of Leadership", Developmental Leadership Program, Background Paper 04, March 2009, <http://www.dlprog.org>**

Burns offers an interesting view on leadership as an essentially human and bilateral relationship, i.e. as a "reciprocal process of mobilizing people who have specific motifs and values, diverse economic, political and other sources, in terms of competition and conflict, and in the direction of independent or joint realization of the goals of the leaders and their followers".

history. The transformational leader is ready to see things from a completely different dimension putting his charisma into use, or someone else's charisma, to achieve specific goals.

George Burns' theory corresponds to Weber's theory to a great extent, who, besides the transformational and transactional leadership styles also distinguishes between moral and immoral leaders. The importance of Burns in political theory is that he provides a description of **five different types of leaders, who appear within the transactional leadership style, including:**

1. Thinking leaders,
2. Bureaucratic leaders,
3. Party leaders,
4. Legislative leaders and
5. Executive leaders.

Furthermore, Burns **describes four transformational types of leaders in his theory:**

1. Intellectual leaders,
2. Reformatory leaders,
3. Revolutionary leaders and
4. Charismatic leaders.

Daniel Goleman's theory, also known as Emotional Intelligence Theory, is primarily directed towards explaining the basic elements that characterize the leader. In that way, according to this author, it is not enough to take into consideration only the person's intelligence separated from other elements in order to define that person as a leader. In Goleman's view, leaders differ from intellectuals by their emotional intelligence, which consists of five components:

1. Self-awareness – the ability to understand one's own strengths and weaknesses;
2. Social skills – how leaders communicate with others and build a perception for state affairs;

3. Self-regulation – an ability of the leader to consider the consequences before reacting in a specific situation;
4. Motivation – a strong will and strength for success, and
5. Empathy – an ability to understand the views (problems) of the other or the others

Among the most prominent theoreticians who study the phenomenon of leadership is, of course, **Barnard Bass**, who identifies various definitions of leadership grouped in the following way:

1. Leadership as a focus of group processes;¹⁰⁵
2. Leadership as an effective personality;¹⁰⁶
3. Leadership as an art of mutual agreement;¹⁰⁷
4. Leadership as a process of making influence;¹⁰⁸
5. Leadership as an act, action or behavior;¹⁰⁹
6. Leadership as a form of persuasion;
7. Leadership as a process of power;
8. Leadership as an instrument for achieving goals;
9. Leadership as a phenomenal effect of interaction;
10. Leadership as a combination of elements, etc..¹¹⁰

In a world that is constantly moving and changing, and especially in weak and fragile states where informal institutions play a bigger role than the formal, and appear in different hybrid forms, the influence of the leadership is always stronger since the leadership itself shapes its own limitations and possibilities. Therefore, according to Bass, it is a key pri-

¹⁰⁵ The most famous theoretician who explains this definition is Cooley, who considers that "the leader is always a nucleus of the tendency". Stimulated by the needs of his followers, the leader directs (focuses) their energy in a specific direction. Therefore, leadership is a function of existing needs and a relationship between the leader and his followers. See: **Bass, B. M. (1990) Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research and Managerial Applications 3rd Edition, New York: The Free Press, (p. 11).**

¹⁰⁶ See: **Bowden, A. O. (1926) "A study of the personality of student leaders in the United States," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, vol. 21, (p.149-160).**

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., **Bass, B. M. (1990).**

¹⁰⁸ See: **Nash, J. B. (1929) "Leadership," Phi Delta Kappa, vol. 12, (pp. 24-25).**

¹⁰⁹ See: **Fiedler, F. E. (1967a) A theory of leadership effectiveness, New York: McGraw-Hill.**

¹¹⁰ See: Ibid., Bass, B. M. (1990).

ority to be familiar with the political leadership and current tendencies in order to understand politics and political processes within the state.

2. CURRENT TRENDS IN THE POLITICAL LEADERSHIP

There are many definitions mentioned in political theory among the so-called basic forms of leadership. However, none of them has managed to provide a more successful classification than that of **James MacGregor Burns**, although there are other attempts worth mentioning by several eminent names in political science, who also discuss new contemporary tendencies and which, in fact, are nothing else but a kind of supplement to Burns' basic postulates. What the majority of contemporary theoreticians who follow this phenomenon have in common is the viewpoint that the old motto "leader-follower" has to be replaced with the motto "leader-citizen".

"In a state of democracy the motto "leader-follower" is a limitation that has to be replaced with the motto "leader-participative and creative citizen".

Globalisation has created the need for new forms of international and supranational leadership as "a set or package that enables a transnational exchange of people, investments, information, ideas and authorities".¹¹¹

Globalisation has increased the importance of leadership in international organisations, regional organisations, and in global agencies on a very high level, introducing new trends in the content and the form of political leadership.

Thus, the quality degree of political leaders and political leadership nowadays is measured in two dimensions:

¹¹¹ See: **Joseph Masciulli, Mikhail A. Molchanov and W.Andy Knight, "Political Leadership in Context", Ashgate Research Companion, http://www.ashgate.com/pdf/SamplePages/Ashgate_Research_Companion_to_Political_Leadership_intro.pdf.**

- » The first is related to how much the leader has mastered the new trends in political communication with the citizens, i.e. what quality of political communication the leader possesses, and
- » The second dimension is related to the most important aspects of the so-called personalization of the leader, among which we distinguish the following key aspects: professional competence of the leader, communicative abilities, the ability to maintain positive political relations and connections with everyone and particularly with political opponents (the ability to enter into dialogue), the personal traits of the leader and his or her behaviour in public, as well as the leader's ability to inspire confidence.

Each political leader should possess excellent professional and communicative abilities, which are their greatest asset in building confidence among citizens and other stakeholders in the political system of the country. Confidence represents the key traditional, but also contemporary, foundation for building a successful political leader. Leaders have to be built as persons of confidence. Considering the fact that the citizens' trust is very difficult to win and very easy to lose, political leaders have to work continuously on all elements that comprise its essence. It is particularly important to constantly advance the leader's public and private behavior, to strengthen the personal traits of the leader, his or her competencies, the ability to present achievements in the media, to be continuously available to the media with a clear position on all current issues, etc. The new trends in political leadership show that the work of the political leader is extremely difficult and full of demands and expectations by the majority of citizens.

The focus on the individual features and characteristics of the leadership results in equating the concepts of "leadership" and "leader", so that leadership is viewed more as an ability, as the content of the leader, rather than a process or a politi-

cal bond between the leader and the citizens.¹¹² Or in Gronn's words, the leader and his or her solo-position are in the heart of this individualistic approach to leadership.

However, **contemporary leadership is not viewed solely as individualistic.** Contrary to this, it has to be observed from the aspect of all involved entities that are crucial to the process of building leadership, i.e. building the leader.

Leadership is related to power, but it is not synonymous with power. The relation between leadership and power is complex and has many different facets. An interesting correlation for further analysis is the facet of "hard power" and the facet of "soft power". However, the facet of "smart power" is even more interesting for further analysis, which synergizes the elements of hard and soft power and amplifies their application, i.e. uses them more discreetly and in combination, depending on the requirements of the specific case.

Modern political science, particularly in the area of political development, focuses mainly on the structure of political power, although there are certain remarks by contemporary theoreticians that the theory should pay equal attention not only to the structure, but also to the agents of power, not only to the bare leadership, but also to the social and historical factors that determine its role.

Why are these clear theoretical guidelines on political leadership not put into practice? One of the reasons for such a situation is the fact that if the leadership is given a key role in determining the political results it might create a crude connotation of authoritarianism, which is opposed to the politically "popular" democratic themes of pluralism and representativeness. The concentrated presence of democracy and cooperation in politics today resulted in the insufficient

¹¹² See: <http://www.leadership.co.uk/mainpages.asp?PageID =3>

presence of the issue of leadership, although there are certain attempts to sustain its existence.¹¹³

Both contemporary and classical leadership theories put the accent for analysis of leadership on the **characteristics that leaders should possess, or in the authors' words**, a set of pre-defined specific characteristics that leaders should possess. Particularly distinct among these are: **intelligence, personal (character) traits, trust, charisma and appearance.**

Other interesting viewpoints are those of De Vader and **Alliger, who further categorize** the previously listed characteristics in the following way:

1. The leader should possess a significant level of intelligence;
2. The leader should balance his or her behavior and position it between extrovert and introvert;
3. The leader should demonstrate a certain degree of interpersonal sensitivity, without losing the dominant note in his or her interpersonal relations, and
4. The leader throughout most of his or her actions should respect conservative features and characteristics. Their overall conclusion is that political leaders try to appear more intelligent, extrovert, and "manly", unlike those individuals who are not leaders.¹¹⁴

There is another viewpoint by Davis, **who considers that political leadership** is "the basic dynamic force that motivates and coordinates political entities towards fulfillment of its goals". With political leadership, the accent should

¹¹³ The slogan "ability, responsibility, and accountability" has an interesting connotation with the contemporary meaning of the concept of "governance" in its essence. The American theory on leadership, which is the most famous theory worldwide, prevails when studying leadership as an organisational and managerial structure. See: **Grint, Keith (2005), Leadership: Limits and Possibilities, New York: Macmillan, as well as in: Grint, Keith, (2000), The Arts of Leadership, New York: Oxford University Press.**

¹¹⁴ See: **Grint, K. (1997) 'Leadership: A contested Construct', in Grint, K. (ed.) Leadership: Classical, Contemporary, and Critical Approaches, Oxford, Oxford University Press, (p. 27-36).**

be placed on its developing dimension that is evaluated by the **success of the leader to create a progressive vision for the state, and to integrate his or her followers into the vision. The leader should find an adequate place for each of them in articulating the vision, as well as in fulfilling the goals that the vision carries with it.**

All of these opinions stimulate the contemporary concepts of political leadership to alter the classical relation "leader-follower" into a modern relation "leader-creative, participative citizens", and not just followers, or in Ronald's words "in democracy we need involved and creative citizens in politics, and not just followers." It is this idea that becomes a guideline for the new motto in political leadership that moves history forward and represents a leadership "for four seasons".¹¹⁵ It is this idea that becomes a guideline for the new motto in political leadership that moves history forward and represents a leadership "for four seasons".

The contemporary political leadership is based on electoral legitimacy, which is particularly important for political leaders who are part of the legislative and executive power, and who gain their political power from the very victory in democratic elections.

2.1. Some important leadership theories

2.1.1. Max Weber's theory

Max Weber observes leadership through the three basic qualities of politics:

- 1. Passion, seen as a strong and intensive orientation towards political activity;**
- 2. A feeling of responsibility and**
- 3. Intuitive assessment, i.e. the ability to do a proper reality check.**

¹¹⁵ See: Heifetz, Ronald (2010). *Leadership without easy answers*. Cambridge: Harvard Business Press, (p. 20).

Weber founds his Theory of Power on the understating of social relations. Thus, according to Weber, the phenomenon of power is created within a certain social behaviour. In Weber's view, the concept of social relations represents the behaviour of a larger number of individuals in a certain direction in order to achieve certain pre-determined goals. His definition of power is one of the most influential and most quoted. According to it, power is the ability of one individual to impose him or her on the others and in this way to implement his/her own will within the system, despite possible resistance by other individuals.

Max Weber has clearly defined the importance not only of passion in the process of acquiring power, but also the charisma of the person in power, his or her political skills and communicative abilities. All of these traits are features of the charismatic authority as well. According to Weber, charismatic authority among political leaders is determined as a power of legitimacy that is acquired in accordance with the leader's qualities, as well as their application that inspires loyalty and obedience among the followers and the public. Therefore, leadership is the power to diffuse the positive energy from the leader and his associates to as many people as possible within the country. According to Weber, the power of the charismatic leader comes to the surface when he manages to convince citizens to believe in his goals and vision. The leader's charisma is related to the risk of losing it, if the leader, as seen in traditional theory, "is abandoned by God", or if the position of power does not allow the leader to provide development, progress and prosperity.¹¹⁶

In contemporary politics, the leader's charisma is considered the most important trait in authoritarian, dictatorship, and theocratic systems. In order to explain the charismatic authority, these regimes often establish a sort of personality cult that justifies the charismatic behaviour of the leaders.

¹¹⁶ See: **Weber's Rationalism and Modern Society**, edited and translated by Tony Waters and Dagmar Waters, Palgrave MacMillan, „Politics as Vocation“, (p. 129-198, and 59-72).

2.1.2. George Burns' theory

George Burns' theory on political leadership skills corresponds with Weber's views to a great extent. The difference in their viewpoints is that Burns offers his own analysis of leaders, with a special focus on the way political leaders function in public. Burns is more focused on the kinds of transformational leadership in the context of moral versus immoral leaders. He also describes five kinds of leaders:¹¹⁷ **intellectual leaders** - leaders who create and shape public opinion, **bureaucratic leaders** - leaders who, in accordance with their position of power, impose themselves on their followers, **party leaders, legislative leaders** - leaders who often work behind the stage as councilors, **entrepreneur leaders** - often described as presidents of states, prime ministers, who are not necessarily related to political parties and quite often act alone.

In accordance with the previous division, Burns' theory describes four kinds of transformational leaders, including: intellectual leaders - who transform society through their publically announced positions and visions, reformatory leaders - those who reform society, revolutionary leaders - those who bring change in society through the system of transformation and enforced changes, charismatic leaders - those who use their charisma to change reality.

Within transformational leadership, Burns implements four basic components which mostly reflect Weber's influence on his thinking. This includes a theoretical determination of leadership skills in the political environment and on the political stage:

1. Charisma and idealized influence - this is the degree at which political leaders are charismatic and charming, and who can influence the public to accept their behaviour, ideals and opinions. Charismatic leaders demonstrate excel-

¹¹⁷ See: **Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper & Row, (p.11-18).**

lent persuasive skills when delivering speeches and maintaining regular contacts with their followers, but are also emotionally strong because they can cause sensitive reactions among their followers. However, the trust that has to be built between the followers and this kind of political leaders is the foundation of all other relations.

2. Inspirational motivation - the degree to which political leaders articulate their vision and mission, which seems acceptable and inspirational for their followers. Leaders with an inspirational motivation challenge public opinion by setting high standards, optimism for future goals, by emphasizing the importance and meaning of the task that has to be realized.

3. Intellectual stimulation – the degree to which political leaders challenge all pre-determined stereotypical views and prejudices, take risks and actions that they implement in their nearby environment. The leader’s vision is a framework for the followers, through which they can see the way they are related to the leader, the organisation, as well as to the social goals and visions.

4. Individualized attention – the degree to which the leader satisfies the needs and requirements of the followers, acting as a mentor, training and teaching the followers to obey, as well as to get involved in the realization of the goals ahead. This degree implements the need for respect and the recognition of the individual contribution that each follower can make for the political group. This approach aims at educating the future generation of leaders by satisfying every person’s need for self-realization, self-fulfillment, and self-esteem.

According to Burns, transactional leadership sets the behaviour of the political leader as motivating in relation to the others. The following statement by Burns provides an interesting description of the transactional political leadership – “do as I say and you’ll get benefits”.

2.1.3. Daniel Goleman's theory

Daniel Goleman's theory is related to the way emotional intelligence works. It gives an answer to the question – whether knowing the emotional intelligence means a better understanding of the leader's characteristics and leadership skills.

This theory is founded on the behaviouristic approach when describing leadership. In addition, Goleman mainly focuses on analyzing leaders' behaviour within one organisation, but also within their nearby surrounding. Goleman represents the emotional intelligence of leaders through the emotional quotient, or EQ, as opposed to the intelligence quotient, or IQ. Thus, Goleman considers that intelligence is not enough a criterion to define leadership skills. There are leaders who are successful and efficient, but not that intelligent. Their success is often related to the degree of their emotional intelligence.

Goleman describes emotional intelligence through five characteristics, or components:

1. Self-awareness – an ability to understand one's own strengths and weaknesses;
2. Social ability – the way one relates and builds relationships with others;
3. Self-regulation – the ability of the leader to think thoroughly and in detail before reacting to a certain situation;
4. Motivating ability – strong will for success;
5. Empathy – an ability to understand things from a different perspective.

The three leadership theories mentioned above are the foundation for all contemporary, modern viewpoints on leadership and leadership skills.

3. A PARTY LEADER AND PARTY GOVERNANCE

Schonfeld mentions two kinds of party governance: monocratic and oligarchic. In the monocratic type, the change of the leader causes structural change in the whole party leadership, since the new leader's goal is to leave a new, personal seal on the party policy, which is why he puts his own people on important positions in the party.

In the oligarchic kind of party governance, the change of a leader does not imply major changes in the composition of the administrative party organs. Schonfeld's greatest contribution is that he succeeded in proving it totally inappropriate and wrong - based on Michels' theses - to claim that oligarchy is related to the stability of the administration. On the contrary, he concludes that the fast change of the leadership always is a good sign of inner-party democracy.

The true meaning of the change of party leadership, says Schonfeld, can be identified only if we know whether the character of the internal party structure is monocratic or oligarchic. Although this explanation requires a more thorough scientific verification, it still distinguishes the key difference between the two kinds of leadership in the parties, as well as the need for a differentiated introspection of the indicators of non-democratic tendencies. The fact that there is a sense that the party leadership cannot be replaced within the parties has a negative effect on the internal party atmosphere. It disables regular promotion of younger members and stimulates internal conflict over distribution of power and intra-party influences.¹¹⁸

The extreme power of the party leadership causes the party's basis to become passive. The causes of this passive state can be seen in the usurped rights by the party elites,

¹¹⁸ See: Michels, Robert (1959), *Political Parties*, New York, Dover.

i.e. the party peak. The power of the leader in the larger parties can be explained only if the relation between party leadership and party members is analyzed in more detail. Moreover, as Rose noted, "researching party leadership is not researching individuals, but much more it is researching the organisational roles of the individuals who are at the top of the party pyramid". However, party leaderships are generally not almighty, as presented in theory with a great degree of distortion and laicism.

The power of the leader is not equal in all spheres. His discretionary power increases when there is a lack of interest among the members regarding certain issues. On the other hand, regarding issues of direct interest for the party members, there is little space for the leader to be independent since party members have clear positions and strenuously resist anything that might jeopardize their interests.

One of the strongest frontiers of the leader's power towards the members is the necessity to secure as much member support as possible, as well as of the electorate during elections. This is why the leadership should take into consideration the expectations and interests of the members and the electorate. **Olson speaks of this specifically in his theory of individual behavior in collectives.** Namely, Olson starts from the supposition that **individual behaviour is rational, assuming that people strive towards maximizing their individual well-being**, which is why they do not engage in collective actions that aim at satisfying the group or collective interest. The rational individual will refrain from collective action only because there is little significance given to the contribution of each individual, while the benefits from the achieved interest are available to those who have not put an effort in it, as well.

This is very similar to the behaviour of the party members, according to Olson. They are not engaged in party activities because they believe that if, for instance, the party wins the elections, regardless of their engagement, they will have a certain benefit from it. How-

ever, the parties often reward those members who have given a significant contribution with their engagement for the victory of the party in the elections. According to Olson, this represents an important factor for the increase in the number of hierarchical levels in the party, the increase in the number of party organs, as well as the number of members in them.

The party leader is facing the necessity to meet the demands and expectations of his followers throughout his whole career. Each failure to comply or to consciously refuse to comply with these requirements brings his position into question.

Rose particularly highlights that the influence on the followers of the leader is great when the followers mutually agree in terms of their expectations. When assessing the power of the leadership in relation to the whole membership, one should keep in mind the fact that the party's leadership is not a homogeneous group, but mutually divided. The relations between them are not characterized only by cooperation, but also by conflict.¹¹⁹

Oligarchic tendencies are not only visible in the fact that the leader remains in position for a long period of time, as well as in his dominance over the members, but also in the superposition of the executive over political organs. The true subordination of the political organs can be seen in the fact that it is the executive organs that make the most important political decisions. According to the statute, the executive organs depend on the political bodies. However, their role is rendered down to only ratifying these decisions. The executive organs have crucial impact on the human resources management in the party, but also in other spheres of society. The members of the executive organs in the party stay on their positions much longer than the regular members of other party bodies and organs.

The oligarchic tendencies in the parties obstruct their greater impact in society towards securing firm grounds with

¹¹⁹ See: **Sartori, Giovanni (1976), Parties and Party Systems, A Framework for Analysis, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.**

the social basis. The feeling that members have no influence in the party they belong to is one of the reasons for the permanent transfer of members from one party to another. Oligarchy is not only usurping the rights of the party members. It is a much more complex phenomenon, since oligarchy is seen as the ability of the party leadership to allow members to "autonomously" accept or reject party commitments and positions. This is a phenomenon of the so-called "voluntary subjection" of party members.

Many authors relate oligarchy to democratic centralism. Thus, according to Bourdeau, "democratic centralism leads to a deep discrepancy between the leadership and the executives in that the latter are deprived of the real practical experience". Jean-Paul Sartre also thinks that the principle of democratic centralism has a negative effect on democratic relations within the party, and it creates a so-called "serialization", i.e. a mechanical, and not a real unity among party members. It should be clear that it is a narrow view to see only the relation between oligarchy and democratic centralism. Oligarchy is also manifested in those parties that are not governed in accordance with this principle.¹²⁰

One of the most important factors for the emergence of oligarchic tendencies in the parties is the demand of the political struggle in which the parties are involved. The fact that parties clash with other political entities in this struggle imposes the need to behave in accordance with the immanent laws of politics. This means that parties have to be very fast in their decision-making process, which, on the other hand, requires a narrower circle of full-time employees who will assist the party leadership in their work.

The demands of the political struggle impose not only fast decision-making, which objectively means excluding par-

¹²⁰ See: Neumann, S. (1955), *Modern Political Parties*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, also in: Ostrogorski, Michael (1902), *Democracy and the Organization of Political Parties*, The Mackmillan Company: New York.

ty members from the decision-making process, but also secrecy of the decisions. This creates more or less an "information gap" between the leader and the party members to the harm of the party membership. The leadership also strives to extend the degree of its independence outside the necessary limits. Thus, it plays a major role in the "division of labour", which is inevitably established within the parties.

Another source of oligarchic tendencies can be found in the internal division of daily party tasks. Robert Michels, who sees a sign of oligarchy whenever party leadership is not replaceable, considers it a necessary momentum because party governance, in his view, should be allowed to people of trust with confirmed skills and loyalty.¹²¹ Party leadership, in the ruthless political struggle, must feel confident with their party's support. This is why, according to Michels, the short-term mandate of the leadership, as well as its regular rotation is undesirable not only for technical, but also for psychological reasons.

Morris Duverger also mentions these psychological reasons, and states that "the stability of the party leadership is always very strong in democratic parties. The activists do not want new faces. The normal development of the elections secures stability in the internal circle of the party as well, and in the main administration." The party that is organised in accordance with the requirements of the political struggle often resembles a pyramid, on top of which is the central organ as the body that makes the main party decisions, which then have to be carried out by the lower party organs.

In formally democratic parties the members, over a longer period of time and through their representatives, participate in decision-making processes related to the goals of party activities. However, these decisions are often very general and unspecific, which does not restrain the hands of the party leadership to make independent decisions.

¹²¹ See, *Ibid.* **Michels, Robert (1959), Political Parties.**

CHAPTER 4



INTRA-PARTY CONFLICTS AND FACTIONS



1. THE CONCEPT OF INTRA-PARTY CONFLICT

It would be a misconception to consider parties as monolithic organisations. Based on this presumption, **the stasiology (a term coined by Morris Duverger to denote the study of political parties)** has long been explaining parties as a "single unit for analysis" that cannot be subdivided into smaller parts. However, in reality, parties do not fit into this presumption for two reasons: **First, some parties are organised in such a way that the power of the central over the lower organs is very weak.**

American parties are pretty much of this kind. However, due to the high degree of decentralization, the oligarchic concept of the power structure, based on **Michels' "iron law of oligarchy"**, can obviously not be applied. That is why certain authors replace it with the thesis on reciprocal influence of various party levels, while **Eldersveld presumes that inside each party there is "not a single oligarchic group, but a larger number of groups whose powers on various levels are mutually constrained"**.¹²²

Eldersveld calls this hierarchic system stratarchy. The allocation of the command, on the one, and the control of the specific levels or degrees of authority, on the other hand, is a pragmatic necessity. Instead of a system of bottom-up subordination, there is a mutual dependence on certain levels in the parties, tolerance, local initiatives, and inertia.

Second, in the parties that are conceived as single entities, the distribution of true power rarely corresponds to the normatively outlined model. In the interest of gaining as much power, influence and prestige as possible, there is **an open of concealed struggle among certain groups of members** in the parties. The criteria for assembling these groups are varied: the social belonging of the par-

¹²² Taken from: **Goati, Vladimir (1990), Savremene političke partije, Komparativna analiza, Drugo dopunjeno izdanje, štampa "16 maj", Stara Pazova, (p.195).**

ty members, the level of their education, their age, their sex, their ideological orientation, etc. However, the fact that there are differences cannot be qualified as conflicts yet.

Political parties, besides being an instrument in the struggle for power in society, are often the battlefield for the struggle between its components – the members and the leaders. Thus, **intra-party conflicts are manifested in two kinds: first, as personal settlements between party members, and second, as an ideological conflict in which certain party members** and/or members of the leadership have different positions with regards to certain ideas and values contained in the party programme, to the position, or the range of the party priorities, the pace of their implementation, etc. This division is assessed as conditional, since in practice it is practically impossible to disseminate where ideological differences cease, and where personal conflicts begin.

This comes from the fact that party members do not often publicly manifest their desire for power and dominance, and the desire to take over the highest positions in the party. On the contrary, they intend to conceal this incentive and keep it a secret. In order to provide the support of the wider membership, they promote their own principles and ideological demands to justify their own aspirations for a certain position within the leadership, or some other personal ambition. This is why, as if by rule, intra-party conflicts related to the desires of certain party members to take over the power are presented as ideological conflicts between the members. And just as the dissatisfied personal and group ambitions are often rendered down to and equaled with the concept of ideological conflict, so do the true ideological discrepancies reflect as personal differences in the style, the character and the temperament of the party members. The personal moments in the conflicts are accentuated, which is not only a useful tactical maneuver of one of the groups in

the clash, or individual party members, but is also used to disqualify opponents ethically. These personal traits become dominant in a later stage of the conflict when the differences in ideology and interest are expressed as personal intolerance, hatred, envy, etc.

Intra-party conflicts that are rooted in ideology have **two characteristic shapes, which, according to Coser, determine the treatment and political faith of their actors.**¹²³

The first shape of ideological conflict is characterized by rejecting the fundamental goals and values of the ideological project of the party or the ideological project as a whole by some of its members, which is why they leave the party. The parties impose severe sanctions against the actors of these kinds of conflicts, which Coser calls **“renegades”**. However, the party assumes a much more severe position towards the actors of the second kind of conflict, where participants criticize the party for not realizing or not putting enough effort in realizing successfully its ideological goals and values. Coser calls the actors of this kind of conflict **“heretics”**.

“The heretics cause much more animosity because, according to Coser, they still share common goals with their former comrades, members”. Intra-party conflicts emerge as a result of the conflict of interest of various party groups and interests. Intra-party conflicts often emerge between:

- » Members of the party leadership, on the one, and the parliamentary group of the party, on the other hand;
- » “elder founders” and “new” party members;
- » the young in age party members and the elderly party members;
- » the so-called insider and outsider party members.

¹²³ See, Ibid. Goati, Vladimir (1990), (p. 205).

Therefore, **intra-party conflicts are divided in: institutionalized**, and non-institutionalized. While the former are stipulated in the statute and regulated in the form of factions, the latter are without any statutory basis.

2. FACTIONS

2.1. The concept of factions

The concept of faction encompasses a structured group of party members whose intention is to take over the governance of the party. The term faction is used to denote the **existence of a special group within the party, which is established as a permanent, not temporary, ad hoc group**, whose members are aware of its specifics in relation to the other party members, i.e. they consciously act as members of the party faction.

Factions are factual groups that have their own organisation and membership. Their goals and organisational status are in accordance with the party in which they function. If this is not the case, then the group is seen as "a party within a party".

Factions can exist even when they are not recognized in the party acts, and even when they are officially banned by the party itself. The process of forming a faction inside a party often goes through several stages: the first stage is to create **a tendency¹²⁴ in the party**, which is an informal process of connecting several party members in order to achieve certain common interests. **Several tendencies**

¹²⁴ According to **Rose, a faction is a "self-governed organised body with a dose of cohesion and discipline"**, while a tendency is defined as a "stable collection of viewpoints" and not as a "stable group of politicians". The tendency lacks organisational compactness, although that is what makes factions sprout. The tendency can become a faction, and the tendency is a stage in forming factions.

in the party can create a party clique,¹²⁵ as the second stage in the process of forming a faction, which is also considered an informal group of party members aiming at achieving common interests and needs within the party. **The first stage is related to the party current that is created when connecting several party cliques, and several party currents create a faction.**

Factions are not monolithic entities and single organisations. They look more like coalitions of heterogeneous groups, rather than a certain homogenous structure. **In other words, factions are not inseparable particles.** For instance, the left faction of the Labour Party in Great Britain is internally divided on many significant issues, such as the state interventionism in the economy, developmental policies, the intensity of the cooperation between the government and the trade unions, etc. There is a similar situation with the right faction, which in 1981 separated from the Labour Party and created a new party. The reason for this separation, which happened for the first time in the Labourist history, was the change of the way of electing the party leader, which denied the party's parliamentary group their right to elect the party leader. Since 1981, instead of the parliamentary group, a joint body including representatives from the trade unions (40%),

¹²⁵ Respective authors, such as, **Lukić, draw a strict line between factions and other groups that form within the parties. He distinguishes between a faction and a clique. According to Lukić, the faction is related to ideology, while the clique to the personal interests of its members. Furthermore, according to Lukić, "the cliques are not formally organized, while the factions are organised groups".** The clique tries to conceal its existence from the public, while the factions act publically. What strikes out as obvious is that none of the criteria he provided can sustain the critical introspection, since ideology and interests go hand in hand while forming various groups within the parties. The interests find ideological rationalization, while the ideological differences gain an interesting foundation. On the other hand, the formulation provided by Lukić is very flexible and allows enough space for both organised cliques and non-organised factions. And finally, the third major difference between factions and cliques is their public, i.e. secret organisation and action, which is considered as a weak feature to make a proper distinction. By (not) admitting that the faction does (not) exist makes no significant change whatsoever. It depends on the tactful assessments, and not on the constitutive characteristics of the faction.

the parliamentary group (30%), and the party organisations (30%) have elected the leader of the Labour Party. Therefore, it is not unusual to have so many discrepancies among the different party factions, and not only on issues of less political significance, but also on issues of key importance.

Factions can have a significant amount of party autonomy. They can even cooperate independently with other political entities, i.e. to act as a party within a party. In some extreme cases, factions can be better organised than the party where they function, although this is not a precondition for their existence in the party. They exist even when they do not have a high degree of autonomy within the party. Therefore, the positions of the parties towards their factions are different. Some parties ban¹²⁶ them, while others tolerate,¹²⁷ them, and thirdly, officially recognize them.

In theory, there are several main reasons for the emergence of factions: the agreement on certain common positions and viewpoints related to certain ideas and values that the party officially rejects, or the agreement to reject certain ideas that are officially accepted, as well as the desire to pursue some personal interests, the trust in the faction leaders, party members lacking social homogeneity, the internal organisation and the democracy cherished in the parties, the way the party leader is elected, the way parties function, etc.

¹²⁶ The communist parties ban factions with official acts. The negative attitude of these parties towards factions is a result of the large goals they aim at achieving. Their orientation towards a radical transformation of society engages all the forces in the party, which is why they attempt not to accept the internal conflicts of party members as a customary and normal party phenomenon.

¹²⁷ The second group of parties goes against the creation of factions in terms of organised groups, but they officially accept or tolerate the existence of certain internal divisions within the party. The statute of the Socialist Party of France is quite indicative in this case, which stipulates that it is forbidden to form organised tendencies, but it is allowed to form party currents within the party. The currents are formed when voting for the general elections on the party congress. It is difficult to believe that the currents will cease to exist and function right after the elections, having in mind the fact that they gather people with similar viewpoints, opinions and positions in relation to the party policy. This is why it is uncertain whether these members will not continue cooperating and socializing in the period between the congresses.

The formation of the factions in the parties depends primarily on the specifics of the political system in the country, but also on the position of the parties in the political system. If the political system bans the existence of opposition parties, then it is very likely to expect certain groups who are dissatisfied with their status in the ruling party to express their dissatisfaction within the party lines. The existence of factions in the party challenges not only the legal, but also the factual obstacles in organising new parties. Thus, for instance, the failure to establish a third party in a two-party system stimulates individuals and groups to pursue their interests through the factions within the existing parties.

Moreover, the position of the parties in the political system has a strong influence on the emergence of factions, as well as the intensity of the faction struggle. Thus, for instance, the factions in the Democratic and the Republican parties in the US in certain federal states show that the faction struggles can be much more intense in those states where the parties have a dominant position, unlike the states where the strength of the parties is equal. Based on this claim, the American author Key suggests a hypothesis that the existence of factions in the US is a result of the lack of or insufficient competition between the parties.

This hypothesis does not only apply to the US, but also to Italy, where the harsh faction division of the Christian Democratic Party is related to the fact that this party has dominated the political life of the country for more than five decades, which was a period when no other party could threaten its hegemony. The question that arises here is whether the hypothesis applies the other way round, i.e. whether it applies on political systems with only one (ruling) party. In this case, since there are no opposition parties, the faction struggle should be even more intense than in systems where parties function in competitive conditions. However, in reality, this hypothesis cannot be confirmed, regardless of the fact that there have

been settlements among the faction in these parties as well. Their occurrence has not been more frequent than in those parties functioning in competitive conditions. On the contrary, conflicts occur less frequently in ruling parties that function in non-competitive systems, although they are more severe and intense. Their typical epilogue is the political, or even physical liquidation of the representatives of the defeated factions.

The external organisation of the party also affects the existence of factions. If this is a party where horizontal relations between separate parts are not possible, and where the power of the higher organs is more emphasized than that of the lower organs, then chances for establishing factions are much smaller. Moreover, in this case it is more an influence, not a cause-effect relationship, because factions are formed in those parties that insist on unity as well, and which base their relationships on the principles of democratic centralism. The statutory ban on factions cannot always be an obstacle for internal conflicts between party members. The Socialist Party of Italy illustrates this thesis, where the division into factions is an important feature of its intra-party life, besides the series of attempts to disable the existence of factions. The same applies to the Communist Party of Finland, which has had two factions existing for almost three decades, which are denoted as "democratic majority" and "dogmatic minority".

The way a party is established, i.e. its "genetic code", has a huge influence on the existence of factions within the party. It is notable that factions are more often established in those parties that were created by merging several smaller parties (the examples of the socialist parties of Italy and France).

2.2. Advantages and disadvantages of factions

In a political sense, factions are often criticized, but at the same time they are praised as bringers of positive energy in the party, which goal is to integrate different party interests

in one group. However, **the main criticism addressed to the party factions** can be synthesized in the claim that they cause a great loss of party energy that reduces the social efficiency of the parties.

Moreover, factions are traditionally criticized for disabling the establishment of a responsible party leadership, i.e. for stimulating the centrifugal tendencies in the party, as well as the divide between party members. The existence of factions in the parties, according to the critics, indicates the existence of certain processes of party decentralization. According to Meynaud, this decentralization has a dual nature: on the one hand, there is an "ideological decentralization" within the party that enables greater fluidity in the party viewpoints, and on the other, the decentralization takes place among the social categories as well, which enables various environments to co-exist within the same organisation. **Meynaud's comments point at the social and political foundation of the factions in the parties, as well as at certain positive effects they have**, which came into the focus of scientific thought only recently.¹²⁸

Unlike the former a priori condemnation of factions as something absolute evil, or expressions of disintegration, schism, and ruthless struggle for power, today, we see much more temperate and restrained analyses. Instead of rendering the reasons for the emergence of factions down to a psychological level only (personal ambitions, willingness for political power, etc.), the new explanations for the functioning of factions in systems with party competition take into consideration the social and political factors.

Namely, it is believed that **factions enable the parties to gather many heterogeneous social forces within their lines**. Therefore, factions in a single party express the various interests of their segments. The existence of factions stimu-

¹²⁸ See: **J. Meynaud (1965), Les parties politiques en Grande Bretagne, Press Universitaires de France (PUF), Paris, (p. 75).**

lates the debate within the party and alleviates the process of changing party positions. In case the party is in power, factions enable greater elasticity in politics. In two-party systems, the existence of internal divisions reduces the discrepancies among the parties. There are certain authors who see factions as an instrument to fight the weaknesses and disadvantages of the existing parties.

The existence of factions in political parties is directly related to the degree and quality of intra-party democracy. This is why we need to tackle this issue as well.

2.3. The concept of intra-party democracy

The essence of intra-party democracy has recently gained in interest among researchers, both those involved in political analysis and those who put it into practice. **Intra-party democracy is determined as a concept that has normative and practical foundations, and which contains the necessary sum of organizational practices** that parties adopt in order to meet the expectations of their members and sympathizers, but also of the wider electorate.

These practices are based on three main pillars:

- » Inclusiveness;
- » transparency, and
- » responsibility

Intra-party democracy is extremely useful for the parties, because when put into practice:

- » It strengthens the party compactness;
- » it mobilizes party members and supporters to take part in party activities, which enables mechanisms for solving probable intra-party disputes;
- » it improves the image of the party;
- » it strengthens the link between the party structures and the electorate;

- » it increases citizens' trust in the activities of the political parties and their representative functions;
- » it creates a better connectedness between the party and its elected representatives in Parliament, as well as in other institutions;
- » it strengthens transparency in the political process and the credibility of its results;
- » it strengthens the democratic political culture in the party elites and among the members;
- » it limits the effects of partitocracy and party bureaucracy in all party activities, as well as oligarchic tendencies in the democratic system, etc.¹²⁹

In political theory, **the term intra-party democracy is very complex, because it encompasses various methods and models of inclusion** of the party members in the decision-making processes for the party, as well as in the process of creating the party policy.

In many countries, there is a **constitutional description of intra-party democracy as a transparent process** that should be in accordance with the general principle of national democracy.

Thus, in the Federal Republic of Germany the intra-party organisation "has to be in agreement with the democratic principles". In Portugal, parties "have to be governed by the principles of transparency, democratic organisation and governance, as well as participation of all its members".

In Finland and Spain, there is a rule that the party internal structures and their actions should be democratic. In some systems, as in the case with the Republic of Macedonia, there is a requirement to register the parties, typically by presenting a certain number of members as founders. Therefore, only registered parties can take part in the electoral race

¹²⁹ See: **Reshaping the Broken Image of Political Parties, Internal Party Democracy in South Eastern Europe**, Georgi Karasimeonov, Bulgarian School of Politics, GorexPress, Sofia, 2007, (p. 9-10).

and assume certain political functions in the system. Thus, for instance, in Sweden, only registered parties that have won a certain percentage of votes can have their representatives in the Riksdag. Party registration is often closely related to the country's allocation of budget resources for party activities.

There are certain viewpoints claiming that intra-party democracy is a collection of intra-party democratic procedures and processes, which are organised in order to elect the most capable party leader(s) who will prepare the best programme for victory on the elections. **Other viewpoints suggest that intra-party democracy means applying democratic processes** in the intra-party decision-making process in order to strengthen the democratic culture, not only among the political parties, but in general within the country.¹³⁰

The idea of intra-party democracy has recently gained in importance due to the generally accepted standpoint by the majority that cultivating intra-party democracy in the party system improves the quality of the citizens' influence in the political process to a great extent. It also strengthens the stability and legitimacy of democracy in the country, which has a very positive effect on the quality of the political parties per se.

There are other viewpoints as well.

Thus, for instance, **according to Giovanni Sartori, "having democracy in the parties is not a necessary precondition for having democracy in the society".**¹³¹

¹³⁰ In relation to these viewpoints, more detailed analysis can be found in the work of: **Susan Scarrow, Political Parties and Democracy in Theoretical and Practical Perspectives, Implementing Intra-Party Democracy, National Democratic Institute for International Affairs, 2005**, http://www.ndi.org/files/1951_polpart_scarrow_110105.pdf

¹³¹ See: **Slaviša Orlović, Političke partije i moć, Agora, Beograd, 2002**, (p. 329). As Sartori claims, it is well known that "the political parties in their internal structure are rarely democratic". In this regard, Roberto Michels states that "party democracy is a democracy in miniature. Democracy at large is not and cannot be a magnified democracy in miniature, because democracy at large is not a static collection of organisations that exist in it, but, to the contrary, it is a "dynamic product" of their interaction". Moreover, as Sartori puts it, "instead of observing each organisation separately, we should review the relations between the competitive organisations". See, *Ibid.* (p.330).

If we agree with Sartori's views, we cannot but conclude that intra-party democracy is an important precondition for promoting the broader concept of democracy in society. If the participative aspects of democracy in the intra-party life are cherished, then the model of citizens' inclusion in the political process of the state is actually strengthened.

This way, citizens are enabled a greater inclusiveness in political life, and the parties gain important educational functions in transferring citizens' power in the political system.

The citizens are actively involved in creating the party electoral agendas, while the political parties are more open to new ideas and new people. It makes it easier for them to get rid of the feeling of concentrated and non-transparent power.

On the other hand, however, too much democracy in the parties can cause problems in their functioning.

The increased influence of citizens in the parties can cause problems in the party leadership when the issue of fulfilling the tasks from the electoral programme is tackled.

The fulfillment of electoral promises often requires a greater degree of control and accountability of the narrow party leadership, which can be jeopardized if the party is overly transparent, and the party structure is too democratically decentralized. Therefore, the emphasis of party democracy should be more on the necessity to involve the citizens in creating clear and feasible electoral programmes, as well as taking full responsibility in case of failure to accomplish.

The citizens' inclusiveness in a party's decision-making process is the first step towards strengthening intra-party democracy. It is notable that the key party decisions in almost all parties are made by the party leadership, or the party leader in particular.

In so-called inclusive political parties all party members, and in some cases all party sympathizers, are given an equal chance to be involved in the decision-making process regarding important political and economic issues.

Considering the fact that inclusiveness represents a process and a set of formal regulations that define it, parties which are more inclusive offer more possibilities for an open process and participation in the decision-making process, than less inclusive parties.

There are three key factors for intra-party democracy to exist:

- 1. The way of recruitment and the election of candidates for the party organs, but also for the electoral political positions in the country,**
- 2. The way party leaders are elected and**
- 3. The way of defining positions on party policy.**

CHAPTER 5



TYPES OF POLITICAL PARTIES AND PARTY SYSTEMS



1. DIFFERENT CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING THE TYPES OF PARTIES

In political theory, there are several criteria for determining the typology of the kinds of political parties, according to their organisation, political goals, membership structure, and political functions.

According to the **criterion of organisation, political parties can be local, clientelistic, or mass parties**. The key issue for mass parties is the recruitment of membership as a basic party activity. Thus, according to Duverger, "without membership, a party would look like a teacher without students". Moreover, the financing of this kind of parties relies on party membership fees. Unlike mass parties, clientelistic parties have a different character. They achieve their functions through a selection of their profiles, unlike the mass parties that achieve their functions through numbers.¹³²

According to the criterion–political goals, parties are divided into: parties with conviction, parties of interests, and programme parties. According to the criterion–membership structure, parties are divided into: popular and class, while according to the political functions, parties can be state (governmental) or oppositional parties.

There are other criteria for distinguishing political parties. Thus, according to the degree of party organisation there are: parties of the electorate and parties of the party membership. According to the sphere of political range, there are popular parties and interest parties, and according to the position towards the political system, parties can be conformist parties and parties opposed to the system.¹³³

¹³² See: Maurice Duverger, *Political Parties*, Wiley, New York, 1963, (p. 64).
¹³³ Taken and adapted from: Uve Bakes/Ekhard Jese (1996), *Informacii za politickoto obrazovanie 207, Partiska demokratija, Bon, Sojuzna centrala za politicko obrazovanie.*

Depending on whether parties are directed towards articulating, i.e. representing the interests, or towards creating and directing the interests and demands, it is possible to distinguish representative parties from parties of integration.¹³⁴ In practice, two or three criteria are often intermingled, which means that all divisions cannot be viewed as absolute. **The criterion that is often applied is the political goal of the parties.** On the other hand, ideology too, i.e. the **ideological orientation of the parties**, is a criterion that is often used to distinguish parties. According to this criterion, they can be divided into: nationalist, conservative, liberal, social democratic, and communist parties.

One of the **oldest divisions of political parties in political theory, which is inapplicable in modern circumstances**, is the division according to the criterion of social group as the basis for distinguishing the various kinds of parties. Based on this division, **there are two groups of parties: citizen and labour parties. In citizen parties there are conservative, liberal and Christian democratic parties, while in the group of labour parties there are social democratic, socialist, communist, and the parties of the "new socialist left".**

According to the French theorist Georges Burdeau, parties can be mass or clientelistic, although the author uses the terms "parties of opinion and "ideological parties". The former parties, according to Birdo, gather representatives of various social groups. They cherish tolerance and respect individual autonomy, while the latter parties gather representatives of only one ideology, and only one social group. They reject tolerance, do not respect individual autonomy, and are inspired by an ideology "stylized by the dogmatic propaganda for the requirements of the actions". It is obvious that Birdo insists on a clear division in relation to the position of the individual in the two kinds of parties. In his

¹³⁴ See: **Neuman, S. ed. Modern Political Parties, The University of Chicago, Chicago, 1956.**

view, “ideological parties” impose stricter discipline to their members than the “parties of opinion”.

Duverger also distinguishes between elite-based parties and mass-based parties, which are defined according to the structural features or the party’s anatomy. Thus, according to Duverger, a mass-based party is a large party that has a firm party organisation with strong party hierarchy and intra-party discipline.

On the other hand, Duverger explains elite-based parties as parties with smaller party membership, due to the so-called social and economic selection of the party officials. Elite-based parties, according to Duverger, emerged first in time. Modern liberal and conservative parties, and with certain specifics American parties too, belong to this kind of parties. These kind of parties do not have a proper membership in its true sense, nor a regular membership fee, and the link between certain sections of the party is very weak. Their activity is mainly oriented towards elections and parliamentary combinations, which is why they are mostly considered semi-seasonal. Their administrative structure is insufficiently developed, and their leadership consists of representatives with individual interests. These parties are mostly interested in dogmatic political issues, rather than ideological issues, which play a very small role. Admission is mainly based on interests and habit. According to Duverger, mass-based parties have the tendency to suppress elite-based parties due to the fact that mass-based parties are far more adjusted to the new conditions in the political struggle, and therefore have better chances to triumph over elite-based parties.

According to Sartori, parties can be divided into: observing, ideological, responsible parties, responsive parties that favor electoral victory, and irresponsible, i.e. demagogic parties oriented towards winning as many votes for their own benefit. Many contemporary authors also highlight the following division of parties: clientelistic, mass, catch-all, cartel, leader, and professional parties.

2. THE CONCEPT AND TYPES OF PARTY SYSTEMS

2.1. The concept of party systems

The party and the electoral systems are the two most important subsystems of the political system of each country. The party system reflects the general physiognomy of the political system. This is due to the fact that the nature and character of the party system affects the nature and the character of the political system to a great extent.

Political parties, defined as formal political organisations, which actually show the divisions in the social structure of the country, act freely, more or less, as a driving force of the social movements. Therefore, the representative authorities would be powerless to act without the existence of parties and the party system.

The party system is generally defined as an organized structure, as an organised closed circle, where the political parties of a certain country exist and function according to predetermined rules for the political game.

The system that sustains a network of relationships, a network of political actions among the political parties (establishing coalitions, cooperation between parties, etc.), is called a party system. However, it should be noted that simply the sum of political parties does not make the party system. The relationships between the parties, their coalitions, the exchange of political experiences and information, the inter-party competition, create a system only if they contribute towards political stability and towards a specifically established order. If there is no order, if there is no stability, the party system is seriously politically shaken, which leads towards creating a new party system, or its transition towards its stabilization. There are such opinions that claim that in times when party identification is weakening and the election samples are becoming unreliable, party systems lose their "systemic" character, which makes it difficult to distinguish them.

Duverger provides the most significant typology of the kinds of party systems, following the criterion of the number of political parties competing to win the power. Thus, Duverger distinguishes between: one-party, two-party, and multiparty systems. Although this typology is the most represented in political theory, parties cannot be rendered down to a simple "game of numbers", after all. Equally important as the number of parties is the criterion of the party's strength, the party's power to be directly involved in state policy-making, as well as in the functioning of the political institutions in the country.

Or, **in Sartori's words, in order to determine the character of the party system it is extremely important to measure the "relevance"** of the political parties when establishing the government and the mandates won in the legislative body. In accordance with this approach of Sartori, parties can be divided into "significant, relevant", i.e. parties that have won the power, parties that are "less relevant", those that participate in the governmental coalition on a smaller scale, and peripheral parties, those that do not get a share of the governmental "cake", or which failed to cross the electoral threshold.

2.2. Determining the types of party systems

The classification of the party systems is a complex and difficult task, due to the fact that there are many problems, dimensions, and divides in political life that defy any attempt to be rendered down to a single dominant basic dimension. Thus, many parties that are left-oriented often refuse to be called parties of the left. They often use other terms, for instance, radical, progressive, democratic, etc. The party system as a system consisting of numerous competing intra-party relationships is classified according to many factors, including: the number of relevant parties in it, the width and the intensity of the intra-party divides that are results of the deeper, social,

ideological, and political polarizations, or conflicts in society, depending on the nature of the political system, etc.

Giovanni Sartori is the first author who starts with **the number as a criterion for the division of party systems, and provides the following classification:**

1. One-party systems including:

a) the systems that **bans** the existence of other political parties, besides the one in power;

b) the systems with a **hegemonic position of a single party**, which allows the existence of subordinated parties that do not jeopardize the position of the governing party;

c) **systems with a predominant party**, where a single party stays in power for a longer period of time in fair competition with the other parties with absolute majority of mandates in the representative organ.

2. Two-party systems

3. Multiparty systems including:

a) party systems with limited pluralism, and

b) party systems with extreme pluralism.

4. Atomized party systems, which according to Sartori are residual, because there is no need for precise counting of political parties due to the fact that the numbers are insignificant or very low.

Sartori goes a step further from the classification in the attempt to form a new typology of party systems, which unlike the previous explains how the party system functions. This typology is formed on the basis of **two criteria: the number of political parties and ideology.**

Sartori introduces ideology as a criterion for classification, observing it through its two dimensions: **the ideological distance and the ideological intensity.** According to

Sartori, the concept of distance is particularly important to understand multiparty systems, while the concept of ideological intensity is to understand one-party systems. Sartori applies the two criteria (number of parties and ideology), and delivers a **seven-component typology, in which the first four components have the same titles as the first four classes from the previous classification**. The title of the fifth and the sixth component is in relation with the respective classes that is changed, and instead of limited and extreme pluralism, uses the terms moderate and polarized pluralism, while the seventh component of the typology is identical with the title of the seventh class.

With this typology, Sartori was only trying to answer the question what the essence of the division in the society is, and wider, and what the real distribution of power in society is. In relation to the distribution of power, the situation is clear in societies with one party. This one party monopolizes the power **(the structure of power is monopolistic)**.

The hegemonic position of one party allows the existence of subordinated parties that do not threaten its dominance (the structure of power is hierarchical). The predominant party holds the whole power as long as it wins the elections, which means that there is an **unimodal concentration** of power. In two-party systems there is competition for power, which is why there is a **bipolar concentration of power**. In systems with moderate pluralism there is weak fragmentation of power or depolarized segmentation, and lately, in systems with polarized pluralism there is strong fragmentation with polarization.¹³⁵

Blondel gives a significantly shorter classification of the party systems based on the number of political parties and their respective size.

¹³⁵ See: **Sartori, G., Stranke i stranački sustavi, Politička kultura, Zagreb, 2002, (p.281)**.

Table No. 8: Configuration of the party systems according to Blondel¹³⁶

Party systems	Hypothetical example of the division of seats in the Parliament	Effective number of parties
Two-party system	55-45	2,0
System with two and a half parties	45-40-15	2,6
Multi-party system with a dominant party	45-20-15-10-10	3,5
Multi-party system without a dominant party	25-25-25-15-10	4,5

2.2.1. One-party system

There are different kinds of one-party systems. According to scientific research, the systems with one ruling party are systems that represent the essence of modern absolutism. These are systems where the only party gives the strength and absolute power to the totalitarian regime. On the other hand, the totalitarian system is the most extreme form of an one-party system. It is a party system where the ruling party rules with all segments of the social and political system without an opposition that would monitor the ruling party.

The phenomenon of an one-party system with totalitarian character emerges spontaneously by simply taking the power from the leader and his supporters. This happened first in Russia in 1917, with the establishing of the Communist Party, then in Turkey in 1919, with the Republican People's Party coming to power, in Italy in 1928, when the existence of the

¹³⁶ See: **Blondel, J., Party Systems and Patterns of Government in Western Democracies, Canadian Journal of Political Science, 1. June, (p. 184-187).**

Fascist Party as the only party on the political stage was stipulated by law, in Germany with the National Socialist Party, etc.

The one-party state is not a random, nor an objectively determined system. It is not a random system, because the development of political parties, as well as the general political situation during the 19th century, created the right conditions for the emergence of one-party totalitarianism. The monopolistic party acts as a permanent government, and there is no mechanism (besides a coup or a revolution) to remove this party from power. The monopolistic party establishes a deep connection with the state apparatus.

There are two kinds of one-party systems. The first kind was present in the systems of state socialism, where the governing communist and socialist parties controlled the management of all social and state organs. **The second kind of one-party systems is related with anticolonial nationalism and the consolidation of developing countries.** For instance, the governing parties in Zimbabwe, Tanzania, etc., were created by independence movements that proclaimed the national need for nation-building and the economic development of the country in which they functioned.

On the other hand, systems with a dominant party should not be confused with one-party systems, although they often have similar features. This system has a competitive spirit, since more parties fight for power in the parliamentary elections, however, one party dominates that has managed to stay in power for a longer period. Japan is often seen as a state with a classical example of a party system with a dominant party. In India too, the Congress Party was continuously in power for thirty years, ever since independence in 1947.

In Europe, Sweden gives the best example of a state with a dominant party, with the Social Democratic Labour Party in power from 1951 until 1993 (independently or in a coalition).

The most important feature of this system is the tendency to redirect the political attention from the competition among the parties to the conflicts between the factions in the dominant party. For instance, the Christian Democratic Party in Italy is a party that acts as a coalition of several privileged groups in Italian society, where politics plays a mediating role among the various party factions. The most powerful groups that work for the benefit of this party are the Roman Catholic Church, the group of farmers, as well as the group with industrial interests.

2.2.2. Two-party system

The two-party system emerged for the first time in the US and in the United Kingdom, the moment the two largest political parties were established. In its classical form, **two-party systems are distinguishable on the basis of three criteria:**

- 1. Although there might be several “smaller” parties, however, only two have enough electoral and legislative strength that gives them real chances to win the power;**
- 2.** The stronger party in the elections has the possibility to rule autonomously, while the other party is in opposition, and
- 3.** The two parties rotate in government, so that when one is in power the other one acts as a “shadow government”.

The American two-party system has been functioning since 1860 as a system of two parties: Republican and Democrat. No other third party (Labour Socialist, Liberal, Prohibitionist, etc.) has managed to impose its dominance on the American political stage, with the exception of some successes on the local level.

In the United Kingdom as well, Parliamentary elections were mainly based on the platforms of the two most powerful parties. However, after 1945, there were some other strong parties that emerged in England, such as the Labour and the Liberal Party, the Radical Party, the Irish National Party. The Labour and the Liberal Party managed to keep balance in the government besides the dominant two-party system. It is interesting to note that the number of political parties in the party system is only one of the factors that determine the nature and character of the party system. It seems there are more important factors, such as those related to the character of the social and economic relations, the level of economic growth of the country, the political culture, the electoral system, etc.

According to Duverger, the two-party system is “natural” because it reflects the dualism between accepting and not accepting a certain policy; the existence of two parties enables the articulation of various views on certain political issues. On the other hand, Philippe Lauvaux highlights the advantage of the two-party system over the multiparty system from the properties of the electorate. In his view, the majority of voters are able to determine themselves only with a “yes” or a “no” in politics, which makes the functioning of more than two parties in the system superfluous. On behalf of the two-party system, the authors often claim that it leads towards moderation of the political parties that compete with each other for the execution of power. The moderation is somehow a result of the nature of the competition between the two parties, where each strives to win the undecided votes. **The parties in the two-party systems are forced to integrate many interests of society, to highlight the common elements on behalf of the specific. That is why two-party systems stimulate the pragmatic orientation of the parties and stimulate agreements between them.** The electoral strat-

egy that aims at winning the maximum support of the voters truly forces parties to approximate each other.

However, on the other hand, the approximately equal strength of the two parties forces them to make bigger electoral promises to the electorate than what can be realistically achieved. The consequence of this is the creation of irresponsible party government, since the party wins the power with a programme which is difficult to implement. There are deep social factors that determine the direction of the functioning of the party systems. **Robert Dahl** was completely right when he emphasized that a two-party system leads to a more stable order, but only if the previous condition is fulfilled, i.e. if there is a significant number of voters in society that accept the centrist ideas and recommendations. If this is not the case, then the two-party system can intensify political conflicts. **Lipset, too, considered that the two-party system functions best when founded on a crosscutting solidarity structure. In cases where the structure of solidarity is polarized with racial, religious, ethnic, or other kinds of divisions, and where the social lines follow the political lines of division, the two-party system can intensify internal conflicts much more than it can help with the integration of society.**

2.2.3. Multi-party system

The basic characteristic of the multi-party system is the political competition between more than two political parties. The participation of more parties in the electoral process increases the probability of creating a multi-party post-election coalition, i.e. reduces the possibility of establishing a one-party government. Today, party systems with more than two competing parties exist in many states with representative democracies. Considering today's heterogeneous society, partism seems more natural than two-partism. In multi-party systems, the parties that cannot expect electoral majority aim

at gaining maximum support from smaller groups, which is why they are concerned with the interests of the whole society. The most highlighted remark against the multi-party system is related to its instability.

In some authors' views, the parties in multi-party systems become a safe space for many calculations and manipulations to take place, while their unreliable alliances lead towards political instability (the examples of Weimar Germany that changed 21 governments in 14 years, and the Fourth French Republic that had 25 governments in 15 years). Another argument in favor of this is the fact that governments in two-party system last longer than those in multi-party systems. However, this argument has a limited importance and implication, and it cannot be applied to all states where multi-party systems are practiced. For instance, it cannot be applied to Scandinavian countries, Denmark, Holland, or even Switzerland. The critics of the multi-party system highlight that countries where various coalitions of parties rotate in the government do not have a multi-party system, but a system of groups. The variable and unpredictable changes of coalition partners restrain the stronger influence of citizens in politics. This results in parties losing their political responsibilities in multi-party systems because it is impossible to assess their political effect. Consequently, voters cannot determine themselves politically.

Multi-party systems can appear in several variations depending on the number of competing parties, such as: **tripartism, quadripartism, and polipartism.**

Tripartism is typical for Australia, New Zealand, and other states where the dualism between the two most general currents "conservatives – labourists" is expanded by representing the interests of, for instance, farmers through the Agricultural Party. It turned out that until the 1990s, there was a system of the so-called "two-and-a-half parties" in Germany, where the Christian Democrats and Social Democrats had almost the same electoral strength as the con-

servatives and labourists in the United Kingdom. However, they were forced to enter into coalition with the small party of the Free Democrats due to the specifics of the electoral system.

Quadripartism is established the moment when agricultural parties are upgraded onto the previously formed tripartism “conservatives – liberals – socialists”, as in the case with some Scandinavian and other European countries.

Polipartism emerges in the 20th century. According to Sartori, polipartism can emerge in two forms: moderate and polarized.

Moderate polipartism is typical for Belgium, Holland and Norway, where there are small ideological differences between the main parties and general acceptance of the party coalitions by reaching inter-party compromises.

The polarized party system exists in those states with striking ideological differences between the parties, where some of them even resort to anti-systemic political action. Examples of polarized party systems can be found in countries from Latin America, Spain, Italy, etc. The main advantage of the multi-party system is that it secures better control and balance within the government, which is always ready for debates, concessions, and politics of compromises. However, on the other hand, the greatest weakness of this system lies in the danger and in the difficulty of creating governmental coalitions. Post-election negotiations and unscrupulous compromises often pose a danger for the stability of the government, as well as its efficiency. A typical example of a state with stability problems resulting from multi-party governments is Italy, where ever since 1945 governments have managed to stay in power for ten months on average. It is notable that the Italian experience has other peculiarities related to the development of political culture, the ideological nature of its party system, as well as the way the multi-party system functions in it.

2.3. Party systems with and without opposition

The concept of political opposition encompasses the political subjects and their actions directed towards winning the power with methods, means and values that are politically accepted. In theory, there is a **minimal consensus that the political opposition is a category that exists and functions within the political system, but outside the reality related to the government.**

As a political phenomenon, the political opposition emerges at the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th century, in order to **denote the institutionally allowed struggle of the political parties that are not in power** against the parties in the government, in order to take control and establish the government in the state. In order for the opposition to exist it is necessary, although not enough a condition, to have at least two parties. Competition is also necessary between the parties in executing power. Therefore, when discussing the issue of political opposition, **four main elements for its existence should be taken into consideration:**

- 1. The existence of at least two political parties** in the party system of the country;
- 2. The two parties should have opposing programmes and ideas** on running state policies;
- 3. Opposing views should be manifested through a mutually principled party competitiveness** in the form of loyal inter-party competition;
- 4. Competitiveness should be achieved in the form of an institutionally allowed struggle for government takeover.**

Therefore, it is believed that the political opposition can survive only in conditions of two-party or multi-party systems. One-party systems do not recognize this democratic phenomenon due to the hegemonic position of the only governing party in the system. Countries that practice institutionalized

political opposition demonstrate major differences in relation to the influence that parties have in society, both in terms of the number of parties and their mutual influence. The various degrees of identification of citizens with the parties shows the differentiated influence parties have in various systems. The low degree of identification of citizens with the parties means a lack of acceptance of the political system, since the parties represent its main pillar. However, the high degree of identification with the parties does not always imply acceptance of the system, since there are parties in the countries with representative democracies that defy the system. Therefore, identification with such parties might imply rejection of the political system. There is another indicator that demonstrates those great differences, not only among the parties in several specific states, but also among the parties in the same state. It is the relation between the number of party members and the number of voters. Research data shows that there are series of factors affecting the relation members-voters, such as: the degree of readiness of citizens to take part in collective political action and cooperate with others, the attitude towards the usefulness (uselessness) of joint efforts, etc.

On the other hand, the evident class conflicts in France and Italy in the period when the parties were formed, affected their attitude of exclusion and unwillingness to establish mutual cooperation. However, party systems are not only a passive reflection of social and other forms of relations. Therefore, it is a mistake to correlate them to party systems due to the fact that political systems, as well as the parties, have certain autonomy. The number of parties and relations between them does not depend only on the degree of the conflicts, but also on the division of society based on national, religious, racial, and regional grounds.

The fact that in a certain society there are strongly antagonized social groups that are formed according to certain terms suggests a more conflicting party system with an increased number of political parties. The religious differences

in a society have a significant impact on the political determination of the citizens, as well as on the number of political parties. The stronger the religious division of society, the more political parties are created that differ on that ground. The influence of religion on the number of political parties, or their orientation is not only evident in countries with several religions, but also in countries with only one religion. In such a case, there is a deep and strong polarizations among its followers, on the one side, and the atheists, on the other (for instance, the situation in France, Poland, etc.). The national heterogenic composition, as a factor, affects the increase of the number of political parties (the examples of Canada, Switzerland), i.e. the division of the existing parties on national grounds (the example of Belgium).

Besides the listed factors, there are other factors that strongly influence the number of political parties and the nature of party systems, such as: the political culture, the political order of the state, and in particular, the electoral system. Thus, according to Lijphart and Gabriel Almond, the political culture is one of the criteria to distinguish political systems with opposition. According to Lijphart, there are two key criteria applied when dividing political systems into types: the first is the character of the political culture, and the second is related to the relationships among the elites. The political culture in a country can be homogeneous or fragmented, and the relationships among the elites can be conflicting, competitive, or cooperative. Countries where the culture is fragmented, and relationships among the elites are conflicting, are highly unstable. These are centrifugal systems. The political systems with fragmented political culture, but with cooperative relationships among the elites (Belgium, Holland), are stable. Lijphart calls them arranged systems. The most stable are countries with a homogeneous political culture and competitive relationships among the elites. These are the so-called centripetal systems, which include the Anglo-American and Scandinavian states.

Almond divides political systems based on the properties of political culture into four kinds: **Anglo-American, continental European, totalitarian and pre-industrial.**

Anglo-America systems are characterized by a homogeneous and global political culture. The homogeneous elements denote the fact that the majority of the political entities accept the values of freedom, mass wellbeing, and security as the highest social goals. The structure of the roles in the Anglo-American political systems is:

1. Very differentiated;
2. Clear, bureaucratic and organised;
3. Typical for its high degree of stability in performing roles;
4. Suitable for diffuse power and influence in the political system as a whole.

In continental European systems, political culture is fragmented. There are remnants of the old period and all the cultural variations have common roots. In these systems, Almond distinguishes three subcultures:

- a) Catholic (France, South Italy, Iceland, parts of Bavaria);
- b) Remnants from the culture of the old middle class, which sees the creation of world culture as one of the goals of its actions;
- c) A subculture related to modern segments of society.

All three subcultures have their own institutions in society: parties, trade unions, media, and schools. The examples of continental Europe, as Almond says, are not suitable for competitive political systems.

Pre-industrial political systems exist in states with cultures that have emerged as a result of the mixing of traditional culture and western influences. In a culture emerging under the influence of juxtaposed influences, besides the two, a third can be distinguished that emerged as a result of the previous two. Due to the existence of various cultures in these

countries there is an acute problem with the communication and coordination between the different social groups. They “have different cognitive maps” and apply different norms for political action. The political roles in the pre-industrial systems are differentiated to a small degree. The political parties are unstable and the communication system is insufficiently specialized. In this system there is also a mixing of roles. Therefore, there might be a parliament that is formally founded on a collection of legal norms and regulations, but with a religious sect in it as an active factor, or a group of tribal families, powerful families, etc.

In totalitarian political systems, political culture gives the illusion of homogeneity. However, considering the fact that there are no voluntary associations, and that the center controls the political communication, it is impossible to determine for certain the level of acceptance of this system. A typical orientation of the individuals towards the system is a combination of conformism with apathy.

The division of political systems by Lijphart and Almond has great analytical value. The previously mentioned kinds of political systems are truly different in their basic features. However, if we put aside the importance of the number of parties as a basic criterion for distinguishing the kinds of political systems, it will surely show some weaknesses in the division. This criterion is particularly important since parties are not only a dependent, but also an independent variable in political life. The number of parties determines the number of possible mutual interactions in the political system.

2.4. Main party families

Having in mind the similarities, parties can be grouped in certain party families. **Thus, in western systems there are mainly three party families: the family of the left, the family of the center, and the family of the right.** This division is

known as the **division of Lauvaux**. There are other divisions by other authors, where the range of party families is wider. Thus, for instance, **according to Steiner, the party grouping can be done in seven party families: the socialists, the liberals, the conservatives, the Christian Democrats, the new radical right, the greens, and the regional parties.**¹³⁷

The division of the party families is also done according to the criteria of the ideal of equality and the ideal of freedom. Thus, in accordance with the views of **Norberto Bobbio, there are four kinds of party families:**

- 1) Extreme left, consisting of parties and doctrines that agree to promote equality and authoritarianism;**
- 2) Centrist left, encompassing egalitarian and liberal parties;**
- 3) Centrist right, encompassing liberal and non-egalitarian movements and**
- 4) Extreme right, encompassing anti-liberal and anti-egalitarian movements.**¹³⁸

In western democratic systems there are five wider party families that can be identified: the left-oriented, the liberal, the conservative, the radical right, and the radical left. The left parties comprise of: the social democratic, i.e. the socialist, the communist, the new left, and the environmental parties. The right parties, i.e. the conservative parties, comprise of: the classical conservative parties, the Christian Democratic, the conservative non-Christian parties, as well as the agricultural parties. In liberal parties there is no significant internal differentiation. To the far ends of this division there are also the left and right extreme parties. The picture would be even more complete if we add the regional, i.e. the local parties to these party families.

¹³⁷ See: **Steiner, J. European Democracies, Longman, New York, 1998.**

¹³⁸ See: **Bobbio, N., Desnica i levica, CID, Podgorica, 1997.**

CHAPTER 6



FINANCING OF POLITICAL PARTIES AND ELECTION CAMPAIGNS

1. MODELS OF POLITICAL PARTY FINANCING

The legal regulation of political party financing, as well as the financing of political campaigns, is an issue that quite often is depicted as “a never-ending story”. Just when one starts thinking all aspects have been covered that provide a legal framework for all issues in this area, a big “no” arises, or a big “however”, which spoil the “story’s happy end”. It is a general perception that there is no ideal legal framework for political party financing, including election campaigns, and it seems improbable that there will ever be, since current legal practice shows that money is always a step ahead of the law.

While the legislator is conceiving legal solutions to eliminate or simply minimize the problematic situations in financing, the financiers and the main political protagonists have already prepared a new plan with a different trajectory for money transfer, which complicates the whole situation even further. This is an extra reason, not only for the academic community but also for the wider public, to take these issues into consideration more seriously. Particularly if they are familiar in detail with most of the problems and manipulative situations that occur on the way of the money and their management in order to create legal provisions that will provide optimal results.

It is impossible to imagine an internal organisation the and functioning of democratic, party, and political systems without the existence of political parties. They represent one of the elements for attaining a representative democracy and an element without which it is impossible to organise political life in a modern sense. Political parties depend on finances to be able to function, but also to survive. The financing of political parties is a necessary segment of the party system, which is why this issue is treated as a central topic of interest not only by the academic community, but among citizens as well.

Money represents the most powerful instrument that should be legally constrained and constantly monitored, particularly in relation to how much money parties spend, and to what purpose. The issue of party financing is a relatively new phenomenon, globally speaking. It is interesting to mention the fact that, not only in the transitional countries but also in much older democracies, the main legislation covering this issue was adopted only three to four decades ago. Thus, for instance, the first Law on Political Parties of Austria, where all issues related to party financing are stipulated, was adopted in 1975. In the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland, though, in 1997, the Government extended the authority of the Committee on Standards in Public Life to also deal with issues related to party financing.

In Luxembourg, the first laws regulating issues related to party financing were introduced in 1999 and limited only to the financing of parliamentary elections, as well as EU parliamentary elections. The long period of indifference of public authorities with regards to party financing had harmful effects in many states. The lack of rules implied a period when everything was allowed. It is clear that parties cannot live off their party membership fees only. If we also consider the fact that parties are non-profit organisations, it is clear that each party has to manage its own way in conditions of a legally unregulated situation. In several states, this “gray” zone resulted in the discovering of a series of suspicious, secret financial resources, which, even in more mature democracies, lead to the persecution and punishment of party leaders for collecting party resources from “black sources”.

Spectacular financial examples can be found in the scandals that shook Italy, German, France, and the US, among other states, out of which only few ended in court. On the other hand, states that have recently regulated the matter in the area of party financing are still facing many challenges in practice. For instance, in Slovakia, the law has not thoroughly

stipulated all aspects related to party financing. In Hungary, the law does not regulate the issue related to party financing with private resources, and in Georgia, there are no legal regulations for monitoring and control of party resources out-flow, etc.

There are two models of party financing: private and public (budget) financing.

1. The model of private party financing is one of the oldest, and in some authors' views the only possible model of party financing. **Private party financing has two main sources: membership fees and donations.**

The membership fee is considered to be the most natural and the least problematic source of party financing. Unlike the membership fee, donations cause problems in practice, not only from the aspect of the donors' nature (foreign or national entities, anonymous or public sources, etc.), but also from the aspect of money distribution in the party funds. The background of these donations always carries a certain level of skepticism, not only in relation to the hidden intentions of the donor, but also from the aspect of their anonymity. On the other hand, the more dependent the party is on the donor, the more obedient it will have to be in meeting the donor's expectations, rather than the citizens' needs and requirements. Namely, when donating, the donor is always rational – applying a strategy of mutual benefit that will enable politicians to win the elections, while the donors with their companies will take all the interesting and financially attractive public tenders.

Besides these two main financial sources, parties can collect finances from the so-called additional sources in most countries: from the income the party receives for renting its property, from loans, bank interests, etc. A total ban on all economic transactions for the political parties is a very unlikely measure. Thus, for instance, in the Czech Republic, political parties are not allowed to run their

own business, or any other profitable activity, as in the case with the Republic of Macedonia too. However, in the Czech Republic the law allows the parties to set up their own companies that will provide a specific type of services (printing and merchandizing of audiovisual and digital publications, propaganda materials, and other publications). This provision is identical in Germany, England, France, etc.

Private sources, in accordance with the recommendations of the Venice Commission, should be limited in terms of:

1. Maximum amount of each donation;
2. Ban on donations from foreign states, foreign governments, or foreign industrial and business companies, or from religious organisations.

In accordance with the recommendations of the Venice Commission, transparency should be guaranteed in private party financing, by obliging each party to publish their annual financial balances for the previous year.

2. The model of public (budget) party financing only partially aims at covering their expenses. At the moment, all European states allocate direct or indirect budget funds for political party financing. The most typical indirect ways of party financing are: compensation for the expenses of parliamentary activities, including the MPs salaries, as well as the support of the party factions in the parliaments and in the opposition, the support during elections (free media representation of the parties, the use of billboards, etc.), no taxation for the parties for gifts and other forms of contributions.

The problems with this kind of financing emerge when someone wants to specify the amount of resources parties receive on this ground. This is practically impossible for several reasons:

1. The state resources which parties receive as assistance in this way are very difficult to measure in monetary value;

2. In many cases, it is not quite clear whether the state helps the party indirectly, or with the assistance, in fact, it puts public goods into use (for example, state officials often use government vehicles and drivers for party purposes as well);
3. This kind of service, or, for instance, the services that state officials benefit from by using official mobile phones, paper, printed materials, etc., is very difficult to measure as indirect state assistance to the party. The potential danger of an uncontrollable increase of such or similar expenditures, as well as the doubt of abusing state funds for this purpose, are the two problematic aspects of the so-called indirect party financing.

On the other hand, direct state financing of the parties is done through two specific forms:

- 1. Resources directed towards electoral expenses and**
- 2. Resources directed towards the regular work of the parties (so-called party expenditures).**

Most states accept direct state financing as a more transparent source of party financing, partly released from the influence of the problematic financial sources of a private kind, i.e. the influence of the donors. The key issue that arises in relation to direct state financing is the criterion based on which state funds are distributed.

On the one hand, the need for fair and equal state treatment of all parties is highlighted, and, on the other, this equal treatment is absurd if we assume that the larger parties are those that carry the load in all state affairs, and the political responsibility towards the state. Therefore, party success in the elections should represent a general criterion for the distribution of state resources, although this criterion has its disadvantages as well. It is clear that public party financing should be directed towards each party represented in the parliament. However, in order to enable equal chances for the dif-

ferent political forces, the public party financing can encompass even those parties that represent a significant part of the electorate and promote their own candidates in the elections, but do not have their representatives in the parliament. Their financing can be determined on periodic grounds in accordance with certain objective criteria.

Political party financing with public funds should be supplemented with monitoring of parties' accounts by the state authorities (Court of Auditors, Public Revenue Office etc.). Each state is obliged to promote a policy of financial transparency of those parties that use public funds. It is almost certain that the models of private and public financing are not always applied in their pure form, but in a certain form that combines elements of both models. **Moreover, there are generally accepted principles that should serve as the foundation for every law on party financing:**

1. There should be a **reasonable balance** between public and private party financing;
2. It is necessary **to determine fair criteria for the distribution of state money among the parties;**
3. It is necessary **to determine precise rules related to the amount and the background of private donations;**
4. It is necessary to provide **complete transparency of the parties' financial accounts,** as well as
5. To establish an **independent organ that will audit the financial work of the parties,** and introduce sanctions in cases of violation of the legal provisions.

Regarding the first principle related to the reasonable balance between public and private party financing, certain experts in the Council of Europe claim that such a balance should be achieved in each state respectively, since there are some precise and generally accepted formulas that can be offered as a good solution. On one hand, public financing is extremely important in order to provide enough resources for normal functioning of the

parties, which is a basic precondition for the limitation of various private influences on the parties. However, on the other hand, the role of public party financing should not be overemphasized since, although it is considered as a source of stability, it can cause other effects – the parties' dependency on the state.

In most European countries the main source of income for political parties is the popularly called “budget party financing”. In some of them (for instance, in Switzerland and in the United Kingdom [without Northern Ireland]), the typical direct budgetary party financing is not accepted, but a model is applied for allocating a certain amount of budget resources for the support of the so-called research grants in the sphere of development policies. One of the main arguments against budgetary party financing in these countries is that the citizens as taxpayers should not be forced to support the parties financially, when they do not support them politically. After a series of corruption scandals, the citizens of Italy rejected the possibility for public party financing in a referendum, except in cases of election campaigns.

On the other hand, some of the countries with the highest percentage of direct budget financing of their parties are: Taiwan, Canada, Turkey, and France. In these states, public party financing is related to the number of votes won in the elections, which is considered a reasonable criterion both in terms of allocating budget resources, but in a political sense as well, in terms of reducing the number of parties without political relevance within the state. Besides the number of votes, another important criterion for allocating budget resources is the number of mandates won in parliament, or the size of the parliamentary group.

All countries are faced with a certain number of essential issues when attempting to put an order in party financing in order to allow the free expression of pluralist political opinion and to guarantee equal treatment of all political parties.

The first issue is whether parties should be given assistance only during elections or after the elections, in a form of ongoing, regular sustenance of the parties. The decision on this issue is very important for both financial and political reasons. Limiting the financing to only covering the electoral expenses, either totally or partially, should help avoid a situation when party resources are fully exhausted with every election. In such a case, parties are considered private organizations with the liberty to collect resources necessary for their daily functioning, but which should be assisted during elections.

According to the second approach, when the state covers all or part of the expenditures for the work of the political parties, there are other viewpoints that should be considered. In such a case, parties are considered officially recognized bodies that contribute towards the ongoing democratic functioning of the state, which justifies the state's support of their functioning. Therefore, we should not be surprised that countries which have taken the second approach are countries where parties are considered "institutions" that should only exist by means of providing for the country. This is the case with the biggest European democracies. Germany is the first example.

Namely, the German Federal Constitutional Court acknowledged the need for public financing not only of the electoral expenditures of the parties, but also of the expenditures related to regular party activities, provided that the state's assistance is counter-proportional to each party's self-financing capacity, calculated in accordance with the requirements for the financing of those party activities necessary for the functioning of the public authorities.

The second issue is related to the character of the resources that can be allocated to the parties, or which they can collect on their own. In many states, there is a provision of strict prohibition for party financing by foreign companies or foreign states and governments, or accepting financial and other kinds of material compensation from foreign sources, regardless whether they are from another country, from a foreign political party, or from physical or legal entities.

The third issue, which is extremely important for party financing, is the preference of public, private, or a combination of the two models. In many states for decades there had been no laws on political party financing, which implied that the states took no interest in regulating these issues, leaving enough space for each party to collect resources freely from various sources to enable their functioning without any clear regulations regarding the methods applied.

In conditions without a legal framework, many countries went through insecure political circumstances which caused the richest in the countries to be also the most powerful politically. Without proper regulations and legal provisions the parties had entered a race for donors, while these were put in a situation to bargain from their position following the principle of "give-and-take".

The illegal situation had to be transformed into a legal one, which is why in many European countries laws were introduced to regulate the issue of party financing, while the percentage of the state's participation in this sphere is different from country to country. Some states offer comprehensive budget compensation for the expenses during election campaigns, during regular party functioning, as well as certain additional party activities.

2. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE SOURCES FOR THE FINANCING OF POLITICAL PARTIES AND OF ELECTION CAMPAIGNS

Good practices for the financing of parties and election campaigns are always related to the following principles:

- a) **Enhancing transparency** in financing of parties and campaigns, which strengthens public trust in them;
- b) **Enhancing the so-called grass-root financing**, without any intention to make this source the only source for financing election campaigns;

- c) **Rejecting the possibility of financing from prohibited sources;**
- d) **Public financing should be partial**, i.e. there should be a balance between public and private financing;
- e) **Legal provisions** should be created **to address potential donors, as well as potential beneficiaries of funds;**
- f) **Regulations** should be determined **to exclude all political entities from public financing that do not comply with the regulations** for transparency of financing as determined by law;
- g) **An independent audit body should be established** to monitor the spending of resources during election campaigns.¹³⁹

The issue about providing legal regulations for the financing of parties and election campaigns emerged in the 1970s and 1980s.¹⁴⁰

Namely, party expenditures for running election campaigns increased so much that it became necessary to search for new resources. It showed that the traditional sources of **private party financing are insufficient to fully cover the electoral expenses**. In fact, in this period, besides the private, parties started receiving **public financing during election campaigns**.¹⁴¹ The need for public financing of the parties and their election campaigns particularly arose after the series of exposed scandals of the parties in their race for financiers of the election campaigns.

¹³⁹ See: Ingrid van Biezen, University of Birmingham, United Kingdom, "Financing political parties and election campaigns-guidelines", http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/greco/evaluations/round3/Financing_Political_Parties_en.pdf, as well as in the documents of the Venice Commission at the Council of Europe: Guidelines and Report on the Financing of Political Parties, Guidelines and Explanatory Report on Legislation on Political Parties: some specific issues; Report on the Participation of Political Parties in Elections, http://www.venice.coe.int/webforms/documents/?pdf=CD_L%282008%29148-e.

¹⁴⁰ Except in Sweden, where this process of legal regulation was initiated in 1960.
¹⁴¹ The first example of public party financing emerged in Costa Rica in 1954, followed by **Argentina in 1955**. The first European country to introduce public party financing was **Germany in 1959**.

Ever since then, the sources of financing of the parties and campaigns have remained the same. The number of countries that have not envisioned public party financing is very small: India, Ireland, Luxembourg, Belarus, Latvia, Moldova, Ukraine, Holland (which has a system of public funds allocated for educational institutions related to parties) and the United Kingdom.

Most countries envision public financing of parties and election expenditures, although there are various financing models, which differ from country to country.

Thus, for instance, **in France, Italy (after 1993), Canada and Poland, public funds are allocated to the parties only to cover election expenditures, and not for expenditures during the normal functioning of the parties.**

On the other hand, in Brazil, the Czech Republic, Greece, Italy (from 1974 to 1993), Japan, Hungary, Germany, Portugal, and Sweden, parties receive budget resources only for their ongoing party functioning.

Finally, there are several countries where parties **receive public funds for both purposes, i.e. for their daily activities as well as for expenditures related to election campaigns, as for example, in Spain, Israel, Mexico, the Republic of Macedonia, etc.**

In accordance with the law, in most of the countries resources are allocated to the national head offices of the parties, while in some countries resources are allocated to their local branches as well.¹⁴²

¹⁴² Thus, for instance, in Sweden since 1977, local authorities have been receiving direct funds directed for the local party branches. This provision is applied in Croatia as well, which implies that local party branches in Croatia have a relatively high degree of financial autonomy. See the work of: Petak, Z., "A Comparative Analysis of Financing Parties and Elections in Croatia and in Other Countries", *Politička misao*, Vol. XXXVIII(2001), No. 5, pp.18-33.

As already mentioned above, public financing can be direct or indirect.

Besides direct state funds for the financing of parties and elections, there are the so-called indirect resources, i.e. non-monetary funds or indirect support. We will take into consideration only the most significant:

- » **Access to media – free media advertising;**
- » **Tax cuts and/or tax exemptions;**
- » **The role of political foundations; and**
- » **Resources from the so-called “administrative capital” controlled by the administrative and regulatory apparatus of the state**

a) Access to media – free media coverage. There are many studies that analyze the importance of media coverage for the success of the party and its candidates during elections. One of the most famous examples of indirect subsidizing of parties during election campaigns, but also aside from them, is through **enabling free access for parties and candidates to the media, particularly television stations. Free media coverage is considered a form of indirect public support.**

The US is an exemption from this rule, where TV coverage has to be paid, and there is no time limit whatsoever. It seems that this is one of the main reasons for the intensified increase in campaign expenditures in the US. There are several open issues related to free access to the TV broadcasters. The first issue is the possible lack of interest among TV producers to secure free time for the promotion of the parties and their candidates. According to the opinion of media theorists, the basic reason for this is the fact that these types of programmes are not attractive for the wider audience. One of the top priorities of each TV producer is to secure top ratings for their programmes. Thus, they have the right to se-

cure media space for electoral advertisement as much as they think is necessary.¹⁴³

A great challenge in the area of free media coverage is the fair distribution of media time among various participants in the elections. If the distribution of media time is based on the results from previous elections, newly established parties, and those that have lost their popularity in the previous election cycle will be discriminated in this way. If, on the other hand, media time is distributed equally among all parties, small and radical parties will have equal time for media presentation to the audience, regardless of the fact that their support is disproportional compared with their opponents. Besides all these challenges, the fair distribution of media time and media coverage during election campaigns in electronic media represents a great contribution to the democratization of the political process.

b) Another form of indirect **financing of parties, both private and public, are tax cuts (reductions) and tax exemptions.** The example of Germany illustrates this model of indirect financing. If you donate an amount of 3,000 Euros to a party in this country, this sum will be extracted from your overall income, which automatically reduces the amount for further taxation. In Canada, for instance, the following system of tax exemption is applied: 75% of tax exemption for the first 100 USD donated, followed by 50% tax exemption for a donation between 100 and 550 USD, and 33% exemption for donations between 550 and 1,150 USD. This means that a person donating 100 USD to a party actually pays only 25 USD, while the rest of the 75% are covered from budget funds.¹⁴⁴ The direct consequence of this form of financing is

143 See: **Funding of Political Parties and Election Campaigns, Handbook Series, Editors: Reginald Austin, Maja Tjernström, International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (2003)**, http://www.idea.int/publications/funding_parties/funding_of_pp.pdf.

144 See: **Marcin Walecki, Political finance, Political money and corruption**, http://transparencyschool.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/02/04_Political_finance.pdf.

that parties can rely on smaller donations, and consequently on several smaller donors, which reduces the role of bigger donors.

In other words, the sources of party finances are dispersed, which reduces the chances for corruption to prosper, and party financing is rendered down to the essence of democratic decision-making contained in the motto: one person, one vote.

c) **Significant forms of indirect financing are political foundations.** Although formally independent, foundations have close ties with the parties. Germany has the most developed system of political foundations. These foundations do not participate in elections directly, but it is publicly known that they organize political trainings for certain party members and activities, prepare analyses for the parties, etc.

d) **The so-called “administrative resources” have a special treatment by the institutions financed from the budget.** It is a fact that the governing party has a bigger chance to use the state resources. The abuse of state resources for electoral goals is universally censored by all international norms and documents. Election candidates should not use state funds for their electoral goals. With regards to this, **the OSCE Copenhagen Document¹⁴⁵ clearly stipulates that member states will continue to promote “a clear separation between the state and political parties, implying that political parties should not be able to restrict the functioning of the state”.**

In order to secure an effective regulation for the allocation of state resources, the legislation has to clearly define all aspects that should be considered abuse. For instance, candidates working in the state administration often use the

¹⁴⁵ See: **Document of the Copenhagen Meeting of the Conference on the Human Dimension of the CSCE**, <http://www.osce.org/node/14304>

communication system free of charge (sharing with the public their activities that are part of their daily tasks), including party propaganda or the promotion of the electoral programme of the candidates, which is considered an abuse of this free resource.

The law should clearly stipulate either the prohibition or limitation of abuses of this kind. The abuse of state resources can include other forms, for instance, manipulation, i.e. **intimidation of the employees in the public/state administration. Any kind of direct engagement of individuals working in the state administration to participate in organized electoral events should be prohibited. The law should prohibit this practice as an abuse of state resources.**

What are the main disadvantages of public financing?

1. The main drawback of public financing is that it increases parties' dependency on the state. This can encourage parties to rely on public resources too much, to the disadvantage of maintaining their relations and interests with the electorate. This is why public financing should be scaled in such a way as to **secure equal opportunities for the political representation of the "older" parties, but also of the newer entities in the party system.**

2. The bigger the party's dependency on budget resources, the bigger the process of bureaucratization of the parties, which reduces the electoral participation of party activists.

3. Private party financing is a traditional way of collecting resources for their functioning.

The model of private financing contains the following financing sources:

- » **Party membership fee;**
- » **Intra-party donations and incomes;**
- » **Personal resources of the candidates;**
- » **Private donations.**

Private resources for party financing, besides the membership fee and regardless whether they are internal or external party resources, are problematic in most cases. Thus, for instance, the responsibility of MPs to pay additional resources for the party's benefit, as a token of appreciation for the party's trust given to them to become representatives, is a serious form of party financing, which cannot be accounted for **taking into consideration the independence of the MPs and respecting their free mandate guaranteed by the constitution.**

Other private resources, like **donations**, still carry the risk of establishing inappropriate relations between the donated money, on the one hand, and the political decisions, on the other. In this context, just by giving the impression that something is abused can be a sufficient indicator for undermining public trust in the political system and its political actors, which can seriously undermine democracy's legitimacy.

Private financing is considered to be a much more acceptable financing model for right-wing parties, rather than those of the left. For right-wing parties, the money received from private sources has always been a more accepted form of financing rather than money received from budget resources. This is a typical and basic feature of all party systems in democratic countries.

Illegal party financing, including electoral campaigns, is a problem that exists in almost all systems. There are several famous scandals related to party fi-

nancing. For instance, the scandal in North Carolina in 1977,¹⁴⁶ then the scandals in Spain,¹⁴⁷ in 1990, and the most famous case of abuse of private funds for political goals that happened during the last decade in Italy in the campaign called “with clean hands”.¹⁴⁸

Illegal party financing seriously undermines and threatens the democratic system. Moreover, the degree of political corruption in some countries is frightening.¹⁴⁹

There is a general problem to distinguish between personal and general corrupt activities in politics. The money received in a corruptive way by politicians for their private use can be well spent on financing their campaigns, in which case we move into the sphere of systemic corruption in political financing. For instance, in the **Czech republic in 1998, the Vice Prime Minister and the Minister of Environment resigned from their positions due to a political scandal related to secret,** anonymous donations that were used by their party in the elections through an organisation registered in the Virgin Islands.

¹⁴⁶ **The case of the disappointed company, which donated a certain amount of money and did not receive the expected results from the party and requested compensation for the money invested in the electoral campaign of the state governor.**

¹⁴⁷ In **Spain in 1990**, there were a series of scandals related to the attempts of several politicians to secure resources for their parties from banks and private businesses, accounting for them as fictitious consultation services.

¹⁴⁸ The most famous case of abuse of private resources for political goals took place in **Italy during the last decade, in the campaign called “with clean hands”, where party leaders installed quasi-party representatives** in positions where bribe and corruption were a routine thing. Although these people were officially not politicians, they de facto represented the politicians’ interests. Namely, as people who enjoyed special trust of the party leaders, they were intermediaries between the companies and the government representatives, who received work positions financed by public money.

¹⁴⁹ See: **Susan Rose-Ackerman, The Political Economy of Corruption**, http://www.ije.com/publications/chapters_preview/12/2ije2334.pdf, **Susan Rose-Ackerman (1999), “Corruption and Government: Causes, Consequences and Reform”, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.**

3. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE LIMITS IN FINANCING OF POLITICAL PARTIES AND ELECTION CAMPAIGNS

In many countries, the limits of the campaign expenses are stipulated in law. Thus, in the United Kingdom, there are limits for individual candidates running for mandates in national parliament. These limits do not apply to the national party headquarters. On the other hand, in the US, there are limits to the electoral expenditures of the candidates who are given public grants.

In Canada, there are precise limits for electoral expenses applying to all parties, not only individual candidates. Setting limits to financial expenditures should be accompanied by administrative regulations that serve as mechanisms to control these limits.

First, it is necessary to determine a control mechanism to approve of all costs before they are made. Moreover, it is necessary to determine appropriate penalties for anyone who will violate the determined limits. In the United Kingdom, for instance, the candidates for the national parliament who have crossed the allowed limits of financing of their electoral campaigns should resign from their position, i.e. renounce their mandate to another candidate. Their political opponents have the right to press charges to the general court, which should issue a penalty for violating financial regulations.

In Australia, Canada, and the US, initiating legal action with the general court is not possible. However, there is a special electoral organ in the electoral administration that can initiate legal action and take charge of the matter. In the US, this is the responsibility of the Federal Election Commission, which is a financially independent institution, and its organisational structure is set in such a way that enables it to monitor the financial limits autonomously. The aim of these limits is to reduce the risk of the parties and the candidates from too much dependency on big donors.

In Italy, for instance, there are no limits for the parties, but there are several limitations for individual candidates. There are differences in the ways limits are determined as well. They can be expressed as a specific sum of money, as a percentage of the donor's income or earnings, or be based on a specific reference point, for instance, the average salary.

In several countries the limits are determined based on the income: Brazil, France, India, Italy, Israel, Japan, Mexico, Russia, the US, Spain, Turkey, etc. It should be highlighted that the limit in most countries is applied only to a specific group of donors. In Israel, the limits are applied on individuals, in India on companies, in Mexico on the nonprofit organizations, etc. On the other hand, in many countries these limits do not exist: Australia, the Czech Republic, Greece, Canada, Holland, Germany, Sweden, the United Kingdom, etc.

The way parties account for their finances differs from country to country. In the United Kingdom, candidates for national parliament are obliged to report their expenditures, but not their sources. There are great differences in the range of public exposure of political finances. In most countries, **only the total amount of resources has to be reported, as well as the main rates of realized or consumed resources**. In some countries, full reports are required on all realized or consumed resources.

Another distinguishing element is the **different treatment parties have, on the one hand, and the individual candidates, on the other**. In the United Kingdom, only the finances of the candidates have to be published, while in Germany, only the finances of the parties. For instance, Bulgaria, Lithuania, and Russia apply limits to election campaign expenses of the candidates for parliamentary elections. For the presidential elections of candidates in **Bulgaria and Poland, there are so-called limits in the form of quotas, while a formula is applied in Russia and Ukraine**.

Some countries make the difference between funds used in campaigns, and funds for ongoing party expenses. For instance, in Germany, data on all party expenditures and incomes is constantly published, including electoral expenditures as well. The same method is applied in Sweden.

Regulating political expenses is generally related to **setting limits for electoral expenditures to political parties and candidates, both for parliamentary and presidential elections.**

Almost half of the countries of SEU have **set limits for resources to be donated for election campaigns of parties and/or candidates.**

The two most typical limitations for resources/sources of donations are state organizations and foreign donors. Moreover, many countries from SEU have envisioned a ban on financing from organisations where the state has its share in the capital, as well as from trade unions.¹⁵⁰

Many countries have put a **ban on anonymous donations, while several countries have put a limit to what extent a donation can be anonymous.** Anonymous donations cannot be more than 25% of the overall party income in Bulgaria, while in Lithuania it is limited to 25 USD from each donation.

In addition, there is a **complete or partial ban on donations** given by foreign governments or other foreign sources (foreign governments, foreign citizens, international companies or organisations). Lithuania makes an exception from

¹⁵⁰ See: **Dr. Marcin Walecki, "Challenging the Norms and Standards of Election Administration: Political Finance", (IFES, 2007), p. 75-93, Dr. Marcin Walecki, IFES Political Finance Advisor, "Political Money and Corruption",** <http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=5&ved=0CEAQFjAE&url=http://www.legislationline.org/download/Walecki/IFES/WhitePaperonPoliticMoneandCorruption.pdf>.
http://www.ifes.org/~media/Files/Publications/Money%20and%20Politics/Global%20Standards/Papers%20Reports%20and%20Conferences%20on%20Global%20Standards/5_IFES_Challenging_Election_Norms_and_Standards_WP_PF.pdf

this rule applying to the countries of SEU, where Lithuanian citizens living and working abroad can finance party and political organisations, i.e. parties can have their representative offices outside the country.

Donations from foreign states (foreign parties or foreign individuals, foreign corporations) or corporations have to be generally prohibited in accordance with the recommendations of the Committee of the Council of Europe for the member-states for establishing common rules against corruption in financing parties and election campaigns, where it stipulates that “states should set limits, i.e. prohibit or find a way to regulate foreign donations”.¹⁵¹

This limit has been practiced in many OSCE members-states as well, in the interest of preventing foreign influence in internal political conditions. However, this issue should be regulated with extra care **in order not to violate the right to freedom of association in cases when parties are internationally active**. This cautious regulation is significant in the light of the growing role of political parties within the EU, as stipulated in Article 12(2) from the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights. This regulation allows certain support from the resources of the foreign “branches” of the party, in accordance with paragraphs 10.4 and 26 from the Copenhagen Document, which envisions foreign cooperation and support of individuals, groups, and organisations that promote human rights and fundamental freedoms.

It should be highlighted that the legal framework has to carefully balance the protection of national interests against the rights of citizens, groups and associations, in the area of cooperation and exchange of information. Historically speaking, limits exist in the national sources of financing in order to prevent certain groups from gaining certain political influence with money.

¹⁵¹ See: <http://assembly.coe.int/ASP/XRef/X2H-DW-XSL.asp?fileid=16907&lang=en>.

The system of democratic governance is based on the principle that parties and candidates are responsible to the citizens, and not to the rich and specialized interest groups. Therefore, there are many reasonable limitations to party financing. In Armenian and Bulgarian legislation, there is a ban on parties receiving financial assistance, donations, or any other resources from foreign countries or foreign organisations, as well as from anonymous sources. Russia, too, has put a ban on donations for election campaigns from foreign states, companies or organisations, or from persons without citizenship, international organisations, or Russian legal entities with more than 30% foreign capital.

It is reasonable for every country not to prefer another foreign state interfering in its internal politics. However, on the other hand, it is notable that some parties which have stayed in power for a longer period in some traditionally democratic countries have received resources from foreign states, legally and in continuity, for financing not only of their election campaigns, but the regular functioning of the parties.

In general, the limitations for the financing of election campaigns can be found in the following forms:

- a) Maximum level of donation;
- b) Ban on donations from industrial or commercial companies, as well as religious organisations;
- c) Preliminary control by public organs, specialized in electoral issues, of the donations from party members who want to be candidates in the elections.

Transparency of the private financing of each party should be guaranteed. Towards this goal, each party should provide their annual financial balance sheets from the previous year, together with the list of all donations received, besides the membership fee. In order to secure equal opportunities for various political forces, the expenditures from the election campaign should be limited in a specific and legal way. The state should

participate in the expenditures from the election campaign with equitable financing in accordance with the percentage of mandates, or proportional votes won on the elections.

Depending on the violation of the legal provisions in the area of financing of election campaigns, certain sanctions should also be envisioned:

- a) Losing public resources as compensation for the costs during campaigns,
- b) Losing the right to receive budget resources for the coming year,
- c) Paying fines,
- d) And even cancellation of electoral results.

According to the position of the UN Human Rights Committee, "reasonable limitations of the electoral expenditures can be justified only when there is no violation of the voters' free choice, or when there is no violation of the democratic processes, due to the disproportional expenditures of any candidate or party".

Each country should determine the limit of the maximum electoral expenditures for the parties in order to achieve a legitimate goal – securing equality among the candidates in the elections.

However, the legitimate goal of such limitations should be balanced with the equally legitimate need for the protection of other citizens' rights, such as the right to a free association and the freedom of expression. These requirements point at the fact that the limits of expenditures should be carefully determined.

Since the state provides certain financial support for the parties, it is legitimate to be able to audit the received and consumed money, particularly in the area of party private sources of donations. The diverse nature and the amounts of resources should not undermine equality among the parties, though.

Some countries, encouraged by their parliaments and constitutional courts, take a step further and stimulate the parties to run profitable activities in order to secure resources that will enhance their autonomy in relation to their donors by generating the so-called own funds. For instance, the Czech Constitutional Court decided against the legal prohibition of parties to run commercial activities. Czech parties today can run publishing companies and publish their editions, as well as organise cultural manifestations to collect resources. In Japan as well, the Supreme Court made a decision that allows parties to be financed by private funds. However, this should not be used as a means of putting pressure on the parties under any condition.

Regulating party and electoral financing is necessary for the protection of the democratic processes in every country, including the regulation on expenditures limitations. As stipulated in the **General Commentary No.25 of the UN Human Rights Committee**, **“the reasonable limits to the electoral expenses can be reasonable limitations on campaign expenditure may be justified where this is necessary to ensure that the free choice of voters is not undermined or the democratic process distorted by the disproportionate expenditure on behalf of any candidate or party. The results of genuine elections should be respected and implemented”**.

As stipulated in the Recommendation of the Committee of Ministers at the Council of Europe from 2003, “the states have to secure independent monitoring in the area of financing of parties and election campaigns. Independent monitoring should include the surveillance of the parties’ accounts and the campaign expenses, as well as their promotion and publishing”.

The monitoring should be done in different ways involving various bodies, including the body in charge of the monitoring or another state financial body. Regardless of which body will have this function, its main task

should be the surveillance of the party financial reports, taking efficient measures determined by law, but also existing in state practices of securing their independence from the political pressures. Such independence is fundamental for this body to function appropriately. **It is highly recommended to carefully determine the way of appointing the members of the monitoring body by law, in order to prevent any kind of political influence on the members.**

This independence of the members should enable independent implementation of the law, and accountability of all entities violating the law. Irregularities in the financial reports of the parties and the inappropriate use of public funds during campaigns can result in wasting all or part of the state resources intended for the parties during elections. Other forms of sanctions for this kind of violation are administrative fines that parties should pay. As stipulated in the Report of the Committee of Ministers at the Council of Europe, "parties should be efficiently and proportionally sanctioned in case they violate the laws on political financing".

4. POLITICAL PARTY FINANCING IN THE REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA – LEGAL PROVISIONS

In accordance with the Law on Financing Political Parties in the Republic of Macedonia, political party financing encompasses the activities of a **political party related to securing financial resources for its functioning, as well as non-financial donations**, such as equipment, donations in the form of professional services and other kinds of non-monetary donations, while the term financial activities of a political party implies all financial transactions made from the account and the property of the party. All financial sources and incomes that the political party secures for its functioning, under conditions stipulated in law, are considered sources of political party financing.

The political parties in the Republic of Macedonia are non-profit organisations. This implies that, in accordance with the law, they cannot run profitable businesses, nor realize profitable activities. Political parties can gain resources for their functioning and activities based on certain conditions and ways determined by this law. In the Republic of Macedonia, political parties are also financed by **public and private sources of financing.**

Public sources of political party financing are envisaged in the Republic of Macedonia's budget, as well as in the budget of the municipalities and the city of Skopje. The total amount of resources for the annual financing of political parties **reaches 0.06% from the overall revenue of the Republic of Macedonia's budget.** These resources can be used by political parties only for the goals determined by law, the statute, and other legal acts of the party.

Up to 30% of the resources for political party financing, secured from the budget of the Republic of Macedonia, are equally distributed to all political parties that have won at least 1% of the total amount of votes in the last elections of representatives in the Republic of Macedonia's Parliament on national level, or the last local elections held in the constituency.

Up to 70% of the resources for political party financing, secured from the Republic of Macedonia's budget, are distributed to political parties, whose candidates have been elected as MPs in the Republic of Macedonia's Assembly in the last parliamentary elections, in accordance with the number of elected MPs of the political parties, and the political parties that have their own candidates elected for councilors in the last local elections, in accordance with the number of elected councilors. These resources are distributed to the political parties with a decision made by the Ministry of Justice. The State Election Commis-

sion forwards a list to the Ministry of Justice, with all the political parties that have won at least 1% of the total number of votes on the last parliamentary elections in the Republic of Macedonia, on national level, or on the last local elections held in each municipality and in the city of Skopje, on a local level. The State Election Commission forwards a list to the Ministry of Justice with the number of elected MPs in the Parliament of the Republic of Macedonia by party, on national level, as well as the number of elected councillors in the local elections, on national level as well.

The resources allocated from the budget of the Republic of Macedonia reach 280,000 EUR in MKD equivalent, for the annual financing of party research and analytical centres, established in accordance with the law as part of the internal organisation of the political party.

The following are considered private sources of political party financing:

- » Membership fees;
- » Donations, gifts, contributions, grants;
- » Legacies;
- » Resources obtained from selling promotional and propaganda materials and
- » Personal incomes.

The party membership fee is a regular amount of resources paid by a member of a political party on an annual basis, in accordance with the party's acts. The amount of the annual fee, for each member individually, should not exceed the amount of average net monthly income in the Republic of Macedonia from the previous year, which is announced by the State Statistical Office. Moreover, political parties can accept donations in the form of money, material resources or services. Political parties can accept non-monetary donations if they can be used for their activities, and in accordance with their statute.

Providing free services to a political party, as well as providing services to political parties paid by a third person is also considered a donation. The service provider is obliged to inform the political party about the value of the service provided. Selling goods and providing services to political parties with lower prices than the market value is also considered a donation. The seller of goods, i.e. the service provider is obliged to inform the political party about the market value of the goods sold, i.e. the services provided. The difference between the market value and the price paid is considered a donation.

The total amount of individual donations should not exceed the sum of 150 average net monthly incomes of legal entities, and 75 average salaries of physical entities in the Republic of Macedonia, paid in the previous month and announced by the State Statistical Office. This amount should not be accumulated more than once a year. If the amount of the donation is bigger than the determined amount, the political party is not allowed to use it and is obliged to return the difference between the allowed and the donated value to the donor immediately and not later than 15 days from the day of receiving the donation.

If the donation's origin cannot be determined, the political party is obliged to transfer the donated value to the budget of the Republic of Macedonia, immediately and not later than 15 days from the day of receiving the donation.

Political parties are obliged to publish the register of donations on their websites every six months for the previous period of six months, in a period of 15 days after the end of the six-month period, or make it available to the public in any other suitable way.

The register of donations should contain the following data:

- » The name, i.e. the title of each individual donor;
- » The type and value of the donation; and
- » The date of receiving the donation.

Political parties in the Republic of Macedonia cannot be financed from:

- » Governments, international institutions, organs and organisations of foreign states or other foreign individuals;
- » State and local organs aside from the resources allocated with the budget of the Republic of Macedonia and the budgets of the municipalities, aside from the resources envisioned with the Law on Political Party Financing and the Electoral Code;
- » Public institutions, public organisations, public funds, or other legal entities managing state capital;
- » Public organisations, public institutions, and public funds established by the municipalities;
- » Organisations with at least 20% participation of state capital, public institutions, including those that have started a process of privatisation;
- » Private companies that provide public services for state organs or state institutions, organisations and funds via agreement, at the moment of giving a contribution to the political party.
- » Citizens' associations (non-governmental organisations), religious communities or religious groups;
- » Resources from companies with mixed capital, with a dominant foreign investment, as well as from anonymous and unidentified sources.

If political parties receive money from these sources, then the resources from the political parties' accounts should be transferred to the budget of the Republic of Macedonia, and will be used to finance humanitarian activities. Political parties which gain and use resources from these sources illegally, as well as resources not listed in the donations register,

will lose their right to be financed by the Republic of Macedonia's budget for the forthcoming year.

The State Audit Office carries out the monitoring of the financial work of the political parties in the Republic of Macedonia. Each political party in the country is obliged to prepare an annual financial report, which should be forwarded to the Public Revenue Office and the State Audit Office by 31st March for the previous year. The State Audit Office and the Public Revenue Office are obliged to publish the received reports on their official websites. If the State Audit Office determines that there are certain irregularities in the annual financial report of a political party, it should file an initiation of infringement proceedings, or report it to the public prosecutor, not later than 30 days from the moment the irregularity has been determined. The State Audit Office, prior to the decision to file for the initiation of infringement proceedings, should address the general court in charge, in order to initiate a settlement procedure, in accordance with the Misdemeanour Law.

Regardless of the misdemeanor responsibility, the payment of resources for regular annual financing from the budget of the Republic of Macedonia will be stopped, i.e. suspended for the political party that will not forward an annual report to the State Audit Office in the deadline stipulated by law, as well as if it does not follow the legal provisions. The payment of resources for regular financing from the budget of the Republic of Macedonia will be suspended for those political parties that have not published the data for the donations received during that year.

PART TWO

**POLITICAL PARTIES IN THE
REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA**

CHAPTER 1



THE POLITICAL AND PARTY ORGANISATION UNTIL THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

1. INTRODUCTORY NOTES

The party system in Macedonia was shaped under the influence of general historical circumstances related to the citizens' aspirations to create an independent state, as well as under the influence of overall historical processes related to the establishing of a representative democracy in a modern sense.

From a state and legal aspect, the history of party organisation in Macedonia can be divided into three periods:

- » The first period, which lasted until 1944, when Macedonia still had not achieved its statehood;
- » The second period, which lasted from 1944 until 1991, when Macedonia began the process of framing its statehood as a socialist republic within Federal Yugoslavia;
- » The third period, lasting from 1991 until today, when Macedonia is an independent, autonomous and democratic state.

In a political and a national sense, the threshold between the first and the second period is the **First Session of the Anti-Fascist Assembly of the National Liberation of Macedonia (ASNOM), held on 2 August 1944 in the Monastery of Venerable Prohor of Pčinja**, where a decision was made to establish the Socialist Republic of Macedonia within the federation with the rest of the peoples of Yugoslavia. The threshold between the second and the third period is the **referendum from 8 September 1991, which fully framed the national aspirations for establishing the Republic of Macedonia as an independent state.**

In accordance with the above mentioned, from the aspect of the character of the political system, the first period of party organisation in Macedonia corresponds with the overall global processes related to the establishing of a representative democracy in a modern sense through a series of legal

and political steps, such as securing the equal and general right to vote for all citizens regardless of their social, gender, national, or any other position and distinction. The second period of party organising is marked as a socialist system of state order, which, contrary to political pluralism, implements the concept of political monism, where only one political party holds the monopoly of political organisation. Finally, today, in the third period, the Republic of Macedonia implements a true multi-party representative democracy following the example of western democratic states.

This analysis is also divided in three periods, in accordance with this time frame. Thus, the first part elaborates the phenomenon of political and party organisation of the Macedonian people until the creation of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia (SRM). The second part elaborates the party and electoral system in the SRM, while the third part expounds the party and electoral system of the contemporary Republic of Macedonia.

2. THE POLITICAL AND PARTY ORGANISATION UNTIL THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

The experience of Macedonia with political and party organising until the creation of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia in 1944 is very rich and varied. Namely, in these historic times, the territory of Macedonia was first **under Ottoman rule** and later, after the Balkan Wars in 1912 and 1913 and the Bucharest Peace Agreement, i.e. after the end of World War I and the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, Macedonia was divided between **Serbia, Bulgaria, and Greece**. With regards to this, the form of party organising of the Macedonian people was conditioned by at least four factors:

- » **First, it is the dynamics of the development of representative democracy** in the respective coun-

tries which represents a **specific historical process** related to establishing, expanding and equaling citizens' right to vote, which took place during the 19th and 20th centuries;

- » **Second**, opposite to the previous, it is **the character of the power in the states mentioned above**, i.e. whether they are authoritarian or democratic systems;
- » **Third, the organisational forms of the Macedonian people**, which although enslaved, still apply military, but also political means to fulfill their aspirations for freedom and the establishing of their own state and
- » **Fourth, the national strategies of the occupying countries**, which reflect on the ways of party organising of the Macedonian people.

For some of the forms of organising of the Macedonian people we **cannot say that they represent classical forms of political parties** as we see them today in states with a representative democracy. However, **considering the way of their functioning, their organisational structure, as well as the goals that are undoubtedly political and deeply national, we can categorize them into this group, of course, in the wider sense of the word.** In any case, opposite to other mentioned nations and as this paper will demonstrate, the Macedonian people are organised in legal political bodies (political parties) that were recognized by the authorities in the states where they were active.

Historically speaking, the beginnings of the development of the party system in Macedonia are related to the establishment of the Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organisation (VMRO)¹⁵² in 1893 as a revolutionary and liberation organisation of the Macedonian people, in order

¹⁵² In various periods of its existence, there were several names that were used (accepted) for this organisation, for instance, Macedonian Revolutionary Organisation (MRO), Secret Macedonian-Odrin Revolutionary Organisation (TMORO), Internal Macedonian-Odrin Revolutionary Organisation (VMORO), and Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organisation (VMRO), etc. In popular and academic literature, as well as in this paper, the name VMRO is used for this organisation (see: www.britannica.com, 25.01.2015).

to secure political autonomy of Macedonia from Ottoman rule. This assertion is a result of two groups of arguments:

- » **First**, because the first political party in the true sense of the word, as well as the people who created it as revolutionaries, politicians, or representatives were part of VMRO, and the promoted and affirmed the goals of VMRO;
- » **Second**, although VMRO was not a political party in a classical sense (namely, VMRO is in essence a revolutionary organisation), however, considering its overall action and functioning, it is undoubtedly an organisation with political goals, which took the form corresponding with the possibilities available to the Macedonian people in this historic period, when it was oppressed and deprived.

The foundation of the party system of Macedonia was set in 1893 with the establishment of VMRO, and the historical beginning of the formation of political parties as legal entities acknowledged by the state took place in 1908. This is a period when the Macedonian people were still under Ottoman rule, which means sharing the destiny of the country it is a part of. In 1908, the **Young Turk Revolution** begins in the Ottoman Empire, taking the form of a general mass democratic movement under the strong influence of the **French Bourgeois Revolution**. Under the pressure of this mass movement, the Sultan, **in July 1908**, reinstates the **old Turkish Constitution from 1876**, proclaims the *hürriyet* (liberty) and calls elections for the state parliament. In these elections, that took place several months later, there were **four elected representatives from Macedonia, among them the VMRO revolutionary Dimitar Vlahov. Historically speaking, this denotes the beginning of the institutionalized political functioning of the Macedonian people in accordance with the rules of par-**

liamentary democracy, which functions even today as a form of a political and constitutional system.

Furthermore, another significant political organisation of the Macedonian people from this period is the **National Federal Party (NFP)** under the leadership of VMRO revolutionaries Dimitar Vlahov and Jane Sandanski, **which was established in 1909 in Thessaloniki as a legal political entity functioning in accordance with the legal provisions of the Ottoman Empire.** This party was striving for the reorganization of the Empire by establishing Macedonia as an autonomous vilayet (province). However, this party **was prohibited a year after its establishment** in accordance with the law prohibiting citizen organisations, which was introduced by the new Young Turk government.

The so-called **socialist organisations**, gathering around the characters and deeds of **Vasil Glavinov, Dimo Hadzi-Dimov** and other renowned revolutionaries, had a special place in the political history of Macedonia **until the partition of Macedonia** during the Balkan Wars from 1912/1913.¹⁵³ These organisations, which **were positioned left from the centre according to ideology**, instigated wide political and revolutionary activities, such as various strikes, workers' protests, and other socially founded actions.

Besides the above mentioned political parties, on the territory of Macedonia, in the period from 1909 until the Balkan Wars, **there were political structures established by Macedonia's neighbouring countries in order to further promote their "greater state" nationalistic propaganda.** Thus, there were legal political parties representing Serbian, Bulgarian, or Greek state interests on Macedonian territory in this period.

¹⁵³ See: **Nadežda Cvetkovska, Gragjanskite partii vo vardarskiot del na Makedonija (1935-1941), Institut za nacionalna istorija, Skopje, 1996, (p.10).**

After the partition of Macedonia during the Balkan Wars from 1912/1913, there were other, more specific examples of political party organising of the Macedonian people which will be further expounded.

After the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes was established (SHS) on the territory of Vardar Macedonia, which was under Serbian authority, in the political life there were many Serbian citizens' parties addressing the Macedonian people. Such parties were **the Radical Party**¹⁵⁴ **the Democratic Party**,¹⁵⁵ **the Republican Party**,¹⁵⁶ i.e. the "**Xhemiet**" party".¹⁵⁷

The advance of Serbian political parties in this period is related to the fact that the Macedonian people were not allowed to establish their own legal political party that would represent and affirm their interests, particularly the aspirations for recognizing their identity and distinctiveness. Contrary to this, the rest of the Serbian political parties, without exception, denied the distinctiveness of the Macedonian people, which resulted in a lack of substantial support. With regards to this, historically speaking, **several representatives from Vardar Macedonia in the Parlia-**

¹⁵⁴ The Radical Party (RP) is the first legal political party in Serbia, established in 1881 under the name People's Radical Party. One of its main political figures was Nikola Pašić. RP is a party that affirms the great Serbian hegemony, ideologically positioned in the right centre, with its voters' basis mainly among peasants and farmers.

¹⁵⁵ The Democratic Party (DP) was established in 1919 in Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina, under the name Yugoslavian Democratic Party, by merging four political parties, i.e. the Progressive Party, the Independent Radical Party, the People's Party, as well as the Democratic Statehood Party. DP represents a party that affirms the great Serbian interests, ideologically positioned in the right centre, with its voters' basis among the small and middle bourgeoisie.

¹⁵⁶ The Republican Party (RP) was established in 1920 by Serbian intellectuals who represented the ideas of political pluralism. RP was supporting republican ideas and considered that Yugoslavia should function as a federation of equal constituents. Due to these positions, RP had supporters among a small portion of the population in Vardar Macedonia, although it did not receive a significant support in the elections.

¹⁵⁷ Xhemiet is a political organisation that existed in Turkey prior to the Balkan wars. However, after the wars and Macedonia's partition, it continued to exist in the established Kingdom of SHS. Xhemiet is a political option of the Muslims in Macedonia.

ment of the Kingdom of SHS who were members of the Democratic Party, made an attempt to establish a so-called Macedonian Party. However, the authorities hampered this attempt.¹⁵⁸ In this direction, the only political entity that received the support of the Macedonian people in this historical period is the **Socialist Workers Party of Yugoslavia (SRPJ) (the Communists)**, since it showed understanding for the aspirations of the Macedonian people. SRPJ was established in Belgrade in 1919, while in 1920, it changed its name into **Communist Party of Yugoslavia (KPJ)**. In this direction, the first parliamentary and local elections took place in Vardar Macedonia in 1920. Considering the character of the objectives of the existing Serbian parties, the Communists, unlike others, had a significant success in the local elections.

Namely, they **achieved victory in the cities of Skopje, Veles, Kumanovo, and Kavadarci**, where they established their own local authorities which were popularly called the **“red municipalities”**. **After Yugoslavia’s occupation in 1941, KPJ became the leader of the people’s uprising against the occupying forces, which ended with the triumph in 1945 and the establishment of Federal Yugoslavia as a socialist state with a one-party system.**

Another more significant organisation of the Macedonian people is the **Macedonian People’s Movement (MANAPO)**. This movement, which rests on antifascist and communist principles, was established in 1936 by Macedonian students at the Belgrade and Zagreb universities. The political platform of MANAPO was introduced in 1936 in Ohrid, its main goal being **“to awaken the national awareness of the Macedonian people, affirm the Macedonian language, fight against the Great Serbian hegemony, democratize the country and solve the Macedonian national issue”**. With such a

¹⁵⁸ See: Nadežda Cvetkovska, *Gragjanskite partii vo vardarskiot del na Makedonija (1935-1941)*, *ibid.*, (p12).

political activity MANAPO gained great popularity and influence among the Macedonian people in Vardar Macedonia. As a result, the state made a decision to prohibit the activities of this organisation.

Besides the organisations in Vardar Macedonia, in the period between the two World Wars, another significant political entity of the Macedonian people is **VMRO-Autonomic, functioning on the territory of Pirin Macedonia**. This political structure in this part of ethnographic Macedonia built a true political and military base (a state within a state). VMRO defined Pirin Macedonia **“as a part of the territory of free and united Macedonia” that had all the “freedoms – cultural, economic and political, and the whole population should incline to the ideas and morals of the Organisation and prepare for the liberation of Macedonia”**. **VMRO prohibited the activities of other citizens’ parties on the territory of Pirin Macedonia, and held a monopoly over the political organising on this territory**. In relation to this, the interests of the Macedonians in the Bulgarian Parliament were represented by the so-called **“Macedonian parliamentary group”, which comprised of elected representatives from this part of the country that was under direct political command of VMRO**. The members of this group publicly declared that they represented the interests of the native population of Pirin Macedonia, as well as of Macedonian refugees from Vardar Macedonia and Aegean Macedonia.

Besides the organisations in Vardar and Pirin Macedonia, in Aegean Macedonia, between the two World Wars, the Macedonian people were more inclined towards the **Communist Party of Greece (CPG)**, which represented the oldest political structure in that country. Ever since its establishment, this party had been fighting for the rights of the working masses and was the only party in Greece that stood up for the protection of ethnic minorities. With regards to this, **CPG is the**

only party that protects the right of ethnic Macedonians from Aegean Macedonian to identity, using their mother tongue, as well as achieving other cultural rights, which were denied to them by the state authorities of Greece.

Another more significant political organisation from this group is **VMRO (United)**, which was established as a result of the unsuccessful unification of the Macedonian organisations with the **May Manifesto from 1924**. This political organisation of the Macedonian people operated under the influence of the **Balkan Communist Federation**, and was supported by the **Communist International** and the Macedonian communists. **Its main goal was to fight for a free and independent Macedonian state, which would be an equal member in the future Balkan federation.** VMRO (United) aspired to become a mass popular movement that would establish tight connections with all "national-revolutionary and social-revolutionary parties and organisations that support the principle of self-determination of the nations and are willing to support Macedonia in being established as an independent state".

Another important political organisation of the Macedonian people in this period is **the Macedonian Patriotic Organisation (MPO)**. This organisation was established in 1922 outside the territory of Macedonia, i.e. in the United States of America (USA), **as a result of the unification of a larger group of Macedonian expatriate organisations.** **Article 2 from the Constitution of MPO, which refers to the goals of this political organisation, stipulates that this organisation "strives for Macedonia to be recognized in a legal way as an independent republic in its geographic and economic borders".** MPO showed readiness to establish forms of close cooperation with other organisations of the oppressed Balkan peoples in order to help establish a Balkan confederation, wherein Macedonia would

be an equal constituent. It is interesting to mention that in order to achieve its political mission, MPO established a special **journalist agency**, through which the American and the global public were introduced to the problems and challenges of the Macedonian people.

This chronological order is concluded with the Communist Union of Macedonia (SKM). **SKM can be defined as illegal, but also as a legal political organisation (political party) of the Macedonian people, which, being part of the SKJ, functioned on the territory of Socialist Macedonia, organising and leading the struggle for the liberation of the Macedonian people and the citizens of Macedonia, during and after World War II.**

The decision to establish the Communist Party of Macedonia was made by SKJ in 1934, while its formation took place 9 years later in 1943 in the town of Tetovo, when the first meeting of this organisation was held.

The SKM was established under the name Communist Party of Macedonia. In 1953 it changed the name to SKM, while in 1990 it changed the name to SKM – Party for Democratic Transformation.

The effect from the actions of the SKM was the creation of the Macedonian state on 2 August 1944, which became a constituent in the federation of the south Slavic peoples.

* * *

Having in mind the above mentioned and based on the examples presented, the conclusion can be drawn that the political organising of the Macedonian people in this first historical period was achieved mainly on four levels:

- » **First**, as part of VMRO, the organisations deriving from it, i.e. those that relied on the legacy of the organisation;

- » **Second**, as part of the communist movement;
- » **Third**, as distinct political organisations relying on the legacy, goals and aspirations of VMRO and the communist movement;
- » **Fourth**, within the frames of the legal political entities in the Ottoman Empire, and later, after 1913, and 1919, in Bulgaria, Serbia and Greece, as states that partitioned the territory of Macedonia.

The conclusion that arises from the analyzed examples is that **the Macedonian people were oppressed and besides revolutionary, they used political methods as well in order to achieve their national goals if this was not prohibited by the oppressing states.** The facts show that after the establishment of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia as part of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, the Macedonian people joined the federation with **a rich political and party (but also revolutionary) experience, which as a collective memory, should contribute towards constructing the new postwar Macedonian socialist constitutional and political system.**

CHAPTER 2



THE PARTY SYSTEM IN THE SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

1. THE PARTY SYSTEM IN THE SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

In general, the development of the party system in the Socialist Republic of Macedonia can be divided in three periods:

- » **The first period of extreme political monism**, which lasted until 29 November 1989;
- » **The second period of transition from political monism to political pluralism**, which lasted from 29 November 1989 until 13 April 1990;
- » **The third period of establishing political pluralism**, which lasted from 13 April until 8 September 1991.

The milestone between the first and the second period is the **10th Congress of the Communist Union of Macedonia (SKM), which took place from 27 until 29 November 1989**. The milestone between the second and the third period is the **Law amending and supplementing the Law on Social Organisations and Associations of Citizens, which was adopted on 13 April 1989, as well as the changes in the Constitution of the SKM from 1974, i.e. the Law on Election and Recall of MPs and Councilors from 21 September 1990**. The third period starts with the **referendum for the independence of Macedonia from 8 September 1991**, when citizens decided to abandon their socialist past, choosing the democratic, independent, and sovereign Republic of Macedonia.

1.1. Characteristics of political monism (the first period)

In the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, before the process of political pluralization took place in the late 1980s, the only political entity that held the monopoly in politics and over the institutions was the Communist Union of Yugoslavia (SKJ), or,

in particular, its constituents in each of the federal units of this state. As part of the SKJ, the Communist Union of Macedonia (SKM) held the monopoly of political power in the Socialist Republic of Macedonia (SRM).

In this period, in the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, i.e. in the Socialist and Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRJ), besides the SKJ, i.e. the SKM as its constituent part, there were other forms of political activity as well. This implies that there is no formally declared monopoly over political power, or, in other words, that it functions as a form of political pluralism. Such organisations are **the Socialist Union of the Working People of Macedonia (SSRNM), the Labour Union, the Youth Organisations, as well as other similar associations. However, these are just forms, because in essence the ruling party controls them all. Therefore, the party system in the SRM is classified as a single-party system, and the Socialist Republic of Macedonia is a country with political monism.**

In Macedonia, in the period before the SKM Congress in November 1989, besides the above mentioned organisations under direct control of this party, as partially autonomous forms of civic associations, there are several nongovernmental organisations, mainly oriented towards issues related with the development of ecology.¹⁵⁹

The events that took place in Slovenia - the most liberal republic in the SFRJ, had a great influence on the process of political pluralization in Macedonia. In Slovenia, similar political movements and organisations were formed, influenced by the wave of liberalization and democratization that spread across the countries of Eastern Europe in the early 1980s, and

¹⁵⁹ See: **Cane Mojanoski, Letopis na makedonskata demokratija, Pakung, Skopje, 2000, (p.13).**

in particular in Hungary and Poland.¹⁶⁰ This phenomenon that took place in Slovenia, which would spread across the rest of the Yugoslavian republics is denoted as the “**Slovenian syndrome**” in political theory. This “syndrome” greatly affected the acceleration of the processes of democratization in Socialist Macedonia.

In this period, during the transition from the 1980s to the 1990s, there were no legal sanctions against the existence of parties as legal entities, which resulted in many initiatives with political goals to emerge, with names such as “**movement**”, for example, the Unified-Macedonian Action Movement (MAAK), or “**league**”, for instance the League for Democracy. These political forms of associations lack the term “**party**” in their titles, probably on purpose, to avoid possible negative reactions by the socialist institutions, since the only legitimate political entity is still the Communist Union of Macedonia (SKM). With regards to this, it should be highlighted that in a similar way, the process of pluralistic, political, and democratic “opening” takes place in the other republic of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRJ).

The Communist Union of Slovenia (SKS) prepared the field for the start of the transition towards political pluralism in the rest of the republics of Federal Yugoslavia, with the decision made in **July 1989**, four months before the Macedonian communists followed in their steps. In any case, it is important to emphasize that such decisions by the communist leaderships in all of the Yugoslavian republics, including the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, were made under the strong

¹⁶⁰ The process of the collapse of communism starts as a result of the riots that took place across the countries of Eastern Europe. These events were initiated in Poland in 1989, and then spread to Hungary, East Germany, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and Romania. The Soviet Union dissolved in 1991, as a result of the decisions made by the Russian Federation and 14 other nations, which declared their independence. Between 1990 and 1992, this system of state governance collapsed in Albania, as well as in Federal Yugoslavia. These processes affected other socialist countries outside the European continent as well, for instance, Cambodia, Ethiopia, and Mongolia, which also rejected this system of state governance. (See: **Bartłomiej Kaminski, The Collapse Of State Socialism, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1991**).

influence of the tectonic movements related to the fall of communism in the countries of Eastern Europe, which occurred in the same period.¹⁶¹

In support of the abovementioned, in 1989, when the SKM Congress took place, the Polish communists legalized the anticommunist movement Solidarity (January) and initiated formal negotiations with their representatives (February), which resulted in this political movement gaining legal status (April) and the call for parliamentary elections in 1989, when the anticommunists won, with the first anticommunist prime minister elected in this country for the first time after 42 years.

Three months before the SKM Congress in Macedonia, millions of citizens of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania protested continuously on a daily basis, for freedom and independence, creating a continuous "chain" of people more than 600 kilometers long.

Two months before the 10th SKM Congress, the process of democratic transition of Hungary came to a final stage, while a month before this event, the communist leader of the Democratic Republic of Germany (DDR), Erich Honecker, was forced to resign from the party leader's position, which was an introduction to the processes that would result in Germany's unification in 1990.

Several days prior to the SKM Congress, in Bulgaria, after 45 years of communist government the president of the party resigned and in his place a new person was assigned, who changed the name of this party into the Bulgarian Socialist Party (BSP).

Finally, on the day of the 10th SKM Congress, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia declared the renunciation of its monopoly over political power, and in December of the same year, after 40 years, the first anticommunist government in this country was elected.

¹⁶¹ See: **Ratko Marković, "Ustavno pravo i političke institucije", IDP Justinijan, Belgrade, 2006, (p.306-335).**

Considering the establishment of the previous socialist system, contrary to the general circumstances in liberal Slovenia as well as in the rest of the countries from Eastern Europe, **the implementation of democratic pluralist ideas in Socialist Macedonia was not entirely peaceful, or without disturbances.**

In general, this is due to the following five facts:

- » **First**, due to the insecurity and absence of a strategy of the SKM regarding how to position itself against the overall processes of pluralization and democratization that occur in Eastern Europe, but also in Federal Yugoslavia, which constituent is Macedonia as well;
- » **Second**, due to the absence of a unified position, i.e. due to the sharp division in the SKM in relation to this issue;
- » **Third**, due to the fact that Macedonia had no significant historical experience with democratic pluralism and the existence of representative democracy, as well as the functioning of a market economy, as a result of the fact that its statehood is still not recognized, i.e. because the Macedonian people were under various oppressions in the period prior to the establishment of the SFRJ, i.e. SRM;
- » **Fourth**, as a result of the abovementioned, there was no political and social elite (in opposition to the existing socialist elite) in Macedonia which would insist on establishing political pluralism more aggressively;
- » **Fifth**, in correlation with the previous point, the SRM also lacks a strong political and democratically oriented diaspora, with strong international relations, and with the capacity to boldly implement the process of democratic transition of the country, which was emphasized in Slovenia, and particularly in Croatia.

In this regard, in the context of the previous statement, **the insecurity, the lack of a strategic approach and the**

divisions within the SKM, as a party that was supposed to implement the process of democratic transformation in Macedonia, came to the surface before and during the 10th Congress of this single political entity of the time, which took place in November 1989.

1.2. Transition from political monism to political pluralism (the second period)

The 10th SKM Congress represents a milestone in the further development of Macedonia as a democratic state, contrary to its partially authoritarian socialist past.

Unlike the countries from the communist block, where the processes of democratic pluralization developed dramatically, **in the SRM, the social climate in on evening before the SKM Congress is totally the opposite.** Certain authors¹⁶² interpret such a situation as a sign that Macedonia, in this period, is a conservative environment where the process of democratic pluralization is difficult to implement. However, not so publicly though, there are pro-democratic social activities taking place, such as the ideas for the political and social rehabilitation of the opponents of the SKM's political monopoly, who were marginalized and thwarted by the system, such as had been the case with professor Slavko Milosavljeski, PhD.¹⁶³

162 See: **Cane Mojanoski, Letopis na makedonskata demokratija, Ibid., (p.11).**

163 Slavko Milosavljeski (1928-2012) is a Macedonian political dissident from the socialist period. At the peak of the Yugoslavian communist leadership's struggle against liberalism and nationalism, Milosavljeski is forced to resign from the position of a secretary of the SKM in 1972. The following year, the SKM leadership excluded Milosavljeski from the core organisation of this party at the Law Faculty in Skopje, which terminated his employment relationship at the Faculty. Moreover, as a result of this persecution, Milosavljeski immigrate to the US in 1974, and later returned to Macedonia. Milosavljeski, in the period after the termination of the political monopoly of the SKM, participated in establishing the Social Democratic Party of Macedonia (SDPM). (See: **Dimitar Mircev, Zaminuvanje na Milosavljeski, dnevnik.mk, 18.10.2012; Denko Maleski, Vo spomen na Slavko Milosavljeski, okno.mk, October 2012).**

In relation to the processes of pluralization and democratization, two wings can be differentiated within the SKM:¹⁶⁴

- » **The conservative** and
- » **The liberal.**

The most prominent representative of the conservative wing of the SKM is **Mihail Danev**, while the most prominent representative of the liberal wing is **Petar Gošev**. These two persons, entered the presidential race after **Jakov Lazarevski's** resignation from the leadership position in the SKM in 1989.¹⁶⁵ As a result, Petar Gošev won the elections, which makes him the last leader of this political structure in Socialist Macedonia.

The conservative wing of the SKM aimed at introducing the so-called "**non-party pluralism**". This term implies the establishment of a system where the SKM will continue to function as the only party within the state. But at the same time, it will allow the existence of the so-called "**legally organised pressure groups**", which will act as legal entities and as organisations that unite people with different ideological and programme interests, striving to attain them through the legally defined means of communication with the state under the leadership of the SKM. Such a projection for a "**non-party pluralism**" is qualified by certain authors¹⁶⁶ as a "**lame**", i.e. "**crippled**" pluralism, since it represents an attempt to make a compromise between two incompatible concepts – **political pluralism**, which implies the existence of a larger number of political parties that compete to win the trust of the citizens, in opposition to **political monism**, which, as an authoritative concept, implies the existence of a single political party that holds the monopoly over the institutions and the state.

164 See: **Aneta Jovevska, "Izborite fokus na političkiot život", Dijalog br.6, Skopje, 1994, (p.81).**

165 The leader's position in communist parties, including the SKM, bears the title General Secretary. In fact, this is equivalent to the position of a president in the democratic political parties.

166 See: **Aneta Jovevska, "Izborite fokus na političkiot život", Ibid.**

The liberal wing of the SKM, contrary to the positions of the representatives of the conservative wing, inaugurates the concept of **democratic political pluralism**, which recognizes the existence of many political parties and interest groups that articulated the different individual and group interests. The parties, in agreement with the rules of democracy, compete in general and direct elections to win the trust of the citizens in order to govern the state.

On the 10th Congress of the SKM, **the ideas of the liberals gained dominance, which results in making a decision to establish Macedonia as a "democratic, civic, and social state", as well as "to terminate the monopoly of the SKM over the power"**.¹⁶⁷ This set in motion the political presumptions for opening the process of political pluralization in Macedonia.

In this regard, abandoning the communist regime in the SRM can be denoted with the phrase **"top-down change" because political pluralism was introduced and achieved without any mass protests or revolutions**, following the examples of Hungary, and Bulgaria, contrary to the unfavorable and negative examples of street demonstrations in Poland, Czechoslovakia, or the Democratic Republic of Germany (East Germany).

In accordance with the decisions made on the last congress of the SKM, president Petar Gošev formed an **Expert Commission**¹⁶⁸ that should prepare the platforms (documents/plans/strategies) for establishing political pluralism and a market economy in Macedonia. In the most recent history of Macedonia, this legislative body will be remembered as **"Gošev's Commission"**.

¹⁶⁷ See: **Slavko Milosavlevski**, "Istočna Evropa pomegju egalitarizmot i demokratijata", Ljuboten, Skopje, 1993, (p.140).

¹⁶⁸ See: **Utrinski vesnik**, "Intervju Petar Gošev: Po porazot vo 1990 godina, sakav da se povlečam od politikata", No. 1929, 16.10.2006.

It consisted of representatives of the academic community, as well as some politicians, 30 members in total. Some of the members of this commission were Kiro Gligorov, Nikola Kljusev, Gordana Siljanovska, Dimitar Dimitrov, Denko Maleski, Ljubomir Frckovski, Lazar Kitanovski, Dimitar Mirčev, Jane Miljoski, and others. Some of them would later become high political figures or state officials.

Namely, Kiro Gligorov will be elected as first president of independent Macedonia, the academic Nikola Kljusev will become the first prime minister, Maleski, Dimitrov, Siljanovska, Frčkovski, and Miljoski will be elected as ministers in the first Macedonian government, while Mirčev will be appointed the first ambassador of the Republic of Macedonia in the Republic of Slovenia. Moreover, as a result of the activities of the expert commission the last socialist government¹⁶⁹ of Macedonia, under the leadership of Gligorie Gogovski, introduced the necessary legislation to implement the first multi-party elections in Macedonia.¹⁷⁰

In the period between the SKM Congress and the implementation of the changes in the Law on Social Organisations and Civic Associations, **the first form of political organising emerged on 4 February 1990 in Skopje, when the constitutional assembly of the Movement for Unified-Macedonian Action – MAAK takes place, followed by the founding assembly of the League for Democracy on 11 February 1990, also in Skopje.** In this period, three other parties had their founding assemblies (or made decisions to establish them), such as the Party for Macedonian Labour Unification on 4 March 1990 in Prilep, the Social Democratic Party of Macedonia on 18 March 1990 in Skopje, as well as the People's Party of Macedonia on 12 April 1990 in Skopje.

¹⁶⁹ In the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, the government is known as an executive council.

¹⁷⁰ See: *Utrinski vesnik*, "Intervju Petar Gošev: Po porazot vo 1990 godina, sakav da se povlečam od politikata", *Ibid*.

1.3. The third period of political pluralism

The process of democratic transformation of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia begins chronologically with the adoption of the following three legal acts:

- » **First**, the Law amending and supplementing the Law on Social Organisations and Civic Associations from 13 April 1990;¹⁷¹
- » **Second**, the Amendments to the Constitution of the SRM from 1974 on 21 September 1990;¹⁷² as well as
- » **Third**, the Law on Election and Recall of MPs and Councilors from 21 September 1990.¹⁷³

The analysis of the chronological order of the adopted legal acts points at the conclusion that the introduction of political pluralism in the SRM did not start first with amendments to the constitution and then changes to the legislation, but the other way round. First, with changes to the legislation and then with amendments to the constitution. The basic principle of subordination of the lower in relation to the higher legal acts was not observed, i.e. instead of harmonizing the law with the constitution, the constitution was changed in order to agree with the previously adopted legal changes to terminate the monopoly of the ruling SKM, and enable the establishment of many parties. However, this is a time when the climate in Macedonia was filled with insecurity and fear; the conflicts in the other constituents of the SFRJ became more dramatic due to the initiation of the collapse of the federation; in the "eastern communist block", on the other hand, there was the process of democratic coups and velvet revolutions, which might be observed as the reason for this sequence of events.

¹⁷¹ **The Law Amending and Supplementing the Law on Social Organisations and Civic Associations, Official Gazette of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, year XLVI, No. 12, Skopje, 13.4.1990, (pp. 273-239).**

¹⁷² **A decision to declare the Amendments LVII – LXXXI to the Constitution of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, Amendments to the Constitution of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, Official Gazette of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, year: XLVI, No. 28, Skopje, 21.9.1990, pp. 506-511.**

¹⁷³ **The Law on Election and Recall of MPs and Councilors, Official Gazette of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, year XLVI, No. 28, Skopje, 21.9.1990, pp. 513-519.**

1.3.1. Law amending and supplementing the Law on Social Organisations and Civic Associations

The legal framework for establishing political parties in the Republic of Macedonia began to be constructed with the adoption of the Law on Amending and Supplementing the Law on Social Organisations and Civic Associations from 13 April 1990.¹⁷⁴

This law was adopted less than five months after the conclusion of the last SKM Congress, where a decision was made to establish political pluralism and terminate the monopoly of this party. The SRM Assembly adopted the law on 12 April 1990, and on the same day, the president of the SRM presidency signed the decree for its entry into force. The following day, the act was published in the Official Gazette. As a consequence, considering the fact that the amendments from 1990 significantly changed the basic meaning of the legislator of the fundamental act from 1983,¹⁷⁵ in the following issue of "the Official Gazette from 21 April 1990" a new refined version of this act was published.¹⁷⁶

The abovementioned events related to this act point at three conclusions:

- » **First**, that there is a high level of anxiety of the institutions to introduce political pluralism;
- » **Second**, that the pace of creating the conditions for introducing political pluralism is satisfactory, as well as
- » **Third**, that the current political and state leadership is evidently inclined towards clearly defining the legal norms, in accordance with which there will be a democratic transformation in the Socialist Republic of Macedonia at the time.

¹⁷⁴ **The Law amending and supplementing the Law on Social Organisations and Civic Associations, Official Gazette of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, year XLVI, No. 12, Skopje, 13.4.1990, Ibid.**

¹⁷⁵ **The Law on Social Organisations and Civic Associations, Official Gazette of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, year XXXIX, No.32, Skopje, 11.11.1983, pp. 625-630.**

¹⁷⁶ **The Law on Social Organisations and Civic Associations (refined text), Official Gazette of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, year XLVI, No.13, Skopje, 13.4.1990, pp. 253-256.**

In the context of the abovementioned, it is very important to consider other comparative examples related to this issue in order to be able to determine closely the speed and the quality of these processes taking place in Macedonia. Thus, in Slovenia, the first law that legalized the existence of political parties, i.e. that created the legal basis for establishing new parties, was adopted in December 1989, that is four months before Macedonia. On the other hand, in Croatia, this law was introduced two months after the Macedonian act was adopted (in June 1990), while in Serbia the law on political organisations was adopted 3 months later, i.e. on 19 July 1990. This is another **confirmation that the dynamics of the processes of political pluralization in Macedonia are closer to the dynamics of the more liberal parts of Federal Yugoslavia, such as Slovenia, for instance.**

The first Law on Social Organisations and Civic Associations in the SRM, introduced in 1983,¹⁷⁷ governs "the way of achieving the freedom of association for the working people (Article 1) to realize their interests and self-governing rights [which are] in accordance with the general interests of socialist society (Article 2), and which are based on socialist self-governing relations (Article 3)". In this regard, **in accordance with this law, citizens are enabled to associate in order to develop a broad spectrum of educational, cultural, technical, sports (Article 2), but not political, activities.** Contrary to the abovementioned, the amendments from April 1990 of this act from 1983 were quite dramatic and radically changed the initial intention of the legislator. These amendments fully corresponded to the dramatic decision of the SKM to terminate political monism, i.e. to introduce the political pluralism. In this regard, unlike the previous situation, with these changes the law governs the citizens' right to establish social organisations and civic associations (Article 1), freely and voluntarily [...] in order to develop various activities, in-

¹⁷⁷ **The Law on Social Organisations and Civic Associations, Official Gazette of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, year XXXIX, No.32, Skopje, 11.11.1983, Ibid.**

cluding political activities (Article 2 Line 1). In this regard, **citizens who will decide to associate in order to attain such political interests and goals, “can establish political organisations, parties and other forms of political organising”** (Article 2 Line 3). **Practically, political pluralism was introduced in the Socialist Republic of Macedonia with the changes in Article 2 of the Law from 1983.** Furthermore, the other articles of the amended law elaborate other issues related to the establishment, the registration, the termination, the financing, etc., of such social organisations and civic associations. The political parties, the political organisations, as well as other forms of political organising of Macedonia’s citizens are part of these organisations today.

With regards to the topic of this paper, Article 12 from the Law¹⁷⁸ that kept the old provision from the previous law is of great significance. According to this article, in order to establish such an association (which implies establishing a political party as well), it is necessary to provide the support and willingness of **at least 10 adult citizens who are permanent residents of Macedonia. Such a liberal condition reflects, among the rest, the honest intentions of the state leadership to establish political pluralism in the Socialist Republic of Macedonia at the time, i.e. to terminate the monopoly of the SKM.** The other requirements of the amended law were quite simple to meet. Thus, in order to register a political party, besides the required number of citizens, it is necessary to have a statute that will determine the goals and tasks; the form of association; the internal organisation; the name and the seat; the conditions and the way of becoming a member; the rights, duties and responsibilities of the members; the representation and presentation; the way of using the resources; the way of informing the public about its functioning (Article 10), as well as other marginal topics.

178 **The Law on Social Organisations and Civic Associations (refined text), Official Gazette of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, year XLVI, No.13, Skopje, 13.4.1990, Ibid.**

The next step is holding a founders assembly, where in accordance with Article 13, the statute and the decision for founding is adopted, including: the names of the founders; the title; the seat; the goals and tasks; the name and surname of the authorized person to carry out the registration. At this point it should be highlighted that, with these amendments, Line 3 from Article 20 was deleted, which obliged the founders of this kind of association to provide an official opinion from the SS-RNM whether there is a social interest for establishing it. **This additionally eliminates the provisions that prevent the fast inauguration of political pluralism in Macedonia.**

In accordance with the Law, the third step, stipulated in Article 15, is to appoint an authorized person who will forward the statute and the decision with the required data adopted on the founding assembly to the office of the Ministry of Internal Affairs in the municipality where the party is founded. The Ministry of Internal Affairs is the organ that keeps a register of such associations and social organisations, including parties. In this regard, the fact that this ministry and not some **non-repressive organ** is the place where party registration takes place, represents an **aggravating/unfavorable condition** in relation to fulfilling citizens' right to a free political association. At the same time, this ministry is authorized to issue a document to confirm the registration of a certain political party. The moment this document is issued, the party is considered an official legal entity. In addition, the changes in the law envision certain alleviation in this part. Namely, it stipulated that if the Ministry of Internal Affairs does not issue a registration certificate in a period of 30 days, the political party will automatically be considered registered from the next day following the deadline (Article 16). In case the Ministry of Internal Affairs finds the party's statute or the founding decision against the constitution and the laws, it is obliged to point out the applicant's mistakes, and assign a deadline of 30 days for their correction (Article 19 Line 2). If this institution decides to reject

the application for registration of a political party, the party has the right to file a complaint to the Ministry of Internal Affairs. If the Ministry of Internal Affairs decides to reject it again, then the applicant has the right to file a complaint to the Supreme Court of Macedonia as a final instance (Article 21).

After the party registration, the Law stipulates two institutes:

- » **First, to ban the existence of the party, as well as**
- » **Second, to terminate the functioning of the party.**

The difference between the two institutes is that in the first case the party, due to certain actions taken against the law and the constitution, and against its will, is cancelled by the institutions. In the second case, the party makes a decision to cease to exist, or the interest for it is under the legally determined level. In this regard, once the party is established, in accordance with Article 23, it can be banned if:

- » It undermines the foundations of the social order determined by the Constitution;
- » it threatens the country's independence;
- » it violates human rights and freedoms;
- » it threatens peace;
- » it spreads national, racial, or religious hatred and intolerance;
- » it stimulates criminal activities,
- » it offends public moral with its actions.

In this case, the District Court of Macedonia is the institution to make such a decision (Article 24). The party has the right to file a complaint to the Supreme Court, which does not delay the execution of the decision (Article 26).

According to the Law (Article 22), a political party will cease to exist if:

- » The members decide to do it;
- » the number of party members is below the required number of founders, i.e. less than 10 people.

The Law, besides those issues related to the founding, the functioning, and the termination of political parties (which are part of social organisations and civic associations), regulates other issues as well, related to the supply and use of resources; commercial activities; as well as penalty provisions.

After the Law entered into force until the end of 1990, there were 19 other political parties established in Macedonia, reaching the total number of 23. In this regard, (from the aspect of the electoral results) some of the more prominent parties are:

- » Party for Democratic Prosperity (PDP), which held its founding assembly in Tetovo, on 15 April 1990, i.e. two days after the adoption of the Law;
- » VMRO-DPMNE, which held a founding assembly on 17 June 1990, i.e. two months after the adoption of the Law;
- » SKM – PDP (later SDSM), considering the fact that it is a legal heir of the SKM, files a request for registration on 3 July 1990, while the
- » Socialist Party of Macedonia (SPM), which held its founding assembly in Skopje, on 13 July 1990, i.e. three months after the adoption of the Law, etc.

In opposition to the newly formed parties it is important to highlight the functioning of the former single party - the SKM - in the new pluralist environment. Namely, this party too and in accordance with the overall tectonic processes taking place within the country, goes through **a thorough review of its ideological and programme postulates. The SKM transforms itself into the SKM – Party for Democratic Transformation, and then into the SDSM.** Therefore, the conclusion is that **the party, in relation to the previous socialist period, creates a discontinuity in its programme and ideology by accepting the principles of social democracy.**

Considering the abovementioned, due to the scope of the transformation the SKM has gone through, as well as due to the changes in its internal organisation, its name, as well as the way of its functioning, it is debatable whether it is the same political party. In this regard, for comparison, in Slovenia and Croatia, the former communist parties fully denied the continuity with the party deriving from them, while in Macedonia (as well as in Serbia, and in Montenegro) the party highlights its continuity with the party it derives from. Anyway, in accordance with other related analyses deriving from examples of this kind, a conclusion can be drawn that there is an organisational continuity between the SKM/SKM-PDP/SDSM. The evidence can be found in the gradual transition of the overall party symbolism and name, but also in the respective statutory regulations of this party that confirm the continuity.

The result from the creation of these legal and political circumstances is 23 registered political parties in Macedonia in 1990. In comparison, in the same period, in Montenegro, 24 political parties are registered, in Croatia 40 political parties, while in Slovenia 124. A similar phenomenon occurs in other countries of Eastern Europe. Namely, in Hungary there are 120 registered political parties in 1989, in Bulgaria (1991) there are 61 parties registered, in Poland (1991) there are 300 parties registered, etc.

All of this points at the fact that in the former socialist/communist block, contrary to the previous political monism, there were certain reverse processes going on, or to be more specific, the ongoing process is – as theory calls it – **“atomization of the party systems”** by establishing many political parties. However, contrary to this initial euphoric wave, the conditions on this plane are stabilized at the end of the 1990s, where out of the multitude of parties in each of the above-

mentioned states several political entities are differentiated, which have the support of the majority of citizens of these states. The best example in this regard is Slovenia, which had more than 100 registered parties until 1994, while in 2001, their number dropped down to 34.¹⁷⁹

Such an “**explosion**” of new political entities in Macedonia points at the following conclusions:

- » **First**, that there is dissatisfaction with the previous, partially authoritarian system, i.e. there is a strong support for democracy and political pluralism;
- » **Second**, there is an evident social fragmentation on various ethnic, social, and ideological lines, which affects the number of established parties;
- » **Third**, the development of such ideological, ethnic, religious, or social fragmentation is suppressed in the period of the partially authoritarian socialism. The result is the intensified strive among such groups to catalyze their ideas and programmes by establishing parties;
- » **Fourth**, there is a “desire to discover the new”, or an “idealism” of a kind, which affects the number of parties that are established.

1.3.2. Amendments to the Constitution of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia from 1974

On 20 September 1990, the Socialist Republic of Macedonia’s Assembly adopted 25 amendments to the Constitution of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia from 1974.¹⁸⁰ Both in range and content, these amendments have the same dramatic character as the one that was created with the amend-

¹⁷⁹ See: **Ratko Marković, “Ustavno pravo i političke institucije”, IPD Justinijan, Belgrade, 2006, Ibid.**

¹⁸⁰ A decision declaring the Amendments LVII – LXXXI to the Constitution of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, Amendments to the Constitution of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, Official Gazette of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, year: XLVI, No.28, Skopje, 21.9.1990, Ibid.

ments to the Law that terminated the monopoly of the SKM. The amendments refer to a wide range of issues, which further redefine Macedonia as a state that takes up the path of democratic pluralism and market economy.

Unlike previously, the constitutional changes redefine certain issues related to:

- » **First**, human rights and freedoms of the citizens (Amendment LXX), including the issue with the status of the expatriates, as well as Macedonians who live in neighboring countries (Amendment LIX);
- » **Second**, the character of the state authority though the changes made in relation to:
 - Citizen representation in the institutions (Amendment LXVI and Amendment LXVIII);
 - The status of the local authorities (Amendment LXIX);
 - The position of the judiciary (Amendment LXXI), including the Constitutional Court (Amendment LXXVIII);
 - The position of Macedonia's Assembly (Amendment LXXIV);
 - The position of the Government (Amendment LXXVI);
 - Introducing the position of President, i.e. vice-President of Macedonia (Amendment LXXV), as well as
 - Redefining the position of the People's Bank (Amendment LXIII);
- » **Third**, the issue of ownership (Amendment LIX and Amendment LX), as well as the economic policy of the country (Amendment LXIII);
- » **Fourth**, holding office in Macedonia (Amendment LXIX and Amendment LXXIII), as well as
- » **Fifth**, the organisation of the services of the country (Amendment LXV).
 - In relation to the topic, and **contrary to the previously accepted formulation that the "working class and all workers are the carries of the**

power and the authority”,¹⁸¹ the new Constitution envisions that “the citizens are the carriers of the power through their elected representatives in the Assembly, the municipality and the city”¹⁸² (Amendment LXVI).¹⁸³ On such a defined ground, Amendment LXX, in addition, provides constitutional guarantees for political organisation and action of the citizens. However, there are certain prohibitions, according to which the party should not:

- resort to violent change of the constitutional order;
- threaten the independence and the territorial integrity of the SRM, i.e. SFRJ;
- violate human rights and freedoms of the citizens;
- incite national, racial, and religious hatred and intolerance.

Here it should be highlighted that the Constitution provides a broad definition of the citizens’ right to a political organisation and action, recommending its further clarification with a law (Amendment LXX). At that time, the act that regulated the forming and functioning of the parties was already adopted in Macedonia.

This is the Law on Social Organisations and Civic Associations,¹⁸⁴ which was expounded earlier in the text. In such a defined frame, according to the amendments, **citizens choose their representatives on elections, on local and national level, from the array of “political organisations and other organisational and associational forms” with**

¹⁸¹ See: Article 109, the Constitution of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, Official Gazette of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, year XXX, No. 7, Skopje, 25.2.1974, pp. 106-162.

¹⁸² According to the amendments, besides this way, citizens can express their will in a referendum, at public gatherings and through other forms of personal expression.

¹⁸³ See: Amendment LXVI, a decision declaring the Amendments LVII – LXXXI to the Constitution of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, Amendments to the Constitution of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, Official Gazette of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, year XLVI, No. 28, Skopje, 21.9.1990, Ibid.

¹⁸⁴ **The Law on Social Organisations and Civic Associations (refined text), Official Gazette of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, year XLVI, No.13, Skopje, 13.4.1990, Ibid.**

a mandate of four years (Amendment LXVIII). Analyzing the abovementioned, it is still unclear **why the author of the Constitution does not use the term "political parties" here, but uses a general formulation "political organisations". The Law on Social Organisations and Civic Associations though, which was adopted earlier, uses the term "party"**.

This omission of the term "party" points at three conclusions:

- » **First**, it represents a "symbolic" hindrance to the achieved progress of Macedonia in relation to the overall processes concerning the termination of the monopoly of the SKM, and the introduction of the multiparty system;
- » **Second**, this can be interpreted as a sign of achieved advantage of the ideas of the conservative wing of the SKM, which before the defeat on the 10th Congress of this party tried to introduce the so-called **"non-party pluralism"** (and not for **"democratic pluralism"**) in accordance with which it was envisioned to enable the functioning of the political organisations that do not have the status of political parties, because that status would only belong to the SKM;
- » **Third**, the fact that the author of the text of the Constitution points at further clarification of the issue of political organising of the citizens with a law can be interpreted as a sign of **insecurity in relation to the (ir)reversibility of the overall processes of democratic pluralization**, i.e. the collapse of communism, or more specifically, socialism. This is due to the fact that the procedure for changing the constitution is much more complex and even more difficult to carry out politically, than changing the law. Therefore, if the author of the text chose to use the word "party" instead of "political organisation", it would contribute

to additionally marginalising all political standpoints that are against the democratization of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia. Contrary to this, there is enough room in the future, if there is such a need, to legally address the conditions related to (non)introducing pluralism, (non)termination of the monopoly of the SKM and (non)transition of Macedonia towards true democracy.

In relation to the issue of political organising, the Constitution introduces two other significant solutions:

- » **First**, with the amendments, the position of the SRM was redefined in relation to the limits of the involvement of religious organisations in politics. This was done with Amendment LXX. Namely, Section 1 of this Amendment stipulates that all citizens of Macedonia have equal rights and responsibilities, regardless of several criteria, among which religious belonging. Line 3 from Section 5, though, stipulates that religious communities are not allowed to establish political organisations. Section 1 replaced Line 1 from Article 204 of the Constitution of the SRM from 1974,¹⁸⁵ which did not guarantee the right to equality of citizens, while Line 3 from Article 225 was supplemented with Section 5 from the Constitution,¹⁸⁶ which stipulated a prohibition on abuse of religion in political goals. With these two changes, **Macedonia banned religious organisations from being active participants in the political process by establishing their own political parties. However, by abandoning the regulation for prohibiting the use of religion in political goals, the author of the text of the constitution allows religious organisations to address the public with their views** and suggestions in relation to important state issues.

¹⁸⁵ **The Constitution of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, Official Gazette of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, year: XXX, No. 7, Skopje, 25.2.1974, Ibid.**

¹⁸⁶ Ibid.

- » **Second**, that the president and the vice president of Macedonia must not be party members, among the rest (Amendment LXXV). In the period when the amended Constitution from 1974 was in force, the President of the Republic was **Kiro Gligorov**, while his vice-President was **Ljubčo Georgievski**. Gligorov, as the President of Macedonia, does not have any party position in the SKM-PDP/SDSM – which is the party that promotes him, and towards which he is inclined. Contrary to him, Georgievski, as a person with a political function, as president of the political party VMRO-DPMNE, was elected for the position of vice-President. He continued to carry out his party function, though.

Considering the party system, in terms of the **basic goal of the parties to win the elections and have the opportunity to govern the state, this goal is not clearly and thoroughly defined with the Constitution**. Amendment LXXIV, related to the legislative power, stipulates that the **representatives elect the president and the members of the government. Amendment LXXV stipulates that the president has the right to propose a candidate for the president of the government to the representatives**. However, Amendment LXXVI, related to the government, stipulates that **the president of the republic, when formulating the proposal for a prime minister, is obliged to consult all parties. However, he decides independently who will be proposed as next prime minister of the country**.

Such a formulation in relation to the procedure for proposing a president of the government points at the following three conclusions:

- » **First**, the author of the text of the constitution allows the president of the Republic a great autonomy when it comes to proposing the next president of the government to the parliament. The president

- of the Republic **does not have explicit responsibility to give the mandate for establishing the government to the political group in majority. This means that the president of the Republic, in theory, can propose the next prime minister to be a person who is not a party member, and has not won the trust of the majority of the citizens;**
- » **Second**, it also represents **a relativization of the basic principle of representative democracy, according to which the party with the majority of votes has the right to govern the country**, which implies the right to propose a candidate for the president of the government first, or in other words to try and establish a government;
 - » **Third**, such a solution in those insecure times can be interpreted as a **conscious intention of the author of the constitution to stimulate the formation of broader political coalitions, comprised of all the relevant parties represented in the Macedonian Assembly, as a sort of stronger guarantee for the peace and stability of the country.**

1.3.3. The Law on the Election and Recall of MPs and Councilors

The adoption of the Law on the Election and Recall of MPs and Councilors¹⁸⁷ on 21 September 1991 provides the legal framework for the introduction of political pluralism in the Republic of Macedonia. This act was adopted at the same time as the abovementioned constitutional changes, as well as with another law related to it, which is the Law on Constituencies for the Election of MPs in the SRM's Assembly.¹⁸⁸

¹⁸⁷ **The Law on the Election and Recall of MPs and Councilors, Official Gazette of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, year XLVI, No. 28, Ibid.**

¹⁸⁸ **The Law on Constituencies for the Election of MPs in the Socialist Republic of Macedonia's Assembly, Official Gazette of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, year XLVI, No. 28, (p. 519).**

In the Law the term “representative” is used, which encompasses the term “MP”, related to the legislative power, as well as the term “councilor”, related to the municipal councils.

In relation to this act:

- » **First**, it defines the way of holding elections;
- » **Second**, it determines the composition and the mandate of the organs implementing the elections;
- » **Third**, it defines the electoral units in principle (the exact range of how each of the 120 constituencies is arranged with the Law on Constituencies for the Election of MPs in the SRM’s Assembly);
- » **Fourth**, it determines the procedure for determining candidates as representatives;
- » **Fifth**, it determines the way to carry out the elections;
- » **Sixth**, it regulates other important issues related to organising a democratic electoral process.

This act, more specifically, **inaugurates the majority electoral system for the election of MPs**. Constituencies are formulated in such a way to allow approximately the same number of citizens to elect one MP. Political parties with more than 1,500 members have the right to propose their candidates for MPs across the whole territory of the state (Article 20 Line 3), while other parties or civic associations should support each of their candidacies for MPs with at least 100 signatures. The State Electoral Commission is the institution that carries out the elections and secures a normal course of the campaign, the voting, the counting of votes, as well as the announcement of the electoral results.

This act, besides the election, also determines the termination of the MPs mandates, in 6 cases:

- » If the MP is recalled;
- » If the MP resigns;
- » If there is a court decision irrevocably convicting the MP to six months of imprisonment, or even more serious punishment;

- » If it is impossible to relate the MP with the representative function;
- » In case of death;
- » If the MP loses his/her employability.

Three days after the adoption of the constitutional amendments, including the Law on the Election and Recall of MPs and Councilors, the President of the Parliament calls the first democratic multi-party elections, which take place on 11 November 1990, and the Macedonian Assembly in this composition is constituted on 8 January 1991. Contrary to Macedonia, these elections in Slovenia and Croatia took place in spring, i.e. six months earlier, while in Serbia, these elections were organised on 9 December 1990, i.e. several weeks later. At this point, it is important to highlight that besides the parliamentary elections that took place in all of the six republics of the former Federative Yugoslavia, no elections of this kind took place on a federal level. This fact, according to theorists, additionally accelerated the process of further disintegration and collapse of Yugoslavia,¹⁸⁹ i.e. the realization of Macedonia's state independence.

¹⁸⁹ The collapse of the SFRJ is characterized by a series of military conflicts, which took place on the territory of this state, excluding Macedonia, which gained its independence in a peaceful way. The wars represented fierce military conflicts between the Yugoslavian People's Army and the Slovenes in Slovenia; between the Croats and Serbs in Croatia; between the Serbs, Croats, and Bosniaks in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and between the Serbs and Albanians in Kosovo. The bloody conflicts, resulting in the dissolution of Federal Yugoslavia, ceased after signing the Dayton Agreement from 1995. After the collapse of this federation, there are 5 new states that emerged first: Slovenia, Croatia, Macedonia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (consisting of Serbia, and Montenegro). On 21 May 2006, as a result of the implemented referendum, Montenegro became an independent state, and with this, Serbia becomes independent as well. On 17 February 2008, the members of the parliament of Kosovo adopted the Declaration of Independence. The wars in Yugoslavia are considered the most ferocious military conflicts on the European continent since World War II. As a consequence, the UN established an International Criminal Tribunal for former Yugoslavia, which has persecuted many of the involved in these military conflicts for war crimes. (See: **Petar Radan, Break-up of Yugoslavia and International Law, Routledge, 21.9.2001; Henry H. Perritt, The road to independence for Kosovo: a chronicle of the Ahtisaari plan, Cambridge University Press, Cabridge, 2010; Види Carole Rogel, The Breakup of Yugoslavia and its Aftermath, Greenwood Press, 2004.**)

2. IDEOLOGICAL PROGRAMME PROFILE OF THE FIRST REGISTERED POLITICAL PARTIES

As soon as the legal and political premises were created in Macedonia during the course of 1990, 23 political parties were established, which range across the whole spectrum from left to right, in terms of ideology. Besides, the ideological diversity is even bigger thanks to the ethnic, social, and religious heterogeneous nature of Macedonia, which is another factor for establishing these political entities.

Table No. 9: List of political parties established in 1990¹⁹⁰

No.	PARTY	ESTABLISHED
1	Movement for Unified-Macedonian Action - MAAK	4.2.1990
2	League for Democracy	11.2.1990
3	Party for Macedonian Labour Unification	4.3.1990
4	Social Democratic Party of Macedonia	18.3.1990
5	People's Party of Macedonia	12.4.1990
6	Party for Democratic Prosperity	15.4.1990
7	Democratic Union – Party of the Farmers	15.4.1990
8	People's Democratic Party	23.4.1990
9	Christian Democratic Party of Macedonia	9.6.1990
10	VMRO - DPMNE	17.6.1990
11	Labour Party	24.6.1990
12	SKM – Party for Democratic Transformation	3.7.1990
13	Young Democratic Progressive Party	12.7.1990
14	Socialist Party of Macedonia	13.7.1990
15	Party for Human Rights	20.7.1990
16	Yugoslavian Party of Macedonia	26.5.1990

¹⁹⁰ See: **Cane Mojanoski, Letopis na makedonskata demokratija, Ibid. (pp. 16-17).**

17	Party for the Full Emancipation of the Roma	12.8.1990
18	Political Party of the Unemployed	12.9.1990
19	Farmer-Labour Party	15.9.1990
20	Democratic Union of the Turks	22.9.1990
21	Union of the Reform Forces of Macedonia	5.9.1990
22	Democratic Union of Educators	15.11.1990
23	Balkan Federation – Balkan without Borders	15.12.1990

In addition, there is an analysis of the ideological and programme postulates from 6 of the 23 registered parties, or more specifically, from:

- » Movement for Unified-Macedonian Action (MAAK);
- » League for Democracy (LD);
- » Party for Democratic Prosperity (PDP);
- » Yugoslavian Party of Macedonia (SJM);
- » SKM – Party for Democratic Transformation (SKM-PDP), i.e. SDSM, as well as
- » VMRO – Democratic Party for Macedonian National Unity (VMRO - DMPNE).

The selection of the six listed political entities is such, in order to capture the programme and ideological postulates of:

- » the first registered parties, i.e. MAAK and LP;
- » the parties of the ethnic minorities through the example of PDP;
- » the parties striving to maintain the status quo of the time through the example of SJM, as well as
- » the two largest parties today in the state, i.e. SDSM and VMRO-DPMNE.

This way, observed through the prism of these criteria, there is a much clearer and more thorough understanding of the character of the Macedonian party system in the early 1990s.

The ideological and programme postulates of the listed political parties will be defined by specifying the positions of each of the parties in relation to five key topics:

- » Macedonia's position;
- » State governance;
- » Interethnic relations;
- » Economic growth, as well as
- » International relations.

2.1. Movement for Unified-Macedonian Action

The founding assembly of MAAK took place on 4 February 1990, in Skopje, which makes it the first political party, as recorded in most recent Macedonian history, formed after the establishment of political pluralism.

The party is officially registered by competent authorities on 12 June 1990.

MAAK determines itself as a **“movement and a patriotic party to all Macedonians and all citizens of Macedonia regardless of their social, national, or religious belonging”**.¹⁹¹

In relation to the position of Macedonia, MAAK strives for a **“free, independent, and sovereign state of Macedonia”** that will have “all the functions of a legitimate and independent state”. According to this party, this position is completely legitimate, since it relies on the **“inalienable right of every nation to self-determination”**. Therefore, **“the Macedonian people must not be pushed into games aiming to create a new Yugoslavia”**. In this direction, for MAAK, the only possible solution **“is some sort of mutual association between the sovereign and independent states established by the peoples of Yugoslavia”**.

From the aspect of the position of Macedonia, this party takes a step forward in its endeavors, **refusing to accept the achieved statehood of the country only in the “Vardar region of Macedonia”**. Namely, for MAAK, **the Bucharest**

¹⁹¹ See: **Vlado Timovski, Sveto Stefanovski, Političkite partii vo Makedonija, Politička programa na Dviženjeto za semakedonska akcija – MAAK, Skopje, 1990, (pp. 79-101).**

Agreement “as the day of the Macedonian national catastrophe, and the day of the divided”, which sanctions the division of Macedonia, “is illegitimate” since it is signed by “the occupiers of Macedonia”. This is the reason why this party takes responsibility to “bring this issue to the competent institutions of the UN”. Meanwhile, MAAK promises to defend the rights of the Macedonians “from the Aegean and Pirin part of Macedonia”.

In relation to the issue of state governance, MAAK sees Macedonia as a **“parliamentary republic”** implementing **“political pluralism”** and inaugurating the principle of **“separation of power”**. According to MAAK, the abovementioned should be the essence of the **“new constitution”** of an independent Macedonian state.

In relation to the issue of interethnic relations, MAAK predominantly sees Macedonia as a **“state expressing the sovereignty of the Macedonian people”**. However, other national minorities in the state of the Macedonian people should realize their **“rights in accordance with the international conventions”**. In this regard, considering the fact that Macedonia is a multi-confessional state, MAAK will strive for religious tolerance, i.e. **“the state shall treat both religions, Christianity and Islam, with equal respect”**. However, contrary to the abovementioned and in relation to this issue, **MAAK speaks of processes of “demographic occupation” and “mechanical inflow” of the non-Macedonian population, which this party strives to cease.**

In relation to the issue of economic growth, MAAK aims to **“provide equal treatment for all forms of ownership”**; to inaugurate the **“market economy”** contrary to the previous command economy; to enable **“free trade of goods, labour and capital”** as well as to secure **“legal protection of private ownership”**. These aspirations, according to MAAK, should be included in the new Macedonian constitution.

Considering the issue of international relations, in its first programme document, MAAK states that the Republic of **Macedonia must have its own independent foreign policy, since it believes that the institutions which are competent for the Yugoslavian foreign policy "do not pursue the Macedonian interests"**, which is an additional reason why Macedonia should be an independent state. Besides this aspiration, MAAK strives to strengthen the regional cooperation of the Republic of Macedonia with its neighboring countries in its electoral programme.

Based on the abovementioned, the first established party in the Republic of Macedonia, **MAAK, can be defined as a national party of the Macedonian people, with a conservative ideological orientation, which strives for an independent and sovereign Macedonian state, for establishing political pluralism, for stable interethnic relations, and market economy.**

2.2. League for Democracy (LD)

The founding assembly of LD took place on 11 February 1990 in Skopje, or 7 days after the founding assembly of MAAK. However, the competent institutions in Macedonia officially register this party on 8 June 1990, i.e. four days before the registration of MAAK. This means that if we take the criterion of "the date of the founding assembly", then LD is the second established political party in Macedonia. **If we take the criterion of "the date of its registration by the competent authorities", then LD is the first registered party in pluralistic Macedonia.**

LD is determined as a **pro-democratic political party** against the existing socialist/communist system.¹⁹²

¹⁹² See: **Vlado Timovski, Sveto Stefanovski, Političkite partii vo Makedonija, Politička programa na Ligata za demokratija, Skopje, 1990, (pp. 49-56).**

In relation to the issue with Macedonia's position, LD asserts that **"it will put all its efforts to preserve the territorial integrity of Yugoslavia and its state unity"**. However, if this state falls apart, LD considers that **"Macedonia should declare neutrality"** and should require **"the European Union to guarantee the safety of its borders"**.

In relation to the issue of state governance, LD starts from the position that **"the communists have committed many atrocities"**, which is why it strives to inaugurate **"representative democracy"** and **"political pluralism"**. Therefore, as a consequence to the abovementioned, LD strives **"to extricate the attribute "socialist" from the name of the Macedonian state, and in the future to name it simply as the Republic of Macedonia"**.

Considering the issue of interethnic relations, LD starts from the position that Macedonia should be governed as a state of all the citizens, regardless of their ethnic belonging. However, LD promises to protect the interests of minority communities **"to have all of their rights recognized in accordance with the international conventions, and nothing more than that"**. The formulation "nothing more than that" in the political programme of this party indirectly points at the assumption that certain requirements of the ethnic communities in Macedonia in relation to certain rights and freedoms are unacceptable, or are against the interests of the Macedonian people. In this part, **LD as well, just like MAAK, tackles the issue of "the demographic explosion" of minority communities, which according to this party, creates inter-ethnic tensions that should be prevented by introducing a "planned population policy", directed primarily at providing benefits for each "employed woman willing to have more children"**.

In relation to the issue with the economic system, LD considers that the foundation of Macedonia's economy should be **"private ownership"**, i.e. Macedonia should inaugurate the market economy instead of the present command economy.

According to LD, this should be achieved through a process of privatisation of the social capital for market value. In this direction, LD also strives for **“denationalization”**, i.e. returning the apprehended property to the citizens of Macedonia.

LD’s programme has no positions considering international relations. This is probably due to the fact that this party primarily focuses on preserving Yugoslavia and its institutions, which were common with the other constituent republics, and in charge of the foreign policy of the state.

Based on the abovementioned, **we can define LD as a civic party ideologically positioned in the political centre, striving to preserve Yugoslavia with Macedonia as its constituent, but as a parliamentary democracy with a market economy, against the previous political monism and command economy.**

2.3. Party for Democratic Prosperity

The founding assembly of PDP took place on 15 April 1990.

This party will be recorded in history as the first political party in pluralistic Macedonia gathering the largest part of Albanians in the country.

In its programme, the **PDP determines itself as a modern political party which addresses the citizens and the peoples of Macedonia and strives to advance and develop democracy as the basic value of European civilization.**¹⁹³

In relation to Macedonia’s position, PDP does not state it directly, but **indirectly inclines towards Macedonia being an independent state, under the condition that “all**

¹⁹³ See: **Vlado Timovski, Sveto Stefanovski, Političkite partii vo Makedonija, Politička programa na Partijata za demokratski prosperitet, Skopje, 1990, (pp. 166-176).**

communities living here should decide for the future of Macedonia and Yugoslavia” and that “any other solution is unacceptable”.

In relation to the issue of state governance, the initial position of PDP is that **Macedonia is a common state for all peoples, i.e. to the “Macedonians, Albanians, Turks, Muslims, Vlach, Roma, and others”**. Macedonia, defined like this, according to this party, should be organised as a **parliamentary democracy** where citizens elect their representatives in general and direct elections, who should govern the state. In this direction, PDP considers that **the highest authority should be given to the institution “presidency of the country”, which should comprise of five persons elected by the citizens in elections.**

Considering the issue of interethnic relations, PDP dedicates a significant place in its first electoral programme. **This party strives for “national equality of all peoples in Macedonia”, who enjoy their full liberty to express their national identity, to cherish their language and culture, to be educated at all levels in their mother language, to use their mother tongue in front of the authorities at all levels, and to be informed in their mother tongue. Moreover, according to PDP, all peoples should freely use their national symbols, and in this direction, they can freely use their toponyms, or names of the places.**

In relation to the economic system, PDP strives **for terminating social ownership, and introducing private ownership and market economy.**

Considering the issue of international relations, PDP affirms the idea of the **European integration of Macedonia and the Balkans, as well as canceling the visa regime towards the European states.**

Based on the abovementioned, **PDP can be defined as a party of the Albanians in Macedonia, ideologically positioned in the political centre, with sympathies for the idea of independence for Macedonia, as a parliamentary democracy of equal peoples, with market economy and a strategic orientation towards joining the European integration processes.**

2.4. Party of the Yugoslavians in Macedonia

SJM was established on 26 June 1990, in Skopje.

According to its programme, SJM will be recorded in history as a party striving to sustain the constitutional and political system of Yugoslavia, considering any other suggestions (confederation or independence) **wrong**.¹⁹⁴

In relation to Macedonia's position, SJM strives to sustain the functioning of Yugoslavia as a federal state of six republics, and that **"any other solution is anachronistic", i.e. "extremely harmful and dangerous"**. SJM supports this position with the fact that **"the Yugoslavian idea represents the foundation of each citizens' activity individually, as well as each federal constituent within Yugoslavia"**.

In relation to the issue of state governance, SJM strives for **introducing political pluralism in Yugoslavia**, without getting deeper into other aspects of this area. This party has similar positions in relation to the issue of the economic system, principally **aspiring for equal treatment of all forms of ownership**.

Considering the issue of interethnic relations, SJM considers that Federal Yugoslavia is the best guarantee for further development in this area.

¹⁹⁴ See: **Vlado Timovski, Sveto Stefanovski, Političkite partii vo Makedonija, Politička programa na Strankata na Jugoslovenite na Makedonija, Skopje, 1990, (pp.166-176).**

Considering the issue of international relations, SJM aligns the interests of Macedonia on this plane with the interests of Yugoslavia, which is why it does not develop special foreign policy priorities. However, in a specific sense, **the party affirms the concept of the EU integration of Yugoslavia.**

Based on the abovementioned, **SJM can be defined as a party of the existing order, with a left ideological orientation, which strives towards the sustenance of Federal Yugoslavia, as well as moderate democratization of the state establishment, as well as the economic system.**

2.5. SKM – Party for Democratic Transformation

SKM-PDP was registered by the competent institutions on 3 July 1990, which marked its formal transition from an entity holding a monopoly over the political power and the institutions, into one of many political parties in pluralist and democratic Macedonia.

According to its programme and ideology, SKM-PDP is determined as a party that accepts and affirms the principles of “democratic socialism”, **“radically breaking its connection with the communist-bolshevik model of a party, with confined indoctrination and monopolistic position in the society”**.¹⁹⁵

In relation to Macedonia’s position, SKM-PDP holds the viewpoint that **“it determines itself for Yugoslavia as a democratic community of equal peoples”**, which represents **“reasonable orientation”**. However, if this is not possible, this party offers two options:

- » **First, “Macedonia should be a confederate state within the community of Yugoslavian peoples”** or
- » **Second, “Macedonia should be organised as an independent state”** under the condition that **“the other Yugoslavian peoples have the same orientation”**.

¹⁹⁵ See: **Vlado Timovski, Sveto Stefanovski, Političkite partii vo Makedonija, Politička programa na SKM-Partija za demokratska preobrazba, Skopje, 1990, (pp. 6-38).**

In relation to the issue of state governance, SKM-PDP aims at organising Macedonia as a **parliamentary democracy**, where the government will be constituted in general, free and democratic elections; where the principle of **separation of power** into legislative, executive, and judicial will be inaugurated, where the executive power will be concentrated in the government and the president of the republic, who will be elected by the parliament. Such state governance should be determined with the new constitution of the country.

Considering interethnic relations, SKM-PDP is **the only political party in this period issuing a special Declaration for interethnic relations**, which is part of this party's programme. The Declaration represents **a call to Macedonians, Albanians, Turks, Vlachs, Roma, and other ethnic communities to join their efforts in advancing the overall democratic and interethnic relations in the country.**

In a specific sense, with this document SKM-PDP outlines its views in relation to this issue, defining Macedonia as a **"state of equal citizens"** where **"interethnic and interreligious relations will be developed based on the principles of tolerance"**. For SKM-PDP **"each citizen is entitled to a free national determination and expression"** as well as **"equality before the law, regardless of their belonging"**. Besides, SKM-PDP strives to enable the representatives of minority ethnic communities to attain their right of affirming their identity, of using their language, of developing their culture, of establishing their cultural institutions, of educating themselves in their mother tongue, etc. The state, on the other hand, should be the guarantor for the attainment of these rights.

In relation to the issue of the economic system, SKM-PDP strives for **market economy** against the command economy, as well as equal treatment of private ownership in relation to other forms of ownership.

Considering the issue of international relations, SKM-PDP promotes the concept of **European integration with the motto "Europe, our home"**. For SKM-PDP, this process **"is a national, political and economic interest of Macedonia"**, which is why the party promises to prepare a special **"development strategy to involve the country in the EU integration processes"**.

Based on the abovementioned, **SKM-PDP can be defined as a party of the left centre with a social democratic orientation, primarily striving for a democratic Macedonia in a democratic Yugoslavia. At the same time, this party accepts political pluralism and is active in promoting interethnic relations, believing in the principles of the market economy and putting a significant effort in affirming the processes of EU integration.**

2.6. VMRO – Democratic Party for Macedonian National Unity

The founding assembly of VMRO-DPMNE took place on 17 June 1990 in Skopje, while the competent institutions registered this party on 3 August 1990.

According to its programme and ideology, this party is determined as a **"national party of the Macedonian people"**¹⁹⁶ with an anticommunist conservative orientation.

The issue with Macedonia's position is the main point of the ideological and programme postulates of VMRO-DPMNE. **The starting position of this party is the creation of an independent Macedonian state.** Similar to MAAK, this party also takes a step forward in this area, stating that **the Macedonian people should not be reconciled with the Bucharest Agreement from 1913 which partitioned**

¹⁹⁶ See: **Vlado Timovski, Sveto Stefanovski, Političkite partii vo Makedonija, Politička programa na VMRO-Demokratska partija za makedonsko nacionalno edinstvo, Skopje, 1990, (pp. 134-147).**

Macedonia. Therefore, according to this party, **the EU integration process should be accepted because, according to them, this implies canceling the borders, i.e. "an opportunity not just for a spiritual, but also for a national and territorial unification" of Macedonia.**

In relation to the future of Yugoslavia, VMRO-DPMNE considers that it can function only as a confederation of sovereign and independent states.

In relation to the issue with the organisation of the state government, VMRO-DPMNE holds the position that Macedonia should be organised as a **"parliamentary democracy following the example of the western countries"**, a system that should be determined by the Constitution. There is no additional elaboration of this principal aspiration in the programme of VMRO-DPMNE.

Regarding the issue of international relations, this party considers **Macedonia to be the country for everyone, and in accordance with that, it strives for national minorities to enjoy all the rights** in accordance with the international conventions.

In relation to the issue of the economic system, VMRO-DPMNE strives to inaugurate a **market economy** in Macedonia, i.e. to enable equal status to private ownership in relation to other forms of ownership.

Considering the issue of international relations, the focal point of VMRO-DPMNE is the **EU integration process**. This party strives for **Macedonia to start adjusting its constitutional and political system independently and in accordance with European standards**. However, according to the party, this goal can be achieved only if there is **"democratization of Macedonia that will happen only through**

a change of government”. In relation to this issue, VMRO-DPMNE also strives for Macedonia to have an independent international policy in relation to Yugoslavia. The crown of this process should be the development of a Macedonian diplomatic and consular network in the world.

Based on the abovementioned, **VMRO-DPMNE can be defined as a national party of the Macedonian people, positioned in the right centre with a conservative ideology. The focal point of this party’s action is the creation of an independent Macedonian state, which will be a parliamentary democracy with a market economy, where interethnic relations will be cherished and which will strive to involve Macedonia in the EU integration process.**

* * *

The analysis of the programme and ideological orientations of the selected political parties offers valuable information that sheds an additional light on the character of the party system in the last socialist days and before the birth of the independent and democratic Republic of Macedonia.

In relation to the issue of the position of Macedonia, the political parties can be divided in four groups:

- » **The first group. Parties that consider the best solution for resolving the Yugoslavian crisis is to create an independent Macedonian state**, which as a consequence, if there are favorable conditions, could develop some sort of weak association with the other independent states deriving from Yugoslavia. MAAK and VMRO-DPMNE are in this group.
- » **The second group. Political parties are against the existing conditions in Yugoslavia, offering three options for crisis resolution:** (1) a reformed Yugoslavian federation as a stronger form of cooperation among the constituent republics; (2) a confeder-

ation as a weak form of association if the first solution is unreachable; (3) the creation of an independent Macedonia if there is no agreement among the leaderships of the six republics of Yugoslavia. LP and SKM-PDP can be placed in this group.

- » **The third group. Political parties are not explicit** regarding the position of Macedonia in relation to Yugoslavia. PDP falls in this group.
- » **The fourth group. Political parties striving for Yugoslavia's sustenance** in its existing form, considering any other solution relativizing the firmness of the federation as dangerous, or more specifically, harmful. SJM can be placed in this group.

In relation to the issue of state governance of Macedonia, except for SJM, which does not provide a detailed elaboration since it strives for sustenance of the existing order, the other parties, without exception, aspire for Macedonia to do with its socialist governance, and instead, to establish parliamentary democracy. In this part, **parties can be divided into two groups.**

- » **The first group. Parties that concretise the idea.** SKM-PDP and PDP can be put in this group. SKM-PDP has a framed concept for the separation of power into legislative, executive, and judiciary; it strives for a unicameral parliament as a legislative power; it strives for bicephalous (two-headed) executive power concentrated in the hands of the government and the chief of the state, who is elected by the parliament. PDP, on the other hand, develops the concept for the separation of power into legislative, executive, and judiciary; striving for a unicameral parliament as a legislative power; while the executive power should be rendered to the institution of "presidency" consisting of five members, elected by the citizens in elections.

- » **The second group. Parties that do not concretise the idea.** MAAK, LD, and VMRO-DPMNE fall into this group. These parties stand on the position that the country should be organised in accordance with European democratic principles and without further elaborating the aspirations of such kind.

Considering interethnic relations, all parties, without exceptions, declare that they will strive to advance and develop them. However, considering the importance of this issue, **the selected political parties can be divided in three groups.**

- » **The first group. Parties that elaborate this issue in detail.** PDP and SKM-PDP are in this group. PDP places this issue on a central level in their programme. Its main aspiration is the requirement to organise Macedonia as a community of equal peoples. SKM-PDP, on the other hand, issues to the public a special Declaration on interethnic relations, which is part of the party programme. With this act, this party symbolically, but also factually, manifests its endeavors to advance this area through a common effort of the Macedonian people and other ethnic communities in order to build a democratic Macedonia together.
- » **The second group. Parties with less detailed elaboration of this issue.** VMRO-DPMNE and SJM are in this group. These parties manifest general aspirations for the advancement of the overall interethnic relations in Macedonia.
- » **The third group. Parties partially marginalizing the importance of this issue.** MAAK and LD are in this group. The parties, which are part of this third group, show tendencies to marginalize the importance of the issue in question with the formulation "rights of the minority communities, but only to the level of international standards and nothing more". In

addition, the programme determination of the above-mentioned parties considering the prevention of the process of mechanical inflow of non-Macedonian population, seen as a potentially dangerous phenomenon that can affect the ethnic balance in Macedonia.

In relation to the issue of the economic system, similar to the issue of state governance, only SJM is an exception from the group of six selected parties, striving for a moderate transformation of the existing command economy in Yugoslavia, i.e. in Macedonia. The other five political parties (MAAK, LD, PDP, SKM-PDP, and VMRO-DPMNE) strive to introduce a market economy, equal treatment of private ownership with the other kinds of ownership, as well as for “opening” Macedonia to the free flow of people, ideas and capital.

Considering the issue of international relations of Macedonia, we can divide the parties into two groups.

- » **The first group. Parties not addressing this issue.** LD and SJM are in this group. They do not address this issue since international affairs is a matter under the jurisdiction of the federal institutions, which these parties strive to sustain.
- » **The second group. Parties addressing this issue.** MAAK, PDP, SKM-PDP, and VMRO-DPMNE are in this group. The basic common determination in this area is the support for the idea of Macedonia’s integration into the EU, which is of strategic interest to the country.

Considering ideology, **the selected parties can be placed across the whole range of the ideological spectrum. However, most of them gravitate around the political centre. Starting from the left to the right, SJM is positioned to the farthest left, while SKM-PDP gravitates around the left centre, declaring itself as a social democratic party. LD and PDP can be defined as parties of the centre, while MAAK and VMRO-DPMNE as par-**

ties of the right centre with a conservative orientation. However, this division is in general terms since there are oscillations of the abovementioned parties on each of the analyzed issues separately. For instance, although LD is defined as a party of the centre, regarding interethnic relations it takes quite a nationalist position. Similar conclusions, on each of the issues, can be drawn for the other analyzed parties as well.

CHAPTER 3



THE PARTY SYSTEM IN THE REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

1. THE PARTY SYSTEM IN THE REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

After constituting the first composition of the Macedonian multi-party Assembly, on 27 January 1991, the representatives elected their first President of the Republic, **Kiro Gligorov**, and on 20 March 1991, the first expert government under the leadership of **Nikola Kljusev** was elected. This set the foundations of the new democratic system of state government organisation.

Meanwhile, **on 25 January 1991, the representatives of the citizens in the Assembly adopted the Declaration on Sovereignty of Macedonia**,¹⁹⁷ where Article 1 stipulates that Macedonia is a sovereign state in accordance with the constitutional determination for independence and territorial integrity of the Macedonian state, as well as the right of the Macedonian people to self-determination, including the right to separation from the federation.

On 7 June 1991, the Amendment LXXXII was adopted, which removes the attribute "socialist" from the name of the SRM.¹⁹⁸ In this regard, on 7 May 1991, the President of the Republic of Macedonia filed a proposal to the MPs for introducing a new democratic Constitution, which was adopted on 17 November 1991, preceded by the Referendum on independence from 8 September 1991 and the Declaration on the plebiscite expression of the citizens' will for a sovereign and independent state of Macedonia, adopted in the session of the Assembly on 17 September 1991.¹⁹⁹

¹⁹⁷ See: **Declaration on Sovereignty of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, the Assembly of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, No. 08-220-1.**

¹⁹⁸ See: **Decision on Declaring the Amendments LXXXII - LXXXV to the Constitution of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia, year XLVII, No. 27, Skopje, 11.6.1991, (p. 357).**

¹⁹⁹ See: **Declaration on the Plebiscite Expression of the Citizens' will for a Sovereign and Independent State of Macedonia, the Republic of Macedonia's Assembly, No. 08-3786, 17.9.1991.**

This way, the new constitutional and legal system of the Republic of Macedonia as a democratic and independent state, was given a framework. Finally, on 19 December 1991, the Declaration on International Recognition of the Republic of Macedonia initiates the process of international recognition of the established Macedonian state.²⁰⁰

1.1. Constitutional framework

The framework of the Republic of Macedonia's party system is determined by the Constitution of the state. Thus, **“political pluralism and free and direct elections” are determined as fundamental values of the new constitutional order.** Unlike the previous socialist period with political monism, with the Constitution, the independent Republic of Macedonia does with the past and starts to offer the highest constitutional guarantees for a full realization of parliamentary democracy, i.e. of political pluralism.

The Republic of Macedonia's Constitution **belongs to the group of constitutions in the world that determine political pluralism as an explicit constitutional category,** implying that it is not done directly by defining the freedom of political association of the citizens.

Such a constitutional solution is the result of two circumstances:

- » **First**, it represents an unknown category, introduced in the new Constitution of the independent Republic of Macedonia for the first time, as well as
- » **Second**, introducing political pluralism was the fundamental premise that had to be done in order to transform the previous socialist system of governance into a new parliamentary and democratic system.

²⁰⁰ See: **Declaration on international recognition of the Republic of Macedonia, the Republic of Macedonia's Assembly, No. 08-5099, 19.12.1991.**

This fundamental value of the constitutional order is further upgraded in the Constitution. Thus, the author of the text of the constitution, in the group of civic and political freedoms and rights, offers two guarantees related to the above mentioned:

- » **First, that the citizens are equal** in realizing their freedoms and rights, regardless of, among the rest, their political orientation (Article 9), as well as
- » **Second, that the citizens have the freedom** to have, among the rest, their own political orientation (Article 16).

The above mentioned implies that **citizens have the absolute right to have their own viewpoints in relation to certain political issues, and have the right to affirm them individually or in a community with other citizens, while the state, on their behalf, offers guarantees for the realization of such rights, and determines that there should not be any inequality in the realization of the freedoms and rights of the citizens due to political belonging.**

Such a condition is further upgraded in **Article 20 from the Constitution**, which refers to the right to association of citizens. Namely, in accordance with the previous provisions, **the author of the text of the constitution guarantees the right to association of citizens in order to achieve their political rights and convictions.**

Such associations can be achieved in two forms:

- » **First, as associations of citizens** or
- » **Second, as political parties.**

The citizens, in accordance with the Constitution, **have the right to freely join or leave** such political entities.

There are three prohibitions stipulated in the Constitution with regards to the political parties (as well as the associations

of citizens), as a form of articulation of the political convictions of the citizens:

- » **First**, they should not be oriented towards a **violent downfall of the constitutional order**;
- » **Second**, they should be oriented towards **encouraging or inciting military aggression, or inflaming national, racial, or religious hatred and intolerance**; as well as
- » **Third, they must not form military or semi-military associations** that are not part of the Republic of Macedonia's armed forces.

Based on the above mentioned, a conclusion can be drawn that **the Constitution allows the establishment of a political party, which strives for non-violent change of the constitutional order. In theory this is called "abuse of the openness of democracy"**. Namely, in history, there are political parties that come to power taking the opportunities of a democratic constitutional order such as that of the Republic of Macedonia. However, after winning the citizens' trust, they take steps to change the foundations of such an order, in accordance with those rules that brought them in a situation to run the institutions.

On such a foundation, and in accordance with Article 22 from the Constitution, **the citizens have the right to elect their political representatives (passive electoral right) to the constitutionally determined levels of government, as well as the right to be elected (active electoral right)**. The conditions to achieve this passive and active electoral right are for citizens to be 18 years old and with working capacity.

In each democracy, political parties aim at realizing their concept of statehood by governing the institutions through the determined state mechanisms.

In this regard, according to the Constitution of the Republic of Macedonia, the citizens, either individually or gath-

ered in political parties, have the right to run for candidacy or to propose candidates for the elections, for:

- » **First**, MPs at the Republic of Macedonia's Assembly;
- » **Second**, the President of the Republic of Macedonia;
- » **Third**, members of the councils and mayors of local municipalities and the city of Skopje.

The determined constitutional framework is additionally elaborated in legislation, providing the full picture of the Macedonian party system.

The key law related to the functioning of the political parties is the Law on Political Parties. Besides this act, the party system of the Republic of Macedonia is additionally shaped by the **Law on Political Party Financing**, as well as **the Electoral Code.**

1.2. Legislative framework

In the Republic of Macedonia, although the framework of political pluralism was established with the Constitution of the Republic of Macedonia from 1991, the old Law on social organisations and associations of citizens from 1983 was still in force until 1994, to be supplemented in 1990, enabling the establishment of many political parties, in opposition to the previously single party system with the SKM.

In the period from the introduction of political pluralism in 1990 until the adoption of the first Law on Political Parties in 1994, there are 68 political parties registered in the Republic of Macedonia. Contrary to this, in the following five years, from 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999, 15 political parties are registered. In other words, **in the first five years since the introduction of political pluralism in Macedonia, there were five times more new political entities registered in relation to the following five years.** As a conclusion of the above mentioned, it is evident that **the first wave of political pluralization, when most of the political parties in Macedonia emerged, went through**

the procedure in accordance with the regulations of the adapted socialist legal act for social organisations of citizens, mentioned above in the text.

Table No. 10: The number of registered political parties by years²⁰¹

No.	YEAR	NUMBER OF PARTIES
1	1990	23
2	1991	13
3	1992	17
4	1993	9
5	1994	6
6	1995	4
7	1996	4
8	1997	4
9	1998	2
10	1999	1

The first Law on Political Parties in independent Macedonia was adopted on 26 July 1994,²⁰² while the second Law on Political Parties was adopted ten years later, on 20 October 2004.²⁰³ In the period from 2004 until 2015, there were four amendments and supplements to this law,^{204 205 206 207} which

²⁰¹ See: Cane Mojanoski, *Letopis na makedonskata demokratija*, *Ibid.*, p.3

²⁰² See: **Law on Political Parties, Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia, year L, No. 41, Skopje, 5.8.1994, pp. 1197-1200.**

²⁰³ See: **Law on Political Parties, Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia, year LX, No. 76, Skopje, 27.10.2004, pp. 1-5.**

²⁰⁴ See: **Law Amending and Supplementing the Law on Political Parties, Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia, year LXIII, No. 5, Skopje, 16.1.2007, pp. 8-9.**

²⁰⁵ See: **Correction to the Law Amending and Supplementing the Law on Political Parties, Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia, year LXIII, No. 8, Skopje, 24.1.2007, p.80.**

²⁰⁶ See: **Law Amending and Supplementing the Law on Political Parties, Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia, year LXIV, No. 5, Skopje, 11.1.2008, p.2.**

²⁰⁷ See: **Law Supplementing the Law on Political Parties, Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia, year LXIX, No. 23, Skopje, 14.2.2008, p.143.**

additionally shaped the basic meaning of the original legal solution.

In addition, there is a review of some of the more important issues, which are part of the specified laws, i.e.:

- » **First**, defining the concept of a political party;
- » **Second**, the way of establishing political parties and registration confirmation;
- » **Third**, the registration procedure of political parties;
- » **Fourth**, the termination of the existence of political parties, as well as
- » **Fifth**, other more important aspects.

The selection of these issues is intended to provide a clearer picture of the fundamental aspects of this sphere from a chronological, but also from a comparative perspective.

1.2.1. Defining the concept of political party

The amendments and supplements from 1990 to the Law on Social Organisations and Civic Associations from 1983, which provided the legal basis for the introduction of the political pluralism in Macedonia, **did not contain a definition of what the concept of a political party represents.** This legal solution contains the phrase “**social organisations and civic associations**” encompassing all forms of associations of people, including nongovernmental (civic) organisations and parties, as well as other shapes of citizen associations.

Contrary to this, **in the first Law on Political Parties in the independent Republic of Macedonia from 1994, a short definition is used**, separating parties from other forms of citizens’ associations. In fact, this is done with the law itself that applies only to political parties, and not to all forms of association, as was the case before. In this regard, according to this law, **political parties are defined as organised groups of citizens striving to participate in the**

government (Article 2). **In the second Law on Political Parties from 2004, this definition is extended but the essence remains the same.** Namely, in accordance with Article 2 from this Law, **a political party is a voluntary organisation of citizens established in order to achieve and protect certain political, economic, social, cultural, and other types of rights and convictions, as well as in order to participate in the political decision-making process as part of the government** (Article 2).

In the context of the Macedonian legal solution, the Law on Political Parties from 2009 in force in Serbia uses a similar definition. Namely, it can be confirmed that **“a political party is an organisation of citizens, who are associated on a free and voluntary basis in order to achieve certain political goals through a democratic modeling of the citizens’ will, and in order to participate in the government”**.

In the first Law on Political Parties of the independent Republic of Croatia, there is no definition of what a political party represents. Contrary to this, it is confirmed that **“the political parties through their free action express the multi-party system as the highest state value”** (Article 1), and that they, by law, have the status of **“legal entity acting in accordance with its programme and its statute”** (Article 2).

Having in mind the two definitions of the concept of a political party in the two laws on **political parties of the Republic of Macedonia, as well as the presented comparative examples, the conclusion can be made that political parties, as well as other forms of citizens’ associations, are established in order to achieve certain common interests of the founders, i.e. the members and sympathizers. However, what makes political parties different from other shapes of citizens’ associations is**

their main goal to be part of the state institutions that make the most important decisions, i.e. to be part of the government. The way of achieving such a goal for the political parties is also determined, **and that is through free and democratic elections, in which citizens elect their representatives nominated by the political parties to represent them for a certain period of time in the institutions, both on a local and national level.**

1.2.2. Ways of establishing a political party and registration confirmation

The largest part of the amendments and supplements to the Law on Political Parties of the Republic of Macedonia is related to the issue with the way of establishing a political party.

The defined framework with the first Law from 1994 remains the same today, while the amendments and supplements that follow refer mainly to the issue of confirming the existence of a registered party, considering the minimal number of members. In this regard, **the legal solutions from 1994 and from 2004 stipulate that a political party can be established by at least 500 adult citizens of the Republic of Macedonia, with permanent residence in the Republic of Macedonia,** and that, in relation to this, the political party will forward a letter of confirmation to the District Court in Skopje with the same minimal number of founders on a yearly basis. Having in mind all of this, since it does not explicitly points at which elements such a confirmation should contain, it can be agreed that it has a form of a general statement. **Such a provision in the legislation did not represent an obstacle to the previously registered parties, due to the simple procedure enabled to meet this condition. However, starting from 2007, this situation begins to change in direction of complicating this condition.**

This complication is in relation to two segments:

- » **First**, in relation to the quantitative parameters, as well as
- » **Second**, in relation to the procedure.

Thus, in the amendments and supplements of the Law on Political Parties from 2007, it was stipulated that **instead of 500, a political party could be established by at least 1000 voters, which represents a serious complication from the quantitative aspect.** Moreover, **previously established political parties had to confirm that their minimal number of members is not below 1000 members through a much more complex procedure than before.**

Namely, it stipulated that political parties, should start a procedure of collection of at least **1000 signatures 45 days before the expiry date of the registration** every four years, which are then certified by a notary and forwarded to the basic court. If the party does not carry out the procedure, the basic court is officially obliged to make a decision to delete the political party from the register (new Article 1 amending Article 11). In this regard, ideologically, but applying the form of **“correction”** of the adopted amendments and supplements 7 days later, **there are further complications to the procedure for confirming the establishment of a political party.** Namely, the form **“correction to an adopted law”** envisions that **political parties, instead of every 4 years, should forward their registration confirmation every 2 years, and instead of certifying the signatures of the members at the notary, it should be done via an authorized person in the regional offices of the Ministry of Justice, i.e. in front of a state organ.**

Eventually, with the amendments from 2008, the situation in this area has been stabilized to a certain degree, obliging the parties **to forward to the basic court at least 1000 individually certified signatures at the notary to con-**

firm that their number of members is within the legal frames not every two, but every four years.

In comparison, **unlike the Republic of Macedonia's case, which requires 1000 collected signatures of adult citizens in order to register a party, in Slovenia's case with a similar number of inhabitants, this number is 200, while in Croatia, with twice as many inhabitants as the Republic of Macedonia, a political party can be registered with the consent of 100 adult citizens.** Finally, in **Serbia**, until 2009, in order to register a political party it was required to collect **100 signatures**, while since 2009 the condition is to collect **10,000 signatures** of adult citizens, or 100 times as much. In this regard, an exception to this rule are the political parties representing the interests of the minorities, which can be registered with 1,000 collected signatures of adult citizens of this country.

The already established parties go through similar experiences in relation to the issue of registration confirmation when it comes to this part. Thus, in Serbia, with the Law on Political Parties from 2009, a diversified solution is applied in relation to the Macedonian solution. Namely, in the legal system of this country, if a political party has won a mandate on the elections for the state or regional parliaments, it is released from the obligation to confirm its registration. However, if a certain political party has not won a mandate in a period of 8 years, in that case our legal solution is applied, i.e. the party is obliged to confirm its registration collecting 10,000 signatures (the same amount of signatures necessary for its initial registration) of adult citizens.

Based on the above mentioned, the conclusion can be made that **in all democratic states there is a lower threshold of initial support that each party should have in order to gain legal status.** Since 2007, in the Republic of Macedonia, there have been certain processes that compli-

cated the conditions for registration of new parties, as well as the conditions for registration confirmation of existing political parties. As a consequence, this **resulted in reducing the number of political parties in the state, which has its own positive and negative effects on the party system. Having in mind the comparative examples, the conclusion is that there is not a unified solution in relation to the minimal number of signatures of citizens each political initiative has to collect in order to be registered as a political party, as well as in relation to the issue with registration confirmation of the already established political party.**

1.2.3. Political party registration procedure

In relation to the issue with the registration of political parties, **the procedure stipulated in the first Law on Political Parties from 1994 basically remains the same until today.** Moreover, the comparative examples from other democratic states similar to the Republic of Macedonia (Slovenia, Croatia, or Serbia) show that they have adopted similar procedures in their legal solutions for political parties.

In the Republic of Macedonia, a political party is founded by the **founders assembly.** In this assembly, **three decisions have to be made:**

- » **First,** a decision is made for founding the political party;
- » **Second,** the programme of the political party is adopted; as well as
- » **Third,** the statute of the political party is adopted.

Then **the party organs are elected, which concludes the first part of the procedure.** After concluding this first part of the procedure, the second part begins, which is related to the registration in the court register at the basic court.

The political party should initiate such a procedure in a period of 30 days after the date of the founding assembly by filing a request to the basic court, comprising of three documents:

- » **First**, minutes of the founding assembly;
- » **Second**, a copy of the programme and statute adopted at the founding assembly; as well as
- » **Third**, a founding decision of the political party.

Furthermore, in accordance with the legal provisions, the court is obliged to respond to this request **in a period of 15 days**, where, if the request for the party registration in the court register is incomplete, the court will advise the applicant to supplement the request **in a period of 30 days**.

If the applicant does not meet the deadline assigned, the court will make a decision to reject the request for registering the party in the register. A **complaint** against this solution can **be filed in a period of 15 days to the Court of Appeals**. Eventually, in accordance with the legal provisions, **a political party starts to exist the moment it is entered into the register of political parties**.

In other democratic states, there are similar provisions in relation to the registration procedure for each political party. **However, there are certain symbolic differences in relation to the institutions compatible for addressing citizens' requests for founding political parties. Thus, for instance, in the Republic of Macedonia until 1994, the competent institution for political party registration was the Ministry of Internal Affairs, while since 1994, political parties are registered in the courts. In Serbia and Croatia, on the other hand, the state organ in charge of the administration is the competent institution for party registration.**

1.2.4. The end of a political party's existence

In relation to the issue of ending the existence of a political party, the same legal solutions that apply are basically unaltered. Thus, in the Republic of Macedonia, a political party will end to exist if:

- » **First**, its functioning is prohibited by a competent court;
- » **Second**, if the Constitutional Court has made a decision according to which the programme, statute, or any other document of that particular political party is not in accordance with the Constitution of the Republic of Macedonia;
- » **Third**, if the party organ makes a decision to end the existence of the particular political party;
- » **Fourth**, when the number of members of the particular political party is reduced below the legally determined number; as well as
- » **Fifth**, if the particular political party makes a decision to merge with another party.

In the context of the above mentioned, the comparative examples are pretty similar. In any case, in the Law on Political Parties of Croatia, besides the listed conditions, there is another feature that serves as a foundation for making the decision to end the existence of a political party. Namely, a political party will formally cease to function in this state **“if the highest party body does not meet in a period twice as long as the obligation defined in its statute”**. This would imply that if, for instance, the congress as the highest party organ, which is obliged to hold its sessions once in four years, is not assembled in a period of 8 years, in that case the Ministry of State Administration will make a decision to prohibit the functioning of the particular political party.

1.2.5. Other issues related to the functioning of political parties

Besides the fundamental issues discussed above, the Law on Political Parties regulates other important topics which provide a more thorough insight into the character of the Macedonian party system.

Thus, in accordance with our legal provisions, **political parties in the Republic of Macedonia are obliged to enable equal gender representation in relation to the positions in the political party available to both genders.** This provision was introduced in the Law on Political Parties from 2004, and it should be seen as part of the overall tendency to create legal and other presumptions for equal participation of both men and women in politics and state institutions. Moreover, the provision stipulates a **“soft obligation”** for political parties to attempt to keep the gender balance in the party bodies and organs. This way, the balanced gender representation in the party organs should find its practical expression in the institutions of the state authorities.

Moreover, there is a legal prohibition on discrimination of citizens based on their membership or non-membership in a political party. The existence of this provision should be observed from the aspect of the whole atmosphere created in the Republic of Macedonia, related to the motives of the citizens to become members of the political parties. Namely, besides the basic motives related to the inclination to the ideology and the programme aspirations of a certain party, in the Republic of Macedonia, there are tendencies among citizens to become party members in order to attain some personal goals, related to career promotions, employment, etc. Such a goal, if it exists, always harms those citizens who are not party members. Therefore, this provision is intended to symbolically point at this problem and to confirm the constitu-

tional norm, according to which the citizens are free in their decision to become or not become a member of a certain political party. In any case, against the constitutional norms, as well as the provision from the Law on Political Parties, there are still tendencies among citizens to use party membership in order to gain their personal interests.

Besides the above mentioned solutions related to the gender equality, as well as to non-discrimination, the Law on Political Parties tackles the issue of prohibitions as well. Thus, there are four more specific prohibitions:

- » **First**, political parties are prohibited to have military or semi-military structures in their internal organisation;
- » **Second**, political parties are prohibited to have their organisations (to act) in the organs of the state and municipal authorities, i.e. it is determined that political parties are organised on a territorial principle;
- » **Third**, political parties registered in other countries are prohibited from functioning on the territory of the Republic of Macedonia; and
- » **Fourth**, political parties are prohibited to use the same name and sign as another party in the Republic of Macedonia, and should not contain the name and the sing of the Republic of Macedonia, of state organs, local authorities, other states or international organisations.

Besides these issues, another important thing from the aspect of the functioning of the political party was envisioned in the supplements to the Law on Political Parties from 2013. With these supplements, **political parties were enabled to establish their party research and analytic centres within their internal organisation**, as determined by law.

1.2.5.1. Party research and analytic centres

The way of functioning of the party research and analytic centres is determined by the Law on Party Research and Analytic Centres from 2013.²⁰⁸

Party research and analytic centres (PIAC) are formed as part of the internal organisation of the parties, without representing any separate legal entity. The reason for their establishment can be found in the **aspiration to construct a platform in the state that will enable a more structured and qualified political debate**. In favor of achieving the goal, the Law envisions a possibility for these research centres of the parties to contact and cooperate with each other through various meetings and gatherings. In this way, the idea is to **contribute towards further advancement of the overall relations between the parties**.

Within the PIAC, there are two departments that function towards attainment of their goals and tasks:

- » **First**, operational department, which prepares analyses, collects data, and does other research necessary for a better functioning of the party;
- » **Second**, project department, which is more related to the public and envisions organising panels, debates, seminars, trainings, etc, for the requirements, and in the function, of a certain party.

The activities of the PIAC are financed from the budget, but also from other projects. In this regard, the legislation prohibits PIAC to use its resources directly or indirectly for the financing of the political party they belong to. This implies that these resources can be used solely for implementing the activities (conducting analyses, researches, organising panels, conferences, etc.) of these centres that indirectly assist the political parties.

²⁰⁸ **Law on Party Research and Analytic Centres, Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia, year LXIX, No. 23, Skopje, 14.2.2013, (pp. 141-142).**

Moreover, with this Law the state enables every registered party to form such research and analytic centres and it obliges to finance the functioning of the research and analytic centres of the four parties with the biggest number of MPs in the Macedonian Parliament of the last elections.

PART THREE

ELECTIONS AND ELECTORAL SYSTEMS

CHAPTER 1



SOVEREIGNTY OF CITIZENS



1. CONCEPT AND THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF SOVEREIGNTY

The concept of sovereignty can be defined as the highest, supreme authority imposed on the citizens from the certain social territory that at the same time is unlimited and independent in the country and abroad.

The basic dilemma that is imposed regarding the definition of the sovereignty introduces the dilemma: where the source of the highest supreme government is located in and where does it belong? In theory, sovereignty is usually explained through the location where the highest supreme government is concentrated in the hands of the government, or in society. Sovereignty is explained as **capacity or mark of the social government as highest legislation form, independent from all the other governments in the territory where it is realized.**

The sovereignty doctrine is developed as a part of a transformation of the European middle age system that existed at the end of the 16th and at the beginning of the 17th century in Western Europe. Namely, the terrifying religious divisions and wars, the growth of capitalistic requirements to provide regulative and normative of legal security, as well as the conflicts that were created because of the absolutist tendencies of the monarchies lead to initiate a new doctrine in solving the international power relations. Because of the imposed requirements for secularization in the internal and in the international power structure, the theological doctrine started to lose the dominance on the expense of the created concept of public sovereignty.

Secularization erased the dominance of the concept of God's legitimization of the monarchy. God and the holy natural right to rule others were replaced with the secular doctrine of sovereignty.

Monarch sovereignty is best described in the work of Jean Bodin ("The Six Books of the Republic", 1576), and later was finalized in the works of Thomas Hobbes ("Leviathan", 1651) and Samuel von Pufendorf ("De jure natura et gentium", 1672), as a concept "all or nothing". According to which, in the concrete theory there is only one last unlimited center that is capable of making regulations in the name of others. That centre cannot be investigated, neither from the outside nor from the inside.

From this point, sovereignty is determined as a crucial mark in the system of governance.

This means that in previous periods, sovereignty in its contemporary meaning was not able to appear due to two crucial reasons:

- » **The first one is connected with the existence of God's rights (divine law)**, the church attitude stating that its government is older than any of the social government, and because of that the divine law is older than the positive (civil) law, from which the church gets the right to social overview, while
- » **The second reason is in the so-called public right that is reflected in the right of the local superiors "sovereignty" to rule over people as that is their natural right which no one can take away from them.**

Sovereignty is a concept that is closely connected to statehood, not just in the historic, but also in the structural sense. If the creation of society in the modern sense is connected with the creation of the sovereign government which in its content is unlimited, undividable and inviolable, the creation of the sovereign government is connected with the development of the absolute monarchist power over the rivalry that has previously been independent feudal aristocracy, ministry and the Holy Roman Empire.

The monarch's victory and his absolute power meant imposing a special type of government within the sovereign government that at the same time is the **single (summa potestas) and supreme government (suprema potestas)**. In this period, sovereignty was mostly defined as negative, as a government that is not inferior to no one, and belongs only to the monarch. For a long time the monarch approved the absolute governing through the **so-called theocratic government theories**.

The basic idea of these theories comes from two concepts: **the concept of direct and the concept of indirect divine right**.

According to the **first concept**, God did not only create the government, but has inaugurated its pillars, the monarch as the single holy representative on earth who was able to do anything and his will was a law for his subordinates, while according to the second concept, God created only the power, while its carriers and the forms to achieve it were produced by humans.

But the theocratic concepts were specific only for the feudal period of social development. By the appearance of a new civil class and by strengthening the theory of the human natural rights and the concept of the social agreement, sovereignty gets a completely different meaning.

Instead of searching and locating its source in God, as was done by the theocratic concepts, the theory of natural rights declared the sovereignty of the people by emphasizing the right to decline their own sovereignty on behalf of one or more individuals.

According to this theory, sovereignty was determined as an estranged and transferable category. Within the theory of natural rights, according to which the human gets its rights from birth, apart from the society, the concept of the social agreement is being developed. Based on this concept, people

need to voluntarily conclude the social agreement, or create society as a place where the general will of all is going to be dominant over the individual will of the people

In fact, this concept negates the previous theocratic concept referring to the origin of the government and the new sovereignty source is found and that source is - the people. **The people are the only source of sovereign government, and not the divine will.**

Although the theory of natural rights of the human and the concept for social agreement as an explanation for creating the society and the sovereignty of the people are basically idealistic and metaphysical in their character, even though, they made a strong impact on the process of denial of the scientific and natural approach of the theocratic concepts of sovereignty. They had a strong influence over the process of disintegration of basic social and political values of the feudal system, but at the same time, they played a significant and progressive role in the preparation of the new citizen doctrine.

Jean-Jacques Rousseau completely developed the concept of public sovereignty. In his opinion, sovereignty of the people is inalienable and undividable and is expressed only by the general will of the citizens and is composed by all citizens.

"Let us suppose – writes Rousseau, that society is composed of ten thousand citizens... Each member of that society has the tenth thousand part from that sovereign government". In other words, the national sovereignty, according to Rousseau, is the total amount of the separate parts of the sovereignty that belongs to individuals in society.²⁰⁹

Rousseau also refers to the demand for social agreement as a base for creating the government. The government, as Rousseau says, should not be concentrated in the hands of an individual or in those of a few, because it would be a direct

²⁰⁹ See: **Rousseau, J.J. (1913), The Social Contract and Discourse, Ed.G.D.H. Cole, London: Dent (Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1969).**

violation of the principle of national sovereignty. "The law that is not confirmed by the people is regarded as an invalid law. The general will of the citizens is the inner moral content of the political community created with a contract, which is the only sovereign thing. The general will is an undividable, non-transferable and inalienable unity, the highest government that no one can present and represent, and only because of that it is performed only directly or is not performed at all", concludes Rousseau defending the idea of the national sovereignty.

Hence, it is considered that only Rousseau was the sole representative of the idea of a complete, direct citizens' democracy in the legislation system. Public representatives have the right to initiative only and to define the legal proposals, while the people give the final regulation for the destiny of the law.

The principle of national sovereignty for the first time was officially declared in the Declaration on Human and Citizen Rights in 1789, adopted after the victory of the French Revolution.

Following the basic idea, the leader of doctrine of people's sovereignty is insignificant to understand the legal and institutional limitation of the social power, but the wish for revolutionary destruction of the feudal state and implementing such a government that would directly state the people's will.

Contained in Article 3 of the Human and Citizen Rights Declaration, the principle of national sovereignty remained to a crucial principle of French Public Law which was confirmed in all constitutional documents, except in the Declaration from 1814.

The French Constitution from 1791 adopted a very specific concept of the public sovereignty different from the one represented by Rousseau. Namely, in this Constitution the concept of representative office was adopted which confirmed total autonomy over the will of the representative institutions.

Hence, as pointed out by the French theoretician Birdo, “national sovereignty, as it was imagined by the people in the Revolution, presents only the legitimacy principle, but not the real people as the only pillar of political life”. But as the same author will confirm, the French Revolution consolidates the two concepts of sovereignty: **the concept of public sovereignty**, represented by a small number of theoreticians, and, above all, those who considered the fact that sovereignty is divided among the citizens that are the part of people, and that each of them individually carries a part of the sovereignty, and **concept of national sovereignty**, according to which the sovereignty belongs only to the people as undivided unity.

The second concept is often used as an argument repeals the implementations of forms of direct democracy, or as a proof that the representation system is only in compliance with the principle of national sovereignty.

This means that the answer to the proposal of who owns the unlimited sovereignty leads or threatens to initiate bloodshed conflicts and civil wars in different European countries. So, in England, the largest scene of this long-term conflict was the Civil war that happened in the interval from 1642-1648. The solution was reached after the glorious revolution in 1688/89 under the compromise formula “The King in the Parliament”. Sovereignty, or, according to the English perception of the concept, the highest legislative power was enacted by compromise to the old enemies, the King and the Parliament together, following the English tradition.

Apart from England, in France, the territory of Jean Bodin, referring to the monarch’s sovereignty received a new challenge-national sovereignty presented in the works of Jean-Jacques Rousseau. The proposal, in which the monarch or the people are sovereign, lead to the escalation of the French revolution in 1789. The structure of Rousseau’s theory of sovereignty was in some parts very similar with Boden’s theory, apart that for Rous-

seau, sovereignty is accomplishing of the common will, and not the monarch's will. It is still undivided, only now it has another pillar, and that is - the people. Unlike England, which solved the conflict between the monarch and the people by using a compromise, through the division of sovereignty between the monarch and the people, France has made the same through creating one abstract subject - the nation.

The idea of national sovereignty was born in 1789, during, and especially after the French revolution. And the French concept of sovereignty had compromised content on a certain level. It was a compromise between the national sovereignty and the monarch sovereignty created with the purpose to:

- a) Avoid the general right to vote (that would follow the national sovereignty)
- b) Avoid monarch absolutism, as well as
- c) Avoid the division of the state territory through emphasizing its indivisibility.

His idea was implemented in both cases. So, in accordance with Article 3 from the Declaration "the sovereignty fundamentally lays in the nation". Because the nation is not a simple regular gathering of the citizens, but it is much more a kind of spiritual community, this concept necessarily implies representative solutions contrary to the direct democratic national sovereignty. Today, the French Constitutional sovereignty doctrine is a compromise between the national on the one, and public sovereignty on the other hand, represented in Article 3 of the Constitution of the Fifth French Republic with the following formulation: "National sovereignty belongs to the people..." It unites the representative, national sovereignty and direct, democratic, republican, public sovereignty

The sovereignty in France is defined also through admission of the indivisibility of the French territory, inalienability of sovereignty and the parliamentary representation by the chief of the state, on the one, (that means the concept of the

national sovereignty), and universal right to vote, the referendum and other shapes of democracy in the republican form of governing (that means the concept of public sovereignty), on the other hand.

Opposite from England and France, in Germany sovereignty is viewed as a concept in relation with society (**Staatssoveranität**).²¹⁰ Since the time of Hegel, the concept of sovereignty in relation with society was used to neutralize the conflict between the sovereignty of the monarch and the sovereignty of the people. Instead of the French "general will", the German doctrine uses the concept of "national will" as a background in the process of creating legitimate and legal politics.

But, it has to be noted that after the adoption of the Weimar Constitution, in Germany redirecting sovereignty from society toward the people was re-examined. So, Article 1, Paragraph 2 in this Constitution stipulates, "The state government comes from the people". In German Fundamental Law from 1949, the idea of national sovereignty was reaffirmed through the formulation "the whole government comes from the people" with the strong realization limitation.

Namely, this Constitution prohibited the citizens the right to referendum. The only exception from this rule was the possibility assumed in Article 29 in the Fundamental Law to announce national referendum in order to determine new borders between the federal areas. So, it was considered that sovereignty was given back to the people, but it was prohibited to be directly used. In compliance with the constitutional provisions, only the elected representatives in Parliament were authorized to use it.

²¹⁰ See: **Hegel, G.W.F. (1942), The Philosophy of Right, trans. T.W. Knox, Oxford Press.**

2. MECHANISMS TO ACHIEVE NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY

Achieving sovereignty and democracy as a system and values are inevitably in line with the means, forms and mechanisms, which define them.

In both theory and practice, there are clearly **two elementary ways in achieving national sovereignty: indirect (representative) way and direct regulation.**

The main difference between these two ways in achieving sovereignty is found in the approved quality and quantity of citizen's participation in the governmental system and in social political life.

Namely, people can, in reliance with the Constitution, reach the power to rule in two ways: **indirectly** (to reach all or some of their functions), or **directly** (through their elected representatives).

In theory, the indirect way to reach the power to rule often is equal to the concept of indirect democracy, while the direct way is equal to the concept of direct (representative) democracy.

This means, the more straight the participation of the citizens in the government is we talk about direct democracy, and vice versa, the more mediated the participation of the people involved in creating the system of government and its politics is by mediators elected from the citizens, we talk about reaching direct or representative democracy.

Whether a certain balance between direct participation of the citizens in the political life of the society exists, on the one hand, and representation of their interests and requirements through separately elected representatives, on the other hand, we talk about **semi-direct democracy** being implemented.

This type of democracy ratifies the most accepted categories, from one simple reason that in modern terms, pure form of direct democracy almost does not exist, if the direct democracy is defined as a system in which all people reach their sovereignty without any mediators.

Direct democracy is a regime in which the citizens are direct pillars of the legislation and ruling government within the national parliaments. This system completely unifies those who govern and those who are governed and implies the lack of the social institutions and governmental interference.

Actually, pure form of direct democracy could be seen only in ancient Rome and Greek city-states in terms when the democracy was limited only to free citizens, and later within the Swiss cantons, the English local self-government and in some federal states of the US.

In the modern sense, the form and the development of direct democracy and also the terms of its realization are connected with the ideas of Jean-Jacques Rousseau in his work "Social Contract" (Le contract social). But it is necessary to point out that Rousseau himself was aware that direct democracy if understood as constant grouping of all the citizens in order to perform "public duties" is impossible. He speaks more about the existence of separate institutions (forms) of direct democracy, and above all, in the legislation.

Representative democracy, on the other hand, excludes direct participation of people in the government. It is possible only through determining previously selected national representatives.

Representative democracy is a system in which delegating the representatives is a result of organizing direct elections by using the general right to vote. As a representative system, representative democracy allows two concepts of sovereignty: **national and public**, as two traditionally opposite concepts.

While viewing the **concept of public sovereignty**, representative democracy kept the understanding that every citizen is an individual pillar to the part of sovereign government, due to which the election of the representatives is a determined right and not a function, while due to the concept of national sovereignty, the representative democracy comes from the will of the nation as an abstract entity, separated from the will of the individual, because it is aimed toward wider social interests. Representative democracy confirms that the representatives do not serve their electorate. Their mandate is free.

Hence, the representative system is considered to be the most acceptable form that promotes real democracy and decreases the sovereignty of the parliamentary assemblies to citizen interests.

3. FORMS OF DIRECT REALIZATION OF CITIZEN SOVEREIGNTY (FORMS OF DIRECT DEMOCRACY)

3.1. Referendum

The referendum (from the Latin word referendum, means something that has to be announced) is the most implemented and the most popular form of direct democracy. Through the referendum citizens directly declare themselves “for” or “repeal”, with a simple “yes” or “no” on several addressed proposals. In fact, the object of the referendum itself is the **moment of the citizens decision** to accept or to decline some general legal act (constitution, law, etc.) or political regulation (for example, regulation to dismiss the parliament, regulation for territorial merger or separate the part of the country with another country, ratification of the international agreements etc.).

Therefore, the referendum is a way for citizen declaration through which the direct will of the people is expressed regarding the addressed referendum proposal.

If the citizens with the majority of votes decide “for” the referendum proposals, then that decision has the force of a law, and in certain situations a force even bigger than a law (the regulation adopted by referendum is considered unchangeable by a common law). There usually is a secret ballot, and the final regulative of the people is obligatory.

Establishing the referendum as a form of direct democracy initially appeared in France during the bourgeois revolution, as well during the process of constituting the US.

Therefore, for example the French revolution parliament adopted a Decree , which precisely stipulates that none of the documents can have the power of constitution if the same is not adopted by the people. Also, the Constitution of the state of Massachusetts was enacted in 1778 by referendum; the Swiss Constitution from 1802 was enacted through organizing a constitutional referendum, etc.

There are **different types of referendum:**

- » According to the **territorial criteria and legal action of decisions**, the referendum can be announced on **the whole territory of the state or in a single part of it;**
- » According to the **legal grounds**, the referendum can be **obligatory or provisional;**
- » According to the case due to which it is announced the referendum can be defined as: **constitutional, legislative, administrative, financial** and referendum in the area of international relations and international law; and
- » According to the **time** when the referendum is held it can be divided to **former and additional;**
- » According to the performance we can divide it to: **constitutional** (when it has a purpose to confirm the regularity or impact of single act) and **abrogative** (when it has a purpose to abolish an act that is in force without replacing it with another), and finally, all the referendums, regarding the effects of their periodical perfor-

mance, can be divided into referendums with a **previous and a final meaning**. While the advisory referendum's previous role was in sense of previous influence on its decision on the process of enacting decision by the representative institution, to all the other referendums the citizen ballot is connected with the final process of enacting the decision. After the decision is enacted by the citizens, the representative institution does not have any further competences.

The majority of citizens that have the right to vote and who live in the country vote on the referendum that is announced on the whole territory of the state, while the referendum that is announced in one federal unit or local political, territorial unit in the country gives the right to declare themselves for the referendum proposal only to the majority of citizens that live in them (for example, a referendum in a single federal state in the US or a referendum in some municipality).

On legal grounds, the referendum can be **obligatory** (compulsory) and **optional**, depending on the compulsory degree of its decision. If the referendum decision has compulsory force for the citizens, then we consider it as an obligatory referendum. On the contrary, the referendum has **optional or advisory** character, because the citizens' opinion referring to a certain proposal is not legal, but is more of a moral responsibility of the parliament to act according to the people's will. At the advisory referendum, the parliament can decide the complete opposite from the people's choice.

According to the **case** on which it is announced, the referendum can be: **constitutional, legislative, administrative, and financial**, and also a referendum in the area of international relations and international law.

By **constitutional** referendum we consider each form of transformation, constitutional revision that depends on the direct will of citizens. Whether the referendum must or can

be announced, or whether it refers to the complete or partial revision of the constitution, there is: absolutely and relatively compulsory constitutional referendum and facultative constitutional referendum.

An absolutely compulsory constitutional referendum is applied when every alteration of the constitution **has to be decided** upon referendum regardless if there is a modification of the whole constitution or only to some of its provisions. This type of referendum is foreseen in the Swiss Constitution of 1874 where it was foreseen that every modification to the constitution must be announced on referendum, and then in the way the same to be accepted it has to be voted on by the majority of voters in the country under terms that at least half of all listed voters from the electoral register have voted.

A relatively obligatory constitutional referendum is applied when the referendum has to be announced only for partial alteration of the Constitution, to some of its articles or to the parts on which there is clear constitutional obligation that the referendum must be organized. This type of referendum is applied, for example, in some federal states in the US.

The constitutional practice usually applies the facultative constitutional referendum. It is interesting that its announcement is decided only by the constitutionally authorized institution, usually the Parliament as the most significant representative institution of the citizens. This referendum can be found in several constitutions in the world, such as, for example, the Italian Constitution of 1947, the SFRY in 1963, etc.

According to the **time limitation** for organizing the referendum, it is divided into **previous or additional**. The previous is a more common referendum rather than additional. It is specific because it is announced for some proposal that the representative institution has not yet adopted the final decision for.

Additional referendum is organized for some issues for which the authorized institution has already adopted a decision, and the referendum is additionally announced. But the law can be put into force only with the citizens' consent. Therefore, often in theory it is stated that on this referendum the citizens actively participate in the law making process.

Regardless the type of referendum, its success depends on meeting a few conditions, among which **two are the most significant: the first** is connected with the free and unobstructed expression of citizens' will, and **the second** takes into consideration the qualification of the citizens to express their true will referring to a certain issue. This means, while the first condition is exclusively connected with removal of the objective or subjective pressures toward the citizens to vote one or the other way (to have precise formulated issues and answers such as "yes" or "no"), the second is always connected with subjective knowledge and the competence that citizens possess in order to pass some complex referendum decisions.

The most important for the referendum as a form of direct consideration is that it enables the people to express their will on a concrete proposal directly, by ballot. But, on the other hand, if we intensively insist on emphasizing the meaning of directness, we can neglect some other moments as referendum weaknesses.

Therefore, the importance of the referendum should not be overrated if we consider the political conditions in which the referendum proposal is created, and also the consequences from the enacted decision. Sometimes the referendum is carried out over strong psychological pressure on citizens (appearing mostly in France during the rule of President De Gaulle), but in authoritarian regimes by applying direct violence and threats.

Because of this, the referendum requires complete openness of the political government toward the citizens, objective

information, citizens' access to all required information referring to the referendum proposal, etc.

The referendum is organized in a manner identical with the elections (the referendum commission is being formed, election lists for citizen evidence are used, the results are being calculated, etc.). The referendum is mostly successful if the majority of the citizens listed in the electoral register have voted; majority of them (50% plus single vote) gave a positive answer to the submitted proposal. To enact positive regulation, sometimes 2/3 of the citizens on the electoral register must answer positively.

3.2. Citizen initiative and other forms of direct consideration

As a form of consideration of the citizens, apart from the referendum, constitutional-legislation theory also imposes the citizen initiative. It considers the form of direct democracy of the citizens or a certain percentage of the electoral body through which they have the authorization to accomplish their right to draft law, other general act or eventual political decision in the representative institution in the country. It is mandatory for the representative body to commence examination and to decide upon the submitted draft law. So, the citizen initiative forces the parliament to reach a decision based on the draft law.

If the legislative body enacts a law, a general act or a concrete political decision in compliance with the draft initiative, then the initiative is considered to be successful.

It is necessary to point out that the representative body has the right to completely conceal with the case of citizen initiative, to undertake the input of certain corrections in it or to decline the corrections.

The citizen initiative is provided in constitutions of many countries.

For example, on a national level it is applied in Austria, Spain, and Italy, and on a regional level in the US, Switzerland, etc. When the case of citizen initiative is a draft law, the countries' constitutions, without exception, propose finalization of the **previous condition – collecting a certain number of citizens' signatures** as a precondition for further processing of the citizens' initiative.

For example, in the constitutions of Switzerland, Hungary and Italy, it is projected to collect 50,000 signatures to support some draft law which through the institute called citizen initiative can be found in the parliamentary procedure. In the Polish Constitution, 100,000 signatures are projected, in the Spanish Constitution 500,000 signatures, in Brazil 1% of the total number of the electorate is required to give consent to the initiative, in Columbia 5% of the total number of voters is required, etc.

A citizen initiative can appear as a:

- » **Regular, unformulated and**
- » **Specified, formulated initiative.**

While the first initiative contains only the draft purpose and certain legal solutions that have to be enacted without their previously concrete elaboration in a format of draft law, the second form of initiative contains concrete elaborate of the proposals transformed into adopted citizen draft law.

Despite the proposed initiative, the representative institution must act and decide upon the concrete proposal. Within the mandatory procedure in the representative body we notice the difference between the citizens' initiative and the petition right as another form of direct democracy.

The petition, actually, is **a form of direct decision** through which the citizens, individually or collectively, have the right in writing to address the representative body or other bodies and institutions and to give concrete initiative, draft or criticize some legal provision, political decision or condi-

tion. In the constitutionally – legislative theory there is a distinction between a petition in a wider sense and petition in a narrow sense. While the first can be proposed by any citizen regardless whether they have the political rights in the country or not (foreigners can propose them as well), the petition in the narrower sense is strictly defined by disposal of political rights in the concrete state.

National veto is further defined as a single legislative referendum through which voters can prohibit or verify the validity of the established law. Although the adoption of the law is a proposal under the strict competence of the representative institution, it can be applied only after expiry of a certain date certain number of citizen – voters require public explanation on it. In case the citizens declare against the law it will be considered, as it was never adopted. Hence, often the national veto is considered as canceled under which certain law is subjected. The function of the national veto is in the possibility to abolish one law that is contrary with the citizens' will; under condition that the majority of the voters listed in the election register repealed that law.

4. CONSTITUTIONAL POSITION OF REFERENDUM AND CITIZENS' INITIATIVE IN THE REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

Referendum and citizens' initiative are the two forms of direct consideration that are stipulated by the Constitution of the Republic of Macedonia. It is necessary to point out that the Constitution only preliminary stipulates and regulates the proposals that are connected with the referendum and the citizen initiative, while more detailed elaboration of all the other aspects is an object of the legal regulation.

1. The referendum in the Republic of Macedonia is defined as a form of direct citizen declaration in considering certain proposals under the jurisdiction of the As-

sembly of the Republic of Macedonia, for proposals under the competence of the municipalities, the city of Skopje and municipalities within the city of Skopje, as well as for other proposals of local meaning.

The referendum on the national level is announced by the Assembly of the Republic of Macedonia, while the referendum on the local level, which is announced by proposals of local meaning, is announced by the councils of the local self-government. On the referendum, the citizens declare themselves directly by secret ballot. The right to vote is assigned to the citizens listed in the election registry as citizens with the right to vote.

In accordance with the legal provisions, the referendum is announced consideration by the citizen or to consult them, and the regulation that is being voted on the consideration referendum is compulsory, while the decision voted on the consulting referendum is not compulsory in its character.

The Assembly of the Republic of Macedonia, in compliance with the Constitution, **must announce an obligatory referendum in three cases:**

- » To adopt the decision of the Assembly to change the border of the Republic of Macedonia,
- » To adopt the decision of the Assembly to ratify or reject the union or unity with other countries and
- » When the draft proposal for announcing the referendum is signed by at least 150,000 voters.

By adopting the decision to change the border of the Republic of Macedonia and by an act to ratify or reject the union or unity with other countries, the Assembly simultaneously enacts the decision to announce a referendum on which the citizens should decide whether to adopt or reject the Assembly's regulation. Within the procedure, as an adopted decision on the referendum is considered that decision that is adopted by the majority of the total number of the electorate listed in the single electorate registry. This adopted decision has a mandatory character.

Also, the decision to ratify or reject the union or unity with other states is adopted on the referendum if it being voted by the majority of the total number of electorate.

In the third case, the Assembly is due to announce the referendum as soon as the draft proposal is signed by at least 150,000 electorates; hence the regulation adopted at the referendum is compulsory.

For the other issues under the jurisdiction of the Assembly of the Republic of Macedonia, the referendum decision is adopted if it is voted on by the majority of the electorate, if it was voted by more than half of the total number of electorates.

Apart from the proposal on which the referendum consideration is imposed by the power of the Constitution, the legislation predicts further possibilities for referendum commitment of the citizens, during which the decisions enacted in this manner **are not compulsory**.

So, the Assembly of the Republic of Macedonia **can announce a previous referendum** to adopt a certain law, regarding issues that are stipulated by law or to re-evaluate a law that was previously adopted (**additional referendum**). The Assembly decides whether to announce the referendum because of the demand for ratification of international agreements, for decisions enacted by the Assembly or declaration of the citizens regarding other proposals for which the Assembly has previously decided upon (**additional referendum**).

The Assembly of the Republic of Macedonia **can announce the referendum** for issues with broader meaning for the Republic of Macedonia due to the consultation with the citizens. According to the Referendum Law and other forms of direct declaration of the citizens (RM Official Gazette, no.81/2005) it clearly defines the proposals for which the Assembly of the Republic of Macedonia **cannot announce referendum**. Those proposals refer to:

- » Republic budget and the final annual budget account
- » Public expenditures
- » Republic reserves
- » Electoral proposal, appointing and dismissing
- » Amnesty
- » Defense, military, state of emergency and
- » Provisions with legal force adopted during the military and state of emergency,
- » Proposals that are being decided upon by the majority of votes from the MPs present in the Assembly, where majority of votes are required from the present MPs who represent the communities that are not the majority in Republic of Macedonia.

A referendum on a state level is announced by the Assembly of the RM on its own initiative and proposed by at least 150,000 citizens. The proposal of announcing the referendum on the state level with elaborate is submitted to the President of the Assembly of the RM, and the Assembly is due in 30 days after the submitted proposal to adopt decision to announce it. There is an interval of 60 to 90 days since the day the decision of announcing the referendum on the state level is being published in the Official Gazette of the RM till the day it is officially held.

The local referendum is announced by the municipality council, the City of Skopje and the municipalities within the City of Skopje, regarding the proposals in their jurisdiction by their own initiative and by proposal of at least 20% from the citizens in the municipality. The decision is published in the official municipality institution or the City of Skopje through the means of public media, from the day it was announced until the day it was held on local level in no more than 25 to 40 days' interval. A local referendum can be announced in order to adopt regulations or for proposals that need to be stipulated within the municipality, such as previous referendum, as well as to re-evaluate the regulations previously adopted as additional referendum.

On the local **level, referendum cannot be announced** for proposals that refer to:

- » The budget and the municipality budget financial statement, City of Skopje and the municipalities of the City of Skopje,
- » Municipality administration organization and
- » Proposals for which the council decides with majority of votes from the present members of the council who belong to the communities that are not the majority in the municipality.

The decisions on the local level referendum are enacted if they are being voted for by the majority of the total number of electorate, if more than the half of the total number of citizens registered in the municipality electoral register.

2. All the proposals regarding the procedure of implementing the referendum, the institutions that effectuate it, the right to vote, carry-out ballot, the ballot direction and establishing the results from the referendum ballot that are regulated by Law on Referendum and other forms of direct citizen declaration.

Citizen initiative is a form of direct declaration of the citizens in deciding by arising initiatives in front of the Assembly of the RM, in the municipality councils, the City of Skopje and the municipalities of the City of Skopje.

A citizen initiative can be initiated for:

- » Submitting a draft to initiate alteration of the Constitution of the RM,
- » Propose the enacting of law,
- » Announcing referendum on the state level and also for:
- » Adopting certain regulations of the municipality or the City of Skopje,
- » Solving certain proposals under the jurisdiction of the councils of the municipalities or the City of Skopje, and for
- » Announcing a referendum on local level.

The citizen initiative on the state level is initiated by the proposal from 100 citizens. But, the citizen initiative on state level to submit proposal to initiate alterations in the Constitution and to announce referendum is initiated if at least 150,000 citizens sign to support the initiative. On the other hand, the citizen initiative for draft law is initiated if at least 10,000 of citizens supported the initiative. The Assembly of the RM is due to decide upon the initiative in an interval of 30 days after the proposal is confirmed.

The citizens' initiative on local level is initiated in the municipality council and the City of Skopje on 100 citizen proposals. For proposals of financial and personnel character the citizens' initiative cannot be initiated.

The law determines **the gathering of the citizens as a form of direct declaration of citizens** in defining the proposals of local importance for the units of local self-government on which proposals are overviewed, some attitudes are pointed out and drafts are prepared on daily proposals regarding the living and work conditions of the citizens in the municipality. The request to summon the citizens is submitted by the municipality mayor.

CHAPTER 2



FORMS OF DIRECT SOVEREIGNTY RIGHTS OF THE CITIZENS (FORMS OF DIRECT DEMOCRACY)



1. THEORY OF REPRESENTATION

The idea to represent the people, the existence of the representative government comes from the fact that people are incapable to execute government by themselves, but are forced to transfer it to representatives that will execute it on their behalf.

Elections, in the context of transferring the will of the citizens to their representatives, are the **most concrete way in practicing the representative democracy**, or as it is usually pointed out in theory, ideally, the best political community represents the representative democratic system in which people practice their supreme governing power through their representatives who are periodically individually elected.²¹¹

The development of modern forms of representation is best illustrated through the historical continuity of the institutional development in political representation that practically was initiated in England during the 13th century, when the most significant constituent document that limited the royal omnipotence and to implement wider social representation, and later to extend to other countries on the continent, the American continent to be precise in the second half of the 17th century.

The modern term of representation is extracted from the theory of the sovereignty of the parliament imposed in England by the revolution in 1688, as well as in theory of people sovereignty that came from the French bourgeois revolution. But, on the other hand, the representation is connected with the type of mandate of the public representative. Actually, it can be manifested in two forms: **representative and imperative**.

²¹¹ See: **Giovanni Saetori, (1958), Democratic Theory, Greenwood Press, Publishers, WestPoint Connecticut.**

While the legal nature of the representative mandate inevitably comes from the theory of not dividing the people's sovereignty, in that context, the public representatives represent the interests of all the people and not just their voters, the imperative mandate binds public representatives to work in compliance with their voters' will and be constantly responsible for them.

The imperative (tied) mandate is based on the mandatory institution in roman law as a contract in which one side (mandate) authorizes the other side (mandatory) to acts on its behalf, by which it is assumed the right of elector to authorize their representatives who are obliged to respect the voter's right. The imperative mandate was possible in smaller political communities. Until the late 1980's, this mandate was typical for socialist countries. Namely, the law in these countries did not only confirm public representatives are directly responsible through electorate, but also, it guarantees parliamentarians' responsibility to inform the electorate of their individual activities and the activities of the Assembly. In this context, public representatives were recalled from their posts if the electorate was not satisfied with their performance.

The representative mandate is the mandate most applied in democratic states. In compliance with the concept of national sovereignty, public representatives enjoy absolute independence given by their electorate. This mandate in its nature is irreversible during its interval, which means that citizens do not have the right, in case of their own dissatisfaction with the representative's activities, to initiate the procedure to renounce the mandate or to abolish it. Due to that, the mandate is called formal or abstract because the representatives are not obliged to nothing concrete, neither do they have previously defined responsibilities and directions of their own action.

2. CONCEPTUAL DETERMINATION OF ELECTIONS

Elections are a universal phenomenon. The universality of elections is effectuated through their political, constitutional and sociological components. All of them together explain the electoral completeness. The moment when these components get adequate electoral specification is more than significant, because through it the system in one society is being accomplished. In absence of electoral specification, there is a gap in the system as a whole, its parts function in vain.

Elections are a concrete political – legal and technical act of constituting the institutional – organizational structure of the political system in the country. Through them, the people’s will is installed in political life; the elections actually determine the citizen power in conducting and executing national sovereignty²¹² Because of this, it is noted that if there are no elections, there won’t be a “bridge” between those who govern and those being governed, also, there is no democracy.²¹³

The “bridge” aims to connect the two “aspects” of the system in a total number of election process through which the pillars of the political power are organized and selected. The elections are not just a concrete act or action; they are the unity of the political – electoral activities in the country. Organizing elections presumes the existence of structure of political power that comes directly from the citizen’s will. Therefore, it is said that the elections legalize and legitimize

²¹² See: **Geoffrey Brennan, Loren Lomasky (1993), Democracy and Decision, The Pure Theory of Electoral Preference, Cambridge University Press, (p.19-33).**

²¹³ “Although, we still need to consider elections as discontinuous and main act. In the period between elections, the people’s power remains in a state of moratorium, but also in this moment there is a wide line of discretion between the basic electoral possibilities and concrete governmental decisions that follow further...” “Elections are, actually the moment when the expression of election will starts to be measured...” We consider Sartori’s ideas in his work: **Giovanni Sartori, Democratic Theory, Greenwood Press, Publishers, Westport Connecticut, Based o the author’s translation of Democrazia e definizione (2nd edition), II Mulino. Bologna, 1958 (p.73).**

the structure of the government and their decisions, as well as the structure of opposition.

Elections are defined as a complex mechanism through which the different interest of the political parties and the citizens in the political community are joined, standardized and accomplished.

This complexity is manifested at the moment when the verb "election" (originally: eligere), a way to express the idea of election through electing, not through delegation, all the political activities that help the realization of the electoral process are added.

It can be noted that the **conceptual determination of elections as a political phenomenon relies on three significant moments:**

- » **Elections as a model through which citizens express their undoubted will to be governed.** This means that the elections very precisely reflect the connection between the electors, on the one hand, and elected as a carrier of the concrete authorizations and responsibilities, on the other hand. The autonomy of the relation is expressed within the more adequate structuring of power relations between these two aspects of the election process. The way of this relation in great deal depends on the position of the electoral system in the country. Hence, the characteristics of the electoral system generate indications of various considerations in the electoral sphere that vary from interpreting the elections as ritually – fictive, through formal, all the way to central institution in the political system,²¹⁴
- » **Elections as a mechanism of political processes when completed provide an overview of "tech-**

²¹⁴ Actually it refers into three various election concepts: etatistic – elitist, functionalistic and radical – democratic. For all of them more general see the work of: Milan Matic (1990), "Election system and democracy", in the Anthology Elections in terms of multi – party system, Institute for Criminology and Social Research, Belgrade (p. 9-12).'

nology of governing”. Overall political processes in the pre and post-electoral interval makes the normative frame in which different phases are defined, the procedures and terms of realization of the elections, and

- » **Elections as democratic act of selection and organization of the government that distinct all political alternatives in the system.** Elections are a type of corrective machine, whose aim is to stabilize the system in the way that by electing the government, the majority and social groups’ interests are satisfied.

Therefore, elections are a logical product of the idea for political representation of the citizens according to which the people are the original carriers of the government, and the political representative’s legitimate executors of government functions. This means that the elections are not just base to constitute the government in an organizational, technical context, but are more legitimate conformists of the government.

Or more precisely, the elections, to a significant level, are one of the most important legitimate rounds that confirm the political power of the government in the system.

But, they by themselves are not the power.

The elections are considered more as “manufacturers” of the content of the political system and creators of its political life. With their assistance, citizens have real impact on the political structure of the system, because in democratic conditions, elections are the most significant political action that citizens take over from the beginning until the end. All these election aspects are part of the democratic understanding of the participation idea and active participation of citizens in political life. Because of that, it is often said that free and immediate elections make the essence and the meaning of democracy. They are an instrument that forms the “contemplative government”, a government that could be asked to take responsibility by the citizens.

On the other hand, we must not draw wrong conclusion and say that elections, priory, “produce” democracy. On the contrary, they are just one segment of democratic living. Democracy should not be identified with elections, because it is always more than just elections. Elections are concrete moment through which democracy revives its theoretic form. Elections are considered to be the beginning of democratic processes. They represent an act of transferring the citizens’ sovereign will to the establishment.

Elections are a quantitative instrument created to form quality selection. When we choose, we actually make democracy possible.

3. EVOLUTIONARY DIMENSION OF ELECTIONS (SHORT RETROSPECTIVE)

As a starting point in clarifying the evolutionary dimension of elections the thesis that elections are the key of democracy and the most significant political act was accepted which in general manifests the people’s will in the political life, then we will conclude that the start of the most relevant electoral thought or the contemporary electoral idea aroused at the beginning of the 19th century since, actually, the rise of the citizen parliamentary system was initiated, when the first political parties appeared in the modern sense of the word.²¹⁵

²¹⁵ In the 19th century, elections and political parties were divided in a way that is still recognizable today. By enlarging the right to vote in great number, mostly in European and Northern American countries, the number of electorate has increased as well as political parties that represented their various interests. By enlarging the role of the political parties the independent presentation of the electoral candidates became more difficult, party support grew into key moment in getting the electoral success. The development of political parties, in accordance with the classical thinking of political theoreticians, was a result for electoral development. Non – parliamentary organizations (as the political parties were called) were set as a necessary moment for the election democracy to function. Political parties, or those that existed in western democracies, were supposed to complete the following functions: structuring the right to vote, integrating and mobilizing the citizens in the election process, recruiting the political leadership, organizing the government, forming public politics and determining political interests.

In order to make a clear historical intersection of the development of electoral thought and practice, first it is necessary to clarify two moments:

- 1. To find proper time and space dimension of the elections as political category, and**
- 2. Clearly divide the multiple theoretic approaches located in a scientific definition.**

Elections undoubtedly always attracted the attention of theoreticians, starting from Aristotle, Cicero, until present day.

But before we initiate analyzing the opinions and the attitudes of the various theoreticians, it is necessary to explain **space and time dimensions**, the historical continuum of election development because each of the three precisely located phases of election development leave their own tracks when studying this phenomenon.

Therefore, in one vote and with one thought we talk about the elections organized in so called **pre-modern interval of the development of the country and politics** (period in ancient Greece till the beginning of the 18th century), with other during interval of **establishing the modern state and first parliamentary government** (the end of the 18th century and implementing the general right to vote), and today it is completely different, in the era of democracy flourishing and its benefits.

3.1. Elections in ancient Greece

With ancient Greece, or more precisely with ancient Athens, the road of development of elections and the electoral thought was initiated. Although the ancient period is definitively not the election interval in the real democratic sense of the word, it can be confirmed that the background of electoral public decision for the first time in human history is found in this interval.

Simply, Solon and his reforms in Athens made a deep mark on the development of the whole electoral thought in the middle and in the new century.

Thanks to Solon, the citizens of Athens got power to elect their representatives in public services and to call the magistrates to take responsibility.

The real democracy in Athens that was implemented immediately after the tyrannical government of Peisistratos, was presented through the reforms of Klajsten who was known as "the father of the Athens's democracy". The essence of these reforms was reflected in the reorganization of the classes and territorial division of Athens' population. Despite the four classes that were mentioned by Solon, Klajsten created ten artificial clergies according the territorial principle (dividing the citizens who live in the coastal area, cities and centre of Athens).²¹⁶

The benefit of this reform is the moment of increasing the number of citizens who are directly included in the "election process". Through his reforms, Klajsten pointed out the significance of elections as a possibility to "team" the power and to reduce oligarch elements in the government through the new "electoral geometry" that included all the citizens of Athens.

By completing Klajsten's reforms, the people in Athens started to clearly appreciate the active involvement of the citizens in the polis life. Pericles stated that: "In the polis, each individual is interested not just in their own affairs but also the community affairs...we do not say that the person who does not have an interest in politics is a person who only looks after his own interests; we say that it is a person without any interests".

The ballot, or tossing the dice, was the most frequent electoral instrument. Despite the ballot, which was ridiculed as an electoral instrument by famous ancient phi-

²¹⁶ See: **Richard S. Katz (1997), Democracy and Elections, Oxford University Press (p.10-14).**

losophers Xenophon and Socrates, it remained the only electoral method of the government for a long time. Apart from the magistrates who were elected by ballot in ancient Greece, there was a group of elected officials in the public Assembly, known as generals, who were under its constant supervision.

In the ancient city-states, for the first time the difference in the type of election between so-called nominated officials, on the one hand and individuals elected by ballot on the other hand. For example, the members of the Council (Bule) were elected by ballot in the intervals of one year, while the members of the Assembly directly elected some of the magistrates and generals.

Even though it is obvious that in ancient Greece there was a certain way to elect the people's representatives in government, still, the following proposal was necessarily imposed as dilemma – whether in a divided society, where the citizens were free on the one, and slaves were not free on the other side, it is possible to talk about holding elections?

The answer was very simple. The "elections" organized in ancient Greece were fully in compliance with the terms and the conditions of the society in that evolutionary interval. Even though from a distance they were unlike today's modern elections, although, they played the key role in the beginning of the electoral process. In order to understand the meaning of elections in the ancient period, we need to consider the characteristics of Athens democracy, the key characteristic of the Greek democratic culture – the principle of rotation in public services.

By accepting this principle, the supporters democracy of the Athens have not just accepted the difference between the governors and the governed, but at the same time, they viewed the impossibility of two functions to be accomplished by the same subject. In that way, the essence of the key democratic principle was confirmed, according to which the citizens had to be qualified to accomplish both aspects of the political process.

The Athens democracy was almost fully organized and accomplished through the principle of replacement and rotation, while the act of selection was accomplished by applying the ballot. The election with ballot and in certain cases with direct nomination was considered to be single rational electoral solution, although during its implementation there was a possibility of conflict between the freedom of election and the rotation as a principle for its limitation.²¹⁷

3.2. Elections in ancient Rome

Ancient Roman democracy was not even close to the Athens type of democracy. Even Polibie himself, who lived for a long time in Rome in the 2nd century BC, hasn't described the Roman political system as democratic, but as a mixed constitutional system (*memigmene politiea*), with a combination of monarchist, aristocratic and democratic elements.

Historians mostly defined the Roman political system as temocratical, a system in which the prior organizational principles on which it is built are the ownership relations.

In such a mixed system, elections were organized to form three types of electoral assemblies:

- » **The oldest assembly known as comita curuiata,**
- » **Assembly with militant background, dates from the time of the military democracy, known as comita centuriata, and**
- » **The third type, Assembly organized by territorial principle, divided in two parts: concilium plebis and comitia populi tributa.**

It is important to mention that all three types of Assemblies mainly represented the interests of rich people, due to the fact that Rome, from an organizational point of view, had strong oligarchic elements. This was especially obvious in

²¹⁷ See: **James Wycliffe Headlam (1933), Elections by Lot at Athens, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.**

centurion Assemblies where the wealthiest property owners had the right to more votes, but also the privilege of voting first. The advantage of the ballot was crucial due to the fact that the candidate who collected the majority of votes was elected. At the moment when one candidate reached the necessary majority, he was considered elected.

Upper classes always had the privilege to elect their candidate, because the lower classes almost never got the right to vote. So, the necessary majority in almost all the cases was reached from the votes of wealthier people.

Therefore, the elected Assemblies were more likely viewed as gatherings of a certain class of citizens where mainly the voted candidate goals and ideas were presented. The electoral assemblies in Rome did not have advisory character analogically to the Athens assembly (Ecclesia). On the contrary, they were convened by the magistrates that declared for (admissibility) a certain law, election of one or more of the proposed candidates for magistrates, etc.

Because of this it can be concluded that the elections in Rome were more like court proceedings, on the procedure in which opposed candidates "measured" their strength and possibilities, rather than a process of determining public support of the citizens addressed toward the governors.

3.3. Elections in the Middle Ages

After the fall of the Roman Republic, in the Middle Ages, the elections got a completely different dimension.

Namely, in the early Middle Ages there were not any significant experiences and thoughts in the field of election, except those that referred to organizing the elections in churches and monasteries. The church, for the first time since its electoral canons, used the categories relative, absolute and qualified electoral majority, and also the secret ballot as a way to vote.

Although they have certain political meaning, the church elections in the early middle century did not leave any significant mark on the development of the electoral thought, although regarding the time and the character of social developments of that time made certain influence through increased democratization of the system.

For example, the electoral right for the first time was defined in the church canons as the citizen right to participate in social life. The fact that the social life then was completely limited to church life did not decrease the significance and the role of the electoral right of the citizens in this interval.

It is important to say that apart from the electoral organization of the church from formal character, in this interval elected church representatives continued to pull their authority and power from Lord -God and from transferred right on the higher canon officials.

Due to this declarative nature of elections in the early middle ages, in electorate theory is said that the largest part of electoral practice in the Middle century late interval is concentrated, **or so-called pre-parliamentarian interval**, when the elections were fatefully connected with the development of parliamentary institutions (firstly as advisory bodies of the monarch, and afterwards as real representative bodies of the citizens), and representative democracy, in the **parliamentarian interval**, when the strength and the energy of elections in the modern sense of the word came forward.²¹⁸

3.4. Elections in England – development of territorial office

In English history there were **three phases in the development of elections**.

²¹⁸ See: **Bernard Manin (1997), The Principles of Representative Government, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, (p.31).**

The first phase was initiated in the Late Middle Ages and lasted until the beginning of 19th century, or to the huge electoral reforms. **The second phase** is the phase of huge electoral reforms and the struggle to establish the foundation of contemporary democracy and the electoral system. **The third phase** covered the interval of final shaping and improving the electoral system.

Although it was highlighted that parliament and elections are qualitatively mutually conditioned and dependent, however, it can be concluded that the parliament in England occurs a lot earlier than the elections themselves.

Originally, the English parliament from today's context was formed without real elections, or it was created from above, after the King's summon. Some authors highlight that the letter of the King John Lackland that he addressed its sheriffs in 1213 is considered as the initial moment in implementing the principle of parliamentary representation in England.²¹⁹

And in the middle of the 13th century, in the next royal summon letter there were some detailed instructions listed regarding the electoral procedure for electing representatives, it was impossible to discuss the organizing of elections in the modern sense of the word. Even with the summon that King Edward I submitted in 1295 to revive the so-called Model Parliament, finally the foundations of real parliamentary offices were set.

The first legal regulative that stipulated English Parliamentary elections was put in force by adopting **the Law from 1406**, as a response of people discontent with district sheriffs and their obstinate power manifestation. By this law the electoral right was valid for "all the present citizens" in the electoral area. Although, at the beginning it seemed that

²¹⁹ See: **Pole, J.R. (1966), Political Representation in England and the Origins of the American Republic, Berkeley: University of California Press, (p.365).**

it will increase democratic impulse on English ground, very quickly this type of enlargement was viewed exclusively in the interest of the lords and their loyalists. That was the reason; this law was abolished in 1430 and replaced with a new one. Despite the previous, the new law maximally "limited the electoral right".

The law of 1430 implemented the majority of ballot principle, but not in the interest of counting votes, but in the interest of confirming candidate abilities and qualifications. Therefore, these rules were not given competitive character. Long afterward, they were not rules with democratic overtone, which was considered a completely normal thing, if we consider the fact that in a large number of districts the reputation of the family had primarily meaning in getting one or more posts in the representative body. That meant that in this interval the elections were highly oligarchic.

A certain democratic shift in the electoral regulative was observed in the 18th century, when the process of running for representative posts in the representative body was expanded over the whole territory of England, not just within the districts, and when the role of the House of Commons was changed and leveled with the role of the lords and the King as representatives that carried out people's will.

All of this had a strong impact to the conception of the electoral system. Increased role of the House of Commons unavoidably required its transformation into a "Creative Assembly", apart the role of so called "ambassador's congress". The first step in accomplishing this idea was made by adopting the famous **Electoral reform law in 1832**, which practically marked the beginning of the second development phase of the electoral development in England.

In the series of huge reform laws, which practically marked the initiation of the third development phase of English elections, the following is listed: electoral laws since 1867

that expanded the right to vote to one million additional voters, then the laws in 1884, 1918 and 1928. With the last law in 1928, the women finally acquired the legally protected right to vote as individually and legally guaranteed right.²²⁰

Later, with the laws in 1948 and 1949 (Representation of the People Acts) all the inconsistencies and anomalies in the election process were removed. Practically, they initiated the real democratization of the elections in England.

3.5. France-an example of electoral radicalism

In France, as well as in the example with England, election development was in close correlation with the development of electoral right. In fact, the electoral evolution in this country hugely depended on the evolution and the quality to realize the electoral right of the French citizen. Although it was expected that the French revolution would widely promote and establish the general right to vote, that, however, did not happen. On the post-revolutionary elections for the existing National assembly the right to vote was limited by implementing the so-called property census, through exclusion of the lowest social groups in the election process, with an explanation that their position and status in the system makes them overtly dependent on the political will of the higher classes (this was group of citizens such as servants, priests, etc.).²²¹

By enacting the popular Decree for the first time, in August 1792, the **so-called “universal right to vote”** was applied, by which the number of voters increased.

However, the right to vote was conditioned, especially the right to be elected for the people representative with **so-called marc d’argent (or more precisely equivalent to 500 daily salaries which each candidate** for MP should be

²²⁰ See: **Baily, D.S. (1964), British Parliamentary Democracy, George G. Harrparand Co Ltd, London, (p.56-57).**

²²¹ See: **Dahl, R.(1971), Polyarchy, Participation and Opposition, New Haven, Yale University Press, (p. 34-35).**

capable to pay in order to be able to be a candidate for this prestigious function) inserted huge misunderstandings and controversies.

The evolution of elections in France also actualized the system of mediate vote (indirect elections) as a mechanism of selecting eminent citizens for electoral process. The request for further precision of the general right to vote, as well as the concluded demand to replace the direct with the indirect elections, were actualized with the Montanjari Constitution in 1793.

Evaluation of elections and the development of electoral rights in France was especially actual by inclusion of limitations on the right to vote (interval between 1830-1848). Releasing the right to vote in any forms of conditions was completely expressed by the end of the World War II, when women got their own unlimited right to vote for the first time.

3.6. Development of the elections in the US

The US is a country in which the election proposal and participation of the citizens is highlighted and treated. Moreover, this proposal was high in the scientific attention, in forming the American political system, during the realization of the developmental process of citizen representative democracy.

From a theoretical aspect, the development of elections and the electoral right in the US derives mostly from the Declaration of Independence from 1776, the US Constitution from 1787, and implementation of some other important documents, above all, of the Philadelphia Conference. The most interesting disputes in America were held regarding the regulation and placement of the electoral right through implementing various censuses and the need to minimize the limitation.

This directly means that in the US, as well as in the other previously listed countries, the development of the electoral

right and elections were in direct correlation with the dilemma and the proposal for their universality. The process of introducing equal electoral right was initiated more openly and was felt in the first decades of the 19th century, although it is necessary to highlight that the unity over electoral right was not properly attended to all citizens, especially not people from the black population.²²²

But, what especially attracted the attention of theoreticians and scientific researchers in the US was the fact that this state, apart from England, has overcome the problem with the property census more simplified in accomplishing the electoral right. Although this overcoming was slow and successive due to different thoughts referred to this address it happened without any bigger system shocks. For example, the so-called Special Committee (Committee of Details, formed directly after adopting the US Constitution), adopted special instructions to apply the ownership clause and its connection in accomplishing the double dimension of the electoral right (active and passive).

The arguments given on behalf of this relation moved from highlighting the need of economic independence of carriers of political power (especially those in the sphere of executive government), as the basic mechanism was released from all types of corruption acts and activities, until the thoughts of the right of ownership as fundamental right of each citizen.

Regardless if the way ownership is being treated, the Special Committee representatives unanimously agreed that the government representatives must own certain property, as well as be ranked socially higher than voters.

The connection of the property status with the electoral right was left at the political scene as a subject of dispute and controversy for a long period. Although the property

²²² See: **Porter H.K. (1918), A History of Suffrage in the United States, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.**

census as a main precondition in implementing the electoral right was not stipulated in the US Constitution in 1787, although, the delegates who voted tacitly supported the correlation between property ownership of those who are elected, on the one, and the electoral rights of the citizen voters, on the other hand.²²³

Despite this moment, to properly understand the development of the electoral right in America, the issue of fragmented electoral legislation had enormous meaning (federal legislation, on one, and legislation of separate federative units, on the other hand), although in practice, there were several attempts from the federal administration to get all the competences related to organizing and implementing elections.

4. ELECTORAL FUNCTIONS

Elections are a complex and complicated mechanism of actions, processes and activities that in a common way can be defined as a "formal act of electing individuals for certain state functions or any kind of position, through giving electoral support by the voters". But, elections are also defined as a democratic act, and then as control of the government as a whole.

In the interspaces, which are not defined, other numerous processes and activities are contained and reach the essence of this phenomenon. That base also contains proposals that refer to the functions of elections as a moving force of all the activities, actions, processes and procedures that make the essence of the electoral process. These functions make the formal side of the elections. The functions of the elections determine also the descriptive side of the electoral act itself by representatives in the system of the government.

²²³ See: **John Elliot (1988), The Debates in the Several State Conventions on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution as Recommended by the General Convention at Philadelphia, New York: Burt Franklin, New York.**

The function of elections is connected with certain criteria, which they determine themselves, during which the most significant valuable determinants are listed as political, institutional and social conditions that exist in one country. In a political system, where the institutional and social conditions exist in one country understood in wider sense of the word, the proposal of the political (in)stability of the country from the aspect of its (un)fragmentation is of crucial significance. On the other hand, social conditions determine functions of elections through (non)existence of social (non)antagonisms, which happen between social, ethnical, interest, and other groups that exist in society.

Hence, we accept the conclusion of Ditter Nolen that in the process of determining the functions of the elections, three structured factors play key roles:

- » **The character of the social structure – its bigger or smaller diversification;**
- » **The character of the political system – whether we consider the presidential, parliamentary or mixed system of governmental organization; and**
- » **The character and the structure of the party system.**

These three factors ease or complicate the realization of the following significant functions of an election:

- » **Function of legitimacy** (legitimacy, or support for the carriers of the political government),
- » **Function of selection, electing and appointing the selected candidates for concrete functions in the state institutions,**
- » **Function of direct and intermediate participation of the citizens in the system of government,** and
- » **Function of representation** (the voters get the chance to be heard and to state their opinion about the conditions within and around the government).²²⁴

²²⁴ See: **Dieter Nohlen (1992), Electoral right and Part constitution, School book, Zagreb, (p. 20-23).**

The first and maybe most important function of elections is the **function of legitimacy** or legitimize the position of the carriers of the government within the system. Organizing the elections arouses the proposal of legitimacy, or their admissibility by the people, as well as the proposal of their democracy. Through elections the legitimacy of the system is "awarded" or "provided" as a whole, because through them, the people were directed to think and to act in a certain way. Regular elections (in accordance with the law and provided procedures) get the legitimate support from the people. The legitimacy of the elections considers their democracy, because holding elections does not mean application of the democratic rules and mechanisms for their implementation. **Hence, there is a rule that each legitimate electoral process is also democratic.** But, there is a dilemma whether each democratic process or democratic system is legitimate by itself, or whether the holding of the elections is sufficient confirmation for their legitimacy?

Democratic elections are neither (in the sense of proper implementation of the legal provisions and procedures) sufficient, nor the only moment which provide electoral legitimacy. The legitimacy of elections requires the inclusion of broader considerations over democracy. The wider concept of electoral legitimacy covers the thinking dimension of those who confirm it.

Therefore, electoral legitimacy is connected with the moment of like-minded, or **accepting certain electoral countries by the citizen in the same way.** On the other hand, (un)acceptance of electoral conditions by the candidates on election day is closely **connected with the moment of responsiveness** (or interest) of citizens for the proposed political programs and electing the political parties that are competing in the electoral race. While the degree of connection between electoral legitimacy and voter response is not always proportional. For example, high voter turnout does not always

imply high level of electoral legitimacy of the elected government representatives. And low response cannot determine the positive way of the legitimacy in the system.

It can be concluded that only a certain middle variant that includes the so-called "satisfactory" voter's response, on the one, and the electoral right of the voters to choose from the offered variants (the participation of more political parties on the elections), on the other hand, the electoral legitimacy of the future carrier of the government can be confirmed. The second function of elections is closely connected with the first one and refers to the **process of selection, election and places the elected candidates on function posts in state institutions.**

The final goal of all elections is to perform the personnel teams of the state institutions and bodies with efficient implementation of the winning electoral program. The level of success of the electoral system also influences the success of functioning of the whole political system. Actually, the moment connected with the achievement of the final goal on the elections is the real criteria of evaluation the success of the electoral system itself. Very often, an inability of the actual government to set and organize institutional structures in the system is justified by inconsistency or imprecision of the electoral system, as argument repeal the functioning of the electoral system. That is why, the successful realization of this function of the elections is considered as valuable criteria that is used to verify the success of the whole system. On the other hand, the selection, the election and realization of this electoral function is not always connected only and solely with the citizens or the electoral candidates. During elections, the citizens also decide the (un)acceptance of some concrete party politics. That is why an election can be successfully accomplished only if they are ready to answer positively both targets: election of individuals and the election of a concrete winning policy.

The third function of an election is **direct and immediate participation of citizens in the system of government**, or inclusion of citizens in the system of government

The success of this function is also directly connected with the successful implementation of the two previous functions, and to mention that it has its own original and independent value. Originality is perceived in the option that is given to citizens for their direct participation in the **decision-making process**. During that, it has to be noted that the post electoral value is considered, which in order to have successful realization, is necessarily added to the activities and processes that happen in the pre-electoral phase. Citizen's participation in the system of government contains several mutually dependent valuable aspects. The successful realization of each valuable aspect leads to a more successful finalization of this electoral function.

So, for example, a successfully accomplished electoral candidate campaign is determined among the other and the success in the medium sphere from which the citizens are informed for and about the problems in politics. The electoral campaigns initiate participative power of the citizens and their wish for bigger or smaller involvement in politics. Or, for example, the act that the ballot is nothing else than an immediate act of expressing the will of the citizens, through which they directly participate in creating the political system.

Participation, such as electoral function does not only give concrete rights, but also responsibilities of the citizens. The bigger its power is within the system, or how successfully is accomplished, the bigger the responsibility of the citizens is in the system.

The level to which citizens take responsibilities in society depends on whether the positive or the negative side of this election function will prevail in the system. If citizens are le-

thargic and uninterested in the final result of the elections, then certainly the negative side of the participation will prevail, or various forms of "enforced" taking of responsibility for conditions in the government. If citizens are motivated and active in creating the government, then it is clear that the positive side of the electoral function will be defined.

In this electoral function, representation is being formed that is perceived through the chance of the voters, to directly define their opinion about the conditions within and about the government. Representation is not just electoral function through which the personal or private moment of an election is defined. This function is much more attached to the interval in which one individual represents the interests of the others, or the proposal for the electoral mandate. The proposal of representing citizens and their interests in society is in direct relation with the development of political parties as basic cells in the representative system. The election between the competitive political parties reveals the meaning of representing as electoral function. Political parties define the structure and the quality of the electoral contest in a direct way.

They are an inevitable segment of elections.

CHAPTER 3



BASIC REMARKS ON THE ELECTORAL SYSTEM



1. ELECTORAL SYSTEM – CONCEPT AND DEFINITION

The first unanimously accepted opinion among the theoreticians who study the electoral proposals is that the electoral system is defined as the most essential element in the political system of each country. The electoral system is the system in which and around which the disputes between the key political forces in the country are accumulated and oversized.

That is why, shaping the electoral system is one of the most significant institutional decisions for each democratic country, although, as from today's point of view it is perceived and studied, it happens very rarely that the electoral system is shaped and organized on purpose and with advanced solutions for all its key parts. Mostly, in the Electoral Theory the electoral system is viewed as a result of some concrete demand (as pre election activity of the carriers of the government), as combination of certain conditions (mostly (miss) use the political vacuum before the elections), although there are such ideas that propose that the short political interests should not be prior in determining and dimensioning the long term electoral system consequences.

Because of this, the theoreticians that study the obstacles of the electoral system are unanimous in their attitude that the background of changing, completion or clarification of the electoral system, as well as social conditions that exist at the moment when all of the these is accomplished, are in fact, much more significant proposals rather the act of its changing, shaping or specifying.

Very often, the theoreticians point sharp critics toward the creators of the electoral system because of insufficient knowledge of electoral problems, unawareness of the political actors that are directly involved in the process of shaping the electoral system, but and because of the abuse of the posi-

tion of power in creating the electoral system pointed toward “operationalization” of the narrow party interests without considering the interests of the society and the state.²²⁵

The second proposal for which there is theoretical unanimity is the proposal of defining and conceptualizing the electoral system. There is compliance that the electoral system should be defined in two ways: **in narrow and in wider sense.**

The electoral system in narrow sense can be defined as a system, which provides “transfer”, or transport of the electoral results in MP mandates in interests of one or more political parties, the independent candidates that won these votes.

The electoral system in narrow sense is much more limited as a concept of electoral rules concepts as wider set of rules that refer to the elections: running rules, administering the election rules, financing election rules, rules for leading electoral campaign etc. These rules should not be mixed with the electoral system in narrow sense.

The electoral system in narrow sense of the word is nothing else than legally regulated technique, or a way to transform the electoral votes in MPs or other type of mandates. That means that the accent is put on the formula, model or the technique of counting the votes and their transfer into the mandates.

The electoral system in **wider sense of the word covers the rules and procedures that refer to all electoral procedures, including the electoral right of the citizens. The electoral system in wider sense covers all the rules that regulate the proposals connected with the electoral organization.** There are rules for announcing elections, defining the day of the elections, setting the candidate’s lists of the parties and independent candidates, record and update the electoral list in the country, rules for organizing and func-

²²⁵ See: **Administration and Cost of Electronics, ACE Project CD – ROM.**

tioning of the electoral administration, running the electoral campaign, rules for media presentation of the candidates, rules for protection of the electoral right, the rules for financing the electoral campaign, rules for submitting objection and lawsuit after the end of the electoral process, the rules to officialize the electoral results etc.

All this leads to conclusion that the electoral system in wider sense is very complicated and complex mechanism of rules, procedures, processes, activities and acts. The established concept of content of the electoral system is largely a reflection of the formal side; they have strong influence on other spheres from electoral and political contest.

2. ELECTORAL SYSTEM IN NARROW SENSE OF THE WORD – COMPONENTS AND POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS

The electoral system in narrow sense of the word is nothing else and nothing more than a system in which the rules of regulating the electoral formulas are covered, or electoral models that help initially to collect electoral votes, and later the same “overturn” in concrete mandates. The electoral formula or electoral models are defined as a rule, or as a principle for the distribution of electoral votes and their transformation in mandates in concrete governmental institutions.

In electoral theory, the division of the electoral models according to the adopted criteria for allocating mandates has been accepted. Therefore, it is considered that there are four most significant electoral models:

- a) Majority electoral model** (the popular electoral model First-Past-The- Post System, an electoral model with two election turns and an alternative election model).
- b) Semi proportional election model** (model of separate nontransferable vote (SNTV) and a parallel election model).

- c) **Proportional election model** (model of the largest remaining, model of the highest average, Donte model).
- d) **Mixed election model** (model of separate transferable vote (Single- Transferable Vote) and other sub variants).²²⁶

2.1. Majority election model (plural election model (First-Past-The-Post-System), election model in two election rounds and an alternative election model)

2.1.1. Plural election model (First-Past-The-Post-System)

The majority election system is the oldest system, dating from the 12th century. At the same time, it is considered to be the simplest electoral system. Depending on the necessary majority to win the mandate, the majority election model is divided to: a model with plural (relative) majority and a model with an absolute majority (50+1) of won votes to get the mandate.

The plural election model (system), also known in theory as "First-Past-The-Post-System", is the simplest variant that generally appears in the electoral theory and practice.²²⁷

The simplicity of this system is seen in the process of ballot, as well as in the process of determining the election result. The states are divided on single mandate electoral units, as there are a total number of elected candidates in the representative body. What the voter should do when he gets the ballot-paper is to circle (just once), or in the other form to clearly and undoubtedly mark the chosen candidate and put it into the ballot

²²⁶ See: **The Report of the Independent Commission on the ballot System**, <http://www.official-documents.co.uk./document/crn40/4090/contents.htm>, **October, 1998.**

²²⁷ This system is applied in the United Kingdom, USA, Canada, India, Bangladesh, Philippines, Zambia, Nepal Thailand and Chile.

box. The voter has the right to one selection only, to choose one candidate because the plural electoral system is applied in single- mandatory electoral units. In certain cases, this system can be applied in multi-mandatory electoral units.

When the ballot is finished, the candidate that won the most votes from the total number of votes entitled in one electoral unit is announced a winner, or has won more votes than other candidates, regardless the percentage he got, or the character of the won majority of votes (relatively or absolutely).

This model has certain advantages:

- » **Simplicity** in applying, for the voters as well as for the vote counters. Citizens vote for the candidate, not for the political party. This system is easy to understand, the ballot is simple, and ballot results are received faster compared to other systems, with the guarantee that they will not contain large mistakes in the calculation process;
- » **Stability and transparency** in representing and in **forming a stable government**. This electoral system forces single-party government. If its work disappoints the voters, they will easily hold it accountable rather than any other government created in another way;
- » **It imposes two – party system, or system position – opposition** where the two largest political parties mostly change its place in the system. In longer period this system is fair for the two largest parties (the example with the American and British system). This electoral model does not create conditions for successful interference of third or fourth in the electoral contest, and the smaller and the extremist parties are especially unsuccessful;
- » It **provides creating coherent parliamentary opposition**.

On the other hand, according to electoral theoreticians these advantages can be considered as **disadvantages of the system**. For example, a two party dominance on the political scene can threaten the interests of various minorities or ethnic groups that live in the country. Given the fact that often the big parties do not have large interests to represent their requirements, leads to endangering the principle of representation, which is considered to be a basic democratic principle, which the plural election model looks after to protect.

Also, the problem that arises is the proposal of how much this model indeed creates coherent parliamentary opposition as we consider the imposed "oppositional" role of the party, which has not won sufficient number of mandates to form the government. The issue regarding the governmental stability is questionable, as well as the stability of the political system, as their stability depends on to the implementation of the pluralist electoral model. Complexity and successfulness of the government as an institution, on the one, as well as the functioning of the whole political system on the other hand, cannot be measured based only on the application of this electoral model.

In electoral theory, the main disadvantages of this system are:

- » The interests of **the small parties, especially minority parties or endangered social groups, are minimized with this system**. The votes of their supporters are often considered as lost votes, in this way they are excluded from the process called "fair representation". This system neglects opinions of minority groups
- » **The plural system produces a disproportion of the total electoral results, as well as a huge number of "lost votes" that do not go on the account of either candidates in the electoral race**. The total number of votes of the winning party is proportionally lower than the number of MPs mandates won

- » The plural system creates a tendency to replace the votes in mandates in an arbitrary and incorrect manner from many aspects:
 - a) The party that forms the majority in the government has very rarely won the majority of votes;
 - b) The party that forms the government usually wins a lower number of the total votes of the voters, but still there are a great number of mandates in the representative body from the opposition party;
 - c) The party that did not win more than the same number of votes with other party can end up with fewer mandates in the representative body (the tendency of the plural system to create a single party majority government, due to some opinions, can be considered an advantage).²²⁸

Due to this system, during the formation of the government, party contribution in the number of elected votes is not considered, but rather the party division of the parliamentary mandates. So, the government can be elected without the majority of the votes of the voters, even if they have the parliamentary majority behind them;

The creation of the so-called "regional feuds", where a single party can get all the mandates in the representative body. The plural system can reward regionally strong parties and punish nationally weak ones, but it can discriminate against some parties because of their failure to provide adequate conditions for a "fair" allocation of the mandates. Mostly, all the other parties pay the electoral account with diffusely divided national support, or with very small regionally concentrated support. Most of the candidates, in terms of applying the plural system, are not elected from the electorate by absolute majority, because the majority of the voters do not support the candidate who won their electoral unit.

²²⁸ See: **Blais Andre (1991), The Debate Over Electoral Systems International Political Science Review, No.12, (p. 239-261).**

Taking into consideration the previously mentioned insufficiencies of the plural system (or more popularly called FPTP system), that is still part of the English electoral legislation; election experts in this country have made efforts for electoral reform in this country, in context of:

- » The political system failure of Stormont in Northern Ireland,
- » Great Britain's admission to the European Union (present EU), and
- » Devolution discussion.

Part of the British government measures to decrease local tensions in Northern Ireland were directed toward promoting the electoral system with separate transferable votes, or implementing it in all provincial elections, except for Westminster. The next pressure for including the proportional electoral system in Great Britain came after its admission to the European Union (present EU) that coincided with disputes for inclusion of the joint electoral rules in all member-countries during the direct election of its members for the European Parliament. And the third significant pressure in promoting the proportional system in Great Britain was made during the opening of the proposal over devolution of Scotland and Wales.

The Commission Report over the Kilbrandon Constitution is the most important thing to be mentioned (Kilbrandon Commission on the Constitution) adopted in 1973, in which the electoral systems were proposed with separate transferable vote and with alternative vote, as a possible replacement of the present plural electoral system, but these proposals were not listed in the Devolution Contract in 1977. But in 1976, the organization called Hansard Society organized the Commission for electoral reform, that proposed the German version of the electoral system, or $\frac{3}{4}$ from the representatives in the House of Commons to be elected in single mandatory electoral units, while the others to be elected on regional lists. It is interesting to mention that in Great Britain interest for the electoral reform issue is constantly increasing.

With the so-called Charter 88, the Liberal and the Labor party in Great Britain opened and supported the issue of the Constitutional reform, promoting the proportional electoral system. In 1990, the Labor party organized an intraparty work group over the proposal of electoral reform, lead by eminent the professor Raymond Plant which was a source for certain electoral solutions for election of members of the reformed second home and regional assemblies. Plant's committee suggested the proportional electoral system for electing members in the Scottish representative bodies, as well as numerous recommendations in favor of the proportional system for election of members in the House of Commons. But, the final results from these recommendations were not fully encouraging, because the Liberals could not fully predict whether the effects from the implementation of the proportional system will be concrete, or whether the implementation of this system will mean complete rejection of the possibility to form another Labor government. In 1993, the Plant's Committee has enacted numerous recommendations for small alteration of Great Britain election system, or implementing an additional ballot (a system similar to alternative ballot that is being applied in Australia). But, the Hon. Smith (the Labor leader), although in favor of the referendum declaration of the voter over this issue, rejected such proposals and once more opened the possibility for changing the existing system with proportional.

In this context, recently, an independent commission of the electoral system in Great Britain made a report containing numerous interesting recommendations and conclusions on the topic – the British electoral system. The main recommendation contained in this report is that the best solution for Britain is for the current plural system to be replaced with the majority system in two electoral rounds. The majority of the members in the representative body (80-85%) to be further elected in single mandatory electoral units, while for the other members the corrective method to be implemented with the party lists that in significant extent will decrease the dispro-

portion of the votes and geographical division that were treated as weaknesses of the plural system. In the electoral units where the mixed system that is being applied is suggested by the members of the representative body to be elected with the system of the alternative vote.

It is necessary to mention that apart from numerous tendencies in directing the changes in the electoral system, Great Britain stands as a country that applies the plural system without any single alteration. Simply, all the offered solutions for the electoral reformers, especially those from Tony Blair's government and the Labor party, were left without practical realization and results.

2.1.2. Electoral model in two electoral rounds and alternative electoral model

The theory in the group of majority electoral systems also includes:

- » Electoral systems in two electoral rounds, or the so-called runoff system, and
- » System of alternative vote

The base point of distinguishing between these two variants of the majority and plural FPTP – electoral system is in the “electoral formula” and in the differences in “ballot structure”. The electoral system in two electoral rounds or the so-called runoff system and system of alternative vote are considered as a compromise solution by those who want to imply certain improvements in the plural system, but those that were not supporters of the system of proportional representation. Actually, both systems are options that emerged to offer improvement of the plural system.

Both systems function within single mandatory units. The main difference between them is that the **system of alternative vote** allows the electorate to establish the order of

their first, second, third, etc. selection, whether if none of the candidates did not win 50% of the votes, then automatically the candidates are eliminated with at least “first preferences”, where on the ballot paper on which that candidate was the first it is being checked who is second best placed candidate. These votes are given to the rest of the candidates in accordance with the order marked on the ballot paper.²²⁹

The process is repeated should one candidate fail to win the absolute majority, and automatically becomes elected. Because of this moment, the system of alternative vote is classified in the group of absolutely majority systems, because the candidate should win absolutely, not a relative majority of votes, in order to be announced as a winner. The system of alternative vote is an unusual electoral system that is presently applied only in Australia, and in modified form in Fiji. One of the advantages of the vote transfer is in the possibility of several candidates with similar programs to accumulate their interests, during which the various candidates are connected. This model provides supporters of candidates with fewer chances to win to be marked as second, third, etc. selection, and to influence the selection of the winning candidate.

Because of this, it is thought that this system is the best for deeply divided societies, because it leads the candidates to fight for support, not just from their supporters, but also for the “second preferences”, to other candidates. In order to win these preferences, candidates must represent broad and moderate views during the electoral campaign, and not extreme or radical ones. Implementation of this system in Australia confirms this conclusion.

Normally in this country, before elections, the leading parties attempt to reach agreement with the smaller parties for the second preferences of their voters. Because of this, the system is known as a “swap with preferences” system.

²²⁹ See: **Kilcullen, R.J., Electoral Systems, Macquarie University,** <http://www.mq.edu.au/hpp/Ockham/y67xan2.html>.

This system has its own insufficiencies. First, in order to be efficiently implemented, the alternative vote requires a reasonable level of electoral literacy of voters. Second, the level of cohesive behavior of the candidates that this system can promote is problematic in terms of deeply divided societies in which ethnic groups are concentrated in certain geographical areas. On the third side, the experiences from implementation of this system in Australia and in the Papua New Guinea show that the system encourages the moderate center politics and provides compilation of various interests in concrete social society.

The majority electoral system with absolute majority means the winner of the elections is considered the candidate who has won more than half (50+1%) of the total number of votes of the voters listed in the electoral register for the electoral unit, or absolute majority of the voters that voted. Such victory in the first electoral round is almost impossible to achieve, and because of that, the second election round is organized in one of **two possible ways**:

- » The first way provides the first two candidates who won most votes in the first round to enter the second election round, where the winner of the second round will be elected between the two candidates. The winner of the second election round according to this tougher variant, will be considered the candidate who won the absolute majority of votes (50+1%) from the total number of voters that voted, and
- » The second way that relatives the toughness of the previous one, provided that in the second electoral round only those candidates that in the first electoral round have won more votes in accordance with the legal percentage will participate.

The winner is the candidate who won most votes, or more votes than the rest of the 2candidates in the electoral unit (**majority electoral system with relative majority**).

One characteristic of both previously mentioned variants of the majority electoral system (with absolute and relative majority) is that elections are organized in two electoral circles, if the required majority is not achieved in the first electoral circle. The electoral system in two election rounds is applied in France, Belgium, as well as in presidential elections in the Republic of Slovenia, Austria, Finland, Portugal, Russia, and Poland, etc. This system is also used in parliamentary elections in over 30 national parliaments of the countries that were, in a certain way, historically under French influence.

In parliamentary elections in France, if the candidate has won more than 50% of the votes in the first electoral round the candidate is considered elected, there is no need to go into the second round of elections. If none of the candidates won such a majority, then the second electoral round is organized one or two weeks later. Only those candidates who won the minimal percentage of the votes (12,5% the votes of the total number of listed voters in the electoral register) have the right to enter the second round.

The fact that French voters have two possibilities for electing a candidate means the electorate itself as a whole ranks the candidates who is the first candidate who is the second of their selection. In this sense, the electoral system in two electoral rounds has certain mutual characteristics with preferential systems, as the system of alternative vote (AV) or the system of separate transferable vote (STV).

However, the electoral system in two election rounds has two unique characteristics:

First, this system in the second electoral round in the electoral race disqualifies certain parties and candidates, and **second**, this system allows the voters to change opinion between the two electoral rounds in order to decide whom to give their trust as the result of parties (re) groups that are possible during the electoral process.

Giovanni Sartori promoted the electoral system in two electoral rounds as the best offered electoral system, in the sense that this system allows voters to vote again. In all the other electoral systems, voters have the right not just to single poll on the polling station and only single poll (whether the re-runs or additional elections are not considered). The electoral system in two electoral rounds offers double election possibility.

In accordance with the thoughts of those that support this system, its basic advantages are:

- » This system supports the traditions of representing the electoral unit according to the principle of single mandatory electoral unit. In France, for example, (the fifth French Republic) this system created relatively good results referring to the issue of governmental stability, incorporating strong parliamentary majorities;
- » This system is easy to understand, and even easier to use;
- » The basic target of elections that are organized in two election rounds is to concentrate and to consolidate support behind the winner, as well as to encourage the process of establishing wide inter-party coalitions and unions in the final phase of the campaign.

On the other hand, the mostly mentioned insufficiencies of this system are the following:

- » Small parties are discouraged in the electoral race, especially those that lack bigger geographical concentration of voters who are their supporters;
- » This system creates additional difficulty for the voters to vote in the two election rounds, and because of that there is a drastic turn over in the voters' response between the first and the second electoral round;
- » This system also creates a huge disproportion between the votes won and the appointed mandates, etc.

The so-called system of alternative vote appears as proportional variant of the majority electoral system. The creator of this system is W.R. Ware ²³⁰, professor at the Technological Institute in Massachusetts, which he created in 1870. The system of alternative vote is used for electing representatives in the Australian Representative House and the Presidential elections in Ireland.

According to this system, instead of two separate electoral procedures (two electoral rounds) and two ballots that exist in double round poll, those activities, in variant of alternative poll, are joined in single poll and in single ballot.

It seems that the name of this system is somehow unhappily chosen, because it is not about establishing a vote model, but a model for counting votes.

In theory, the system of alternative vote is explained as follows. Each voter has the right to single first choice and few other preferences that he should mark with a number in front of the serial number, or before name and the surname of the listed candidates.

Their first choice or favorite candidate the voter marks it with number 1 that he puts it in front of their name or surname, while its second, third, etc. preference, also clearly and undoubtedly marks it at the ballot paper.

After collecting the votes from all the ballot papers, they are counted and it is being determined which candidate won the absolute majority (more than 50%) from the first preferences, or from the first choice. Whether a single candidate has won the necessary majority of the first preferences or selections, he is declared as winner, while the other preferences are neglected.

At first, this system seems to be more concrete than any other system that we have viewed so far. Apart from the plu-

²³⁰ See: **Farrell, David, McAllister Ian, Legislative Recruitment to Upper Houses: The Australian Senate and House of Representatives Compared, Journal of Legislative Studies, No.1, (p.243-263).**

ral system, and in the certain cases the electoral system in two electoral rounds, with the system of alternative votes the elected candidate wins a larger number of votes apart all the other candidates together.

According to the system of alternative vote, the candidates should win support not just of their supporters, but the supporters of the other candidates. In the so-called divided societies, where the candidate requires support from other ethnic groups in order to win the elections, this system can be a strong encouragement of the integrative processes, because all the candidates have interests to get to this groups in search for their second choice (second preference).

This system also provides the electors greater selection of candidates that will represent their interests. If that does not happen with their first chosen candidate, they have the possibility to elect a second one. This means that the electoral system with alternative vote produces a lot less "lost votes" in the electoral units, or much more electors potentially influence the creation of the electoral result. This condition can encourage increased response of the electors, as well as the participation of the citizens in the elections.

On the other hand, because elections are held on one day, there is not a possibility or enough time, as is the case with the electoral system in two election rounds, for the parties to use manipulative strategies in order to increase their "prey". Simply, there is not a second circle so they can arrange and apply the same.

Apart from all these advantages, the system of alternative vote has certain insufficiencies, such as: danger from the possible appearance of a great number of void ballot papers and, based on that numerous lost votes; the opinion that this system creates a "more democratic" result is more than disputable, because its use is disrupted by the act of ballot, but also with the procedure of counting the votes.

Namely, this system directs the political machineries to distribute the so-called maps “how to vote, and how to elect the other preferences” directly to the voters. As the most mentioned insufficiency of this electoral system is the fact that it causes systematic discrimination of those candidates who are at the lower part of the ballot paper in order to create effective government for the winner, etc.

2.2. Semi-proportional electoral models (separate non-transferable vote and parallel systems)

Semi-proportional electoral systems offer different electoral solutions apart the previously mentioned electoral systems. Namely, those are systems that “interpret” votes into mandates in the manner that is somewhere between the proportionality of pure proportional systems and the principle of majority in majority systems.

Otherwise, two most applied semi-proportional electoral systems are: **the system of single non-transferable vote and the parallel systems.**

The system of single non-transferable vote is completely different from the system of alternative vote, because each voter has the right, (without the possibility of more preferences) to give their vote only to one single candidate, although it covers more mandatory electoral units.

The voter has the opportunity to vote only for a single candidate listed on the party candidates’ list. Those candidates that have the largest number of votes fill the MPs seats. For example, in the electoral unit where four candidates should be elected, it is enough for a single candidate to win more than 20% of the votes in order to win the elections. Elections that are organized by this electoral system look like a real contest not just between the parties, but between candidates from the same party. This means that the election “battle”, which can be created among more candidates in the same party, can produce an intraparty fragmentation.

The most significant difference that exists between the system of single non-transferable vote and the majority electoral systems is that the first one is much more capable of facilitating the introduction of small parties. But on the other hand, parties with 10% electorate support, whose voters are allocated in the country, may not win a single mandate, at the account of the bigger parties. Given the fact that this system offers voters one possibility to vote, it gives bigger incentive for the political parties to address a large number of voters in a more adequate manner. As long as parties have the support from a constant percentage of voters, they will be able to win mandates without any need to address "other voters".

And in the end, this system requires parties to prepare complex programs and approaches not just to the process of nomination, but also in managing the elections. Announcing the bigger number of party candidates in the elections can also be unproductive as in the case of announcing the lowest number of candidates. The need to discipline party voters in sense of their equal vote allocation to all party candidates in the country is the most significant when this electoral model is applied.

According to Lijphart, the biggest advantages of the system of the single non-transferable vote are:

- » Its simplicity, and
- » Ballot for certain candidates as a selection from the party list of candidates.

For small parties, an extra benefit is that this system usually creates minority representatives. On the other hand, for bigger parties, the largest challenge for this system is that it avoids announcing a bigger number of party candidates (or losing the mandates) and announcing a smaller number of candidates (or losing votes).²³¹

²³¹ See: **Arend Lijphart, PR vs. Single-Member Districts in States, Testimony before the California State Legislature**, <http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/polit/damy/lijphart.htm>.

This system was applied in the Taiwanese parliamentary elections, the Japanese elections for the representatives of the House of Commons 1948-1993, in the elections in Jordan, etc.

Parallel systems are systems that use the party proportional lists and the so-called electoral units in which “the winner gets it all”. **According to this system, the parties’ proportional lists do not compensate any disproportion that may appear in the majority of electoral units.**

These systems are used in 20 countries. They are considered as a solid option. The Russian electoral system is the classic example of the parallel electoral system, because 225 MPs are elected according to the proportional system on regional party lists, while the other 225 MPs are elected in single member electoral units according to the plural electoral system (the Russian Duma consists of 450 representatives). Only Russia and Andorra have a balanced division of mandates (50/50) which are elected according to the proportional system of party lists and mandates that are elected according to the majority electoral system.

The parallel systems that use the combination of the plural electoral system with single member electoral units and proportional party lists are also used in Croatia, Guinea, Japan, Nigeria, South Korea, etc. while in Albania, Lithuania, Armenia, the system with two electoral rounds is used with single member electoral units and proportional lists system.

The advantages of parallel systems are that those systems create smaller fragmentation of the party systems apart the clean proportional electoral systems, with much better representation of the smaller parties.

Parallel electoral systems give the voters not only the possibility of electing single candidate in their electoral unit (on local level), but also party election (on national level) due the fact that this system gives possibility to hold two elections.

On the other hand, these systems have certain insufficiencies. Namely, with the fact that parallel systems do not manage to guarantee total proportionality of the elections, means that some parties are still able to stay without their representatives, despite the fact that they have won a sufficient number of votes. The relative complexity of this system can also cause confusion among voters referring to the model of allocation of votes and their transformation into mandates.

2.3. Proportional electoral models (systems with party lists in which the formula is of the largest remaining and the highest average)

The system of proportional representation is neither more nor above the principle of representative democracy. Due to the fact that democracy is the second name of the directly expressed will of the people, which means that proportional electoral systems are systems in which political parties are elected directly, or their candidates fully correspond with the will of the people.

Citizens get the chance to vote for political parties and lists of candidates, which by their commitments and ideas are closest to them and their party commitments. The proportional electoral systems are more directed toward overcoming the numerous problems that appear in countries with huge democratic experience, and which, from their aspect, are in close relation with the principles of democracy: participation and election.

The participation of citizens in the electoral policy and the position of the extremely limited, or narrow space of alternative actions within the elections, are two key problems where the spears of democracy break. The occurrence of the proportional electoral principle had the purpose to solve and to overcome such problems, and in that direction to reach democracy.

Actually, the grounds of proportional representation overlap with the development of representative democracy, especially by extending the right to vote and to develop contemporary political parties. The strongest pressure in replacing majority electoral systems with proportional ones were felt in the period of expanding the democratic processes in Europe, in the late 19th century of so-called "divided societies" (by ethnic, religious and other nature).

In these societies, conditions for creating the idea of equality in representing the various ethnicities were created very fast, groups or communities that composes their interior construction.

Today, the implementation of these systems is largely spread especially in Europe, Latin America, as well as in Africa (1/3 of the countries in Africa use the proportional electoral systems). Hence, it is often considered that proportional systems are a generally accepted source of electoral policy in the world.

Belgium was the first country to adopt the proportional representative principle.

Critics of the majority electoral system, or more precisely, supporters of the proportional electoral system, emphasize the "undemocratic" nature of the majority system, as the only way to replace the closed electoral round consider the installment of the proportional electoral models as the only "correct" rule for the allocation of democratic power and power in each country.

Opposing the majority elected government by the minority voters; the proportionalities offer elected power and government in accordance with the public support won. According to the proportional system, each political party is represented in the parliament proportionally with expressed public will.

After the elected get the place in the parliament, each political party should negotiate and “unite” with the others, with the target to form the parliamentary majority that will reflect the wishes of the majority of the citizens. In theory, it is considered that the system of proportional representation specifies the role much more and the meaning of the political parties round the majority of the electoral system. This system accomplishes its role much more through the vote of the citizens for the party lists (opened or closed, regional or national) and program commitments of the political parties more than the single candidates as individuals, which is typically the case of the majority electoral systems.

Hence, elected representatives, according to the proportional system of representation, do not represent the citizens in the governmental system, but political parties of the citizens, which are their direct selection. They do not express the will of the people, but the platform of the ruling political party.

In this sense citizens, despite the vote to elect their representatives in the government system, vote much more to support the political philosophies of the ruling parties.

Although, by definition proportional electoral systems are used only in more mandatory electoral units when it is not possible to function in three or less than three mandate electoral units. It is almost impossible to allocate the single mandate (single MP place) among more political parties in single mandatory or double mandatory electoral unit.

The voter’s political will is completely upgraded in the given vote for a single candidate or political party. The citizen election is the most significant moment within each electoral system. In the proportional system with the party lists, mandates are won proportionally with the won votes.

Supporters of proportional electoral systems believe that this exact moment is very well protected and achievable with-

in the proportional electoral system and numerous variables that arise from it. **In the meantime, they talk about few advantages of the proportional systems:**

First, the main reason for the increased implementation of this system worldwide lies in its simplicity. Each political party, in the pre-election period, prepares party lists of candidates for each electoral unit. The length of the list directly depends on the number of mandates that need to be filled in the electoral unit. The parties are stimulated to lead active electoral campaigns in every part of the country. There, in fact, lies one of the explanations for why the proportional systems produce higher voter's outcome on election day than other electoral systems. Political parties are more stimulated to mobilize electors to vote, regardless of the location where they accomplish their electoral right. On the other hand, electors also have more choice and willingness to vote from one simple reason that there is little risk of losing their votes on the so-called hopeless candidates, or to significantly strong candidates.

Therefore, it is considered that proportional systems are more attractive to successful politicians, which at the same time is the first advantage of these systems vis-à-vis majority electoral systems.

Second, proportional systems force ballot for political parties, and not for individual candidates, where the proportion of the votes that were won by each political party determines the number of mandates, which that party should win.

Third, because it is very rare for a single political party to win the sufficient majority of votes from the citizens in order to individually form the government. **The proportional electoral system mostly supports forming the coalition governments that have to provide bigger stability and coherence in the decision-making process.** Supporters of

proportional systems consider that effective politics requires a rather stable, than forceful hand. Western European experience shows the parliamentary systems in combination with proportional electoral systems that have bigger success in the field of the governmental existence, the turnout of the voters on the election day, but also certain positive changes in the field of economy.

Fourth, proportional systems use more-mandatory electoral units in which the number of candidates that are elected depends on the number of citizens that live in them. This means that proportional systems insist on the natural size of the electoral units as main factors in defining them, and not the electoral units that are more or less artificial creations. Simply, the electoral alteration (gerrymandering) does not present a problem with these systems.

Fifth, these systems create very little lost votes, especially in cases when the electoral threshold is set low. Each political party that has a concrete percentage of the electoral support can hope for representative mandates in the legislative house.

Sixth, these systems represent the interests of minority cultural and social groups much more. It is a result of the possibility for the party lists to list candidates from these groups that will take a concrete place within the political institutions. In this way, it is easier to detect different interests of the voters who belong to different cultural, ethnic or other groups in the system.

On the other hand, proportional systems have several insufficiencies:

First, large coalition governments that are the result of the implementation of the proportional systems can be transformed into negative characteristics of the

political system. The non-existence of the clearly set governmental policy on solid grounds can be a serious destabilizing moment of the political system. The election of larger number of parties, from which none has the majority in the representative house, can result in creating an unstable government and insecurity among the parties that cooperate in forming coalitions and unions. Various maneuver ventures that mostly happen “behind the scenes” and party “interference” can create unwanted situations in determining general governmental policy. In these situations, small parties can get greater benefit from bigger parties, especially if they reach for different forms of blackmail and threats. It can create a high degree of insecurity in the system, especially if it refers to the post-transitional interval, in which new governments are expected to do a lot in the field of economy and politics.

Second, proportional systems create fragmented party systems. The fragmentation of the party system is a direct result of the existence of a larger number of small parties created under the direct influence of the electoral system, under favorable moments that this system creates for the entrance of small parties in the Parliament. As a result of the entrance of the small parties in the Parliament minority, unstable governments are created, as well as minority parties that are in the position to decide for the allocation of power in the country.

Third, these systems, in their nature, apply more mandatory electoral units that disrupt direct connection of the electorate with its representatives in the representative house. It is believed that these systems weaken the connection between the voters’ representatives, on the one, and the electoral unit where they were elected, on the other hand. The insufficiency of local identification of the representative, and also its identification with the voter’s interests is considered as a main insufficiency of these systems.

Other insufficiencies of proportional systems depend on the variant of implemented proportional system. The problems of the type of personalization, complexity of the ballot system and difficult procedures for evaluating the validity of ballot papers, delaying counting and publishing of the results, etc. can also be considered as insufficiencies of some of the variants of proportional systems.

The idea for proportional representation is connected with four individuals who are mentioned in the electoral theory: Thomas Hare (England), Viktor d'Hondt (Belgium), Eduard Hagenbach-Bischoff (Switzerland) and A. Sainte-Lague (France), whose names are given to the various variables of the proportional electoral system.

So, the proportional electoral system is found in several forms that on their side differ according to the electoral formulas or quotes that they apply in counting the votes and in allocation of the mandates:

- » **Proportional system with the highest remainder (the largest remainder system); and**
- » **Proportional system with the highest average (the highest average system).**

The difference between these two most significant variables of the proportional electoral system is found in the way, or the method in which it is used to calculate votes and allocate mandates.

2.3.1. Proportional electoral model with the largest remaining (The largest remainder system)

This system is most frequently applied in Australia, Denmark, Belgium, Greece and Iceland. Their basic characteristics refer to collecting the votes. Most often implemented quote in determining the results with the proportional system with the largest remainder (the largest remainder system) is the Hare

quote that is still known as “simple quote”. Simplicity is viewed in the way that this quote leads to establishing the final electoral result. It is when the number of the votes won is divided by the number of mandates in the electoral unit.

Table no.11: Hypothetical example of functioning of the system with the largest remaining

Total votes = 1000

Number of mandates = 5

Hare quote = 200

Votes won in the first round	Hare quote	Mandates	Remaining from the second round	Mandates	Total mandates
Party A 360	200	1	160	1	2
Party B 310	200	1	110	0	1
Party C 150	-	0	150	1	1
Party D 120	-	0	120	1	1

In our example five political parties fight to win five members in the electoral unit. The total number of the won votes is 1000. In this example the Hare quote is a method of calculating votes and allocating mandates.

The **first phase of the vote-calculating process** makes qualification of the given votes in separate groups that refer to the various political parties, which enter the electoral contest. As we can notice in the table, the first two parties (360 and 310 won votes) exceed the Hare quote (200 votes), so they are rewarded and get a single mandate in the first electoral circle. Because the other three parties did not manage to win the necessary votes determined by the Hare quote, there are three unfilled mandates. Because of that, there is a second round of calculation in which the largest remaining of the votes is taken into consideration, or mandates are allocated in accordance with the order of that larger remaining. So, in our example, the three mandates will be won by the

parties A, B and C. The final result will be: two won mandates for party A, and one for parties B, C and D.

As we can see from the example, this variant of the proportional system produces proportional results, during which the small parties have easier assignment in winning the mandates apart from the other electoral systems. Hare quote favors smaller parties.

Otherwise, in theory additional alternative quotes that differ from the Hare quote are mentioned: the so-called **Drop quota** (mostly appointed as Hagenbach-Bischoff quote Hagenbach-Bischoff quota) and **imperiali quota**.

The first quota (used in Greece) is calculated by dividing the total number of valid votes and the number of the members plus one, and by adding 1 to the total result (or, $[\text{votes}/\text{mandates} + 1] + 1$), while the second quote (was used in Italy until 1993) is calculated by dividing the total number of valid votes and the number of mandates plus two (or, $[\text{votes}/\text{mandates} + 2]$).

2.3.2. Proportional model with the highest average (The Highest Average System)

This system is much more applied in democratic states, unlike the previous one. The crucial difference between these two systems is the way they function. So, while the first functions according to the application of the adequate quote of allocating the won votes and received mandates, **the system with the highest average functions according to the divider method**, or the votes of every political party are divided with the series of dividers with a purpose to manage to determine one average vote.

Political parties with the "highest average" of votes, after every phase of the process of calculating the votes win mandates and their votes are further divided with the following divider.

The process of division continues until all mandates are divided within the electoral process. While the electoral literature deals with the most frequent usage of the **two main types of dividers:**

- » **The Donton system (with the dividers 1,2,3,4..., etc.); and**
- » **A modified variant of the Sainte-Lague system (with the dividers 1.4,3,5,7.,etc.).**

According to the **Donton system**, the process of calculating the votes is very simple. First, all votes are grouped according to party supporters or according to the number of votes won by each party. This total amount is then divided according to the Donton dividers, 1,2,3...,etc., depending on the number of mandates that have to be filled in the electoral unit. From the total amount of the results, the largest are selected by the number of MPs that are elected in the electoral unit. They are ordered by size. Depending on the number of times the common divider is contained in the total number of votes on each party list, the number of mandates is determined and distributed to every party list. For example, if we suppose that the elections in a single electoral unit in which 6 MPs are elected on 4 party lists that participate. List A won 330.898 votes, list B won 212.512 votes, list C won 154.926, list D won 154.926 and list E won 99.730 votes. The electoral results in each list are divided with 1,2,3,4,5 and 6.

List A

330.898:1=330.898
 330.898:2=165.449
 330.898:3=110.299
 330.898:4=82.724
 330.898:5=66.179
 330.898:6=55.149

List B

212.512:1=212.512
 212.512:2=**106.256**
 212.512:3=70.837
 212.512:4=53.128
 212.512:5=42.502
 212.512:6=35.418

List C

154.926:1=154.926
 154.926:2=77.463
 154.926:3=51.642
 154.926:4=38.731
 154.926:5=30.985
 154.926:6=25.821

List D

99.730:1=99.730
 99.730:2=49.865
 99.730:3=33.243
 99.730:4=24.932
 99.730:5=19.946
 99.730:6=16.621

From all the results, **the sixth result by size is 106.256**, which at the same time is the mutual divider that divides the final results from each list:

List A – 330.898:106.256 = 3
 List B – 212.512:106.256 = 2
 List C – 154.926:106.256 = 1
 List D – 99.730:106.256 = 0

In our example, party A wins three mandates, party B has two mandates, party C single mandate, and party D is without a single mandate won.

The pure variant of the Sainte-Lague system, according to the Lijphart's ideas, "leads to approximate proportionality which is very close to the one that is in force, because its ideally impartial way has an effect on small as well as on large political parties".²³²

Apart from the pure **Sainte-Lague** system, which was used recently in New Zealand, because it was readjusted proportionality, and was replaced with its modified variant. The modified **Sainte-Lague** system puts smaller political parties into a more difficult electoral position, or, in accordance with our example:

²³² Cited to: **Arend Lijphart (1994), Electoral Systems and Party Systems: A Study of Twenty – Seven Democracies, 1945-1990, Oxford: Oxford University Press, (p.23).**

Table no.12: Hypothetical example of the functioning of the modified Sainte-Lague System

Total number of votes = 1000

Number of mandates = 5

Party A	Party B	Party C	Party D	Party E
Won votes 360	310	150	120	60
Total number divided 1.4 257 (first mandate)	221 (second mandate)	107 (fourth mandate)	85	42
Total number of votes divided with 3 120 (Third mandate)	103 (fifth mandate)	50	40	20
Total number of votes divided with 5 72	62	30	24	12
Total number of won mandates 2	2	1	0	0

2.4. Mixed electoral models (individual portable vote)

Apart from the parallel systems, which use the proportional system of party lists and majority system with electoral units in which “the winner gets it all”, and under which the eventual disproportion in the majority electoral units is not compensated, **mixed electoral systems are also defined as systems in which there is a mix of proportional representation and majority ballot, compensate disproportion within the majority electoral units.** The moment of compensation makes the main difference between these two systems.

Detailed viewing of the essence of the majority and plural on the one side and proportional electoral systems on the

other, in fact, we conclude that both of them have their positive and also negative aspects.

While supporters of the plural – majority electoral systems constantly assure us that only the rules and the methods contained in these electoral systems bring equitable, efficient and democratic equality in the process of organizing the political system, as well as in the decision-making process, supporters of proportional representation consider that it has bigger advantages in relation to majority representation ²³³:

- » The first and basic advantage is connected with the moment of proportional representation of all opinions and interests of the electorate, proportionally in accordance with its force;
- » This system prevents the unreal political majority, as well in the institutions of the systems and also among the electors themselves;
- » Prevents extreme political movements to enter into the institutions of the system, although it is true that extreme political parties can much easier enter parliament through this system, rather than through the majority electoral system;
- » Gives possibilities to new political currents that are the result of the social changes to come ahead in the political system;
- » Prevents the artificial alteration of the electoral units (gerrymandering), because according to the proportional electoral system, all electoral units are more mandatory, where the number of the representatives that are appointed in each electoral unit depends on the number of population that lives in it. This means that the proportional electoral system does not create manipulative or artificial electoral units with the purpose to satisfy the equality criteria among the people;

²³³ See: **Pippa Norris (1997), Choosing Electoral Systems: Proportional Majoritarian, and Mixed Systems, Contrasting Political Institutions, International Political Science Review, Vol.18 (3), July, (p.297 - 312).**

- » The proportional electoral system stimulates political parties to lead active campaigns in all areas or regions in the country, etc.

While establishing the main advantages of the plural – majority and proportional electoral systems, theoreticians or supporters of the mixed electoral system concluded that neither of them can satisfy the increased democracy demands in sense of increased representation of all citizens and increased equality of the right to vote.

The only way to do this as efficiently as possible is to accept the mixed electoral system, or to make a combination between the majority-plural electoral principle, according to which some of the mandates in the representative body will be elected, and proportional principle, according to which the rest of the mandates will be elected. The combinations or variants that appear in this case can vary. Of course, they do not depend only on the political will of the creators of the electoral system in the country, and from numerous factors that exist in it (party fragments, social structure of society, political climate of the system, and others).

The system of separate transferable vote, as a variant of the mixed electoral system, dates back to the middle of the 19th century. In theory, it is known as a peripheral system of the pressure groups, supporters of the British electoral system reforms.

This system is called **system of individual transferable vote**, because it is based on the principle that the voter has a single choice for its representative, but if the preferred candidates do not have sufficient number of votes, or have a small chance to be elected in the representative body, then its votes are transferred to the second or the next candidate.

This system is currently used in the parliamentary elections in Australia (in Senate elections as House of Lords), the

Republic of Ireland (for all elections, except the presidential) and on Malta (for elections in single – chamber parliament). These states have single mutual characteristic – they are countries with small size.

How does the system work?

1. Mostly, this system creates bigger electoral units from single-member (in Ireland, there are three- and five- member electoral units), so the principle of proportionality is being disputed. The country itself is divided in more - mandatory electoral units. In each of them, four or five representatives are being elected. The parties put the same number of candidates on the party list as there are elected representatives on the ballot paper. The voters vote with preferences.

2. The voters have the right to vote for candidates that are listed on the ballot paper with the first, second, etc., preference. Voters are advised to vote for as many candidates as possible, even on different party lists, because that way they will maximize the influence in the final electoral result with their own vote. So, as is known, the system of individual transferable vote is an electoral system that allows citizens to make a selection of candidates that are listed on more party lists, or to select several candidates from a single party list.

3. Voters rank their preferences of candidates with 1, 2, 3, 4, etc....in a number of cases. Ranking with preferences is not compulsory, and voters are able to vote for a single candidate only.

4. After the complete number of votes won with first preference is grouped, the calculation starts with determining the "quote" of the votes necessary for electing a single candidate. The quote is reached when the votes are divided with the number of mandates $+1/ +1(\text{quote} = [\text{votes}/\text{MP members} + 1] + 1)$. In the first phase of the calculation the total number of first

preferences for each candidate is determined. Each candidate who has more first preferences from the determined quote is considered as immediately elected. If none of the candidates reaches the quote, then the candidates with least first preferences are eliminated, and their second preferences are reallocated according to the second preferences on the ballot papers. For increased precision, all ballot papers of one candidate are reassigned, not just the surplus. If, for example, a candidate won 100 votes, and the surplus is 10 votes (the quote in that case is 90), each ballot paper will be reassigned, but with rate 1/10 from each vote. This process continues until all mandates of the electoral unit are completed.

Without any doubt, this system has certain advantages.

First, through the possibility for the voter to vote not just for different parties, but also for different candidates listed on the party list is increasing. **This means that this system strengthens the principle of personalization.**

Because voters have the possibility to express as many preferences as they want, it is almost impossible for the voters to vote negatively. The parties, on the other hand, unavoidably will respond to this possibility through offering political platforms and solutions that will attract the interests of a larger number of voters, in spite of spending a huge quantum of energy to prove the negative aspects of the politics of other parties. With the so-called preferential vote, candidates individually have the need to highlight their capabilities, the level of diversity in quality than the others with the purpose to get more support from the electorate. In the whole electoral process, candidates must not exaggerate highlighting the negative characteristics of the other candidates, if they want to win a larger number of second preferences from these candidates supporters. In this sense, this system in its nature is considered highly democratic.

Second, the system of individual transferable vote moves one step forward from the other electoral systems, because it successfully removes the power of the party elites to decide which of their candidates are elected.

Third, this system prevents the possibility that small parties will profile in the system (created as a result of faction activities in the parties) without highlighting the necessity of determining some arbitrary threshold.

Fourth, an interesting and innovative moment of this system is the fact that in more mandatory electoral units, the candidates are competing not just as opponents from different parties, but also as opponents from the same party. This electoral game mostly allows and provides representation of a larger number of interests and opinions in the system. The responsibility of the MPs in front of their voters in the electoral unit is especially increased, and vice versa, the voters have real influence on their MPs.

Fifth, if the vote's calculation process with this system is more complex and lasts longer, the process of ballot does not create bigger difficulties for the average elector.

In spite of the advantages, the **system of individual transferable vote also has certain disadvantages:**

- » The most frequent accusation is that it creates general instability in the party system and between the parties themselves (increased fractions and conflicts between candidates from the same party);
- » Instability of the party system can raise the proposal for governmental stability (that is not the case in Ireland, where coalition governments, in most of the cases, last longer. The average duration of an Irish government is three to four years);
- » This system imposes different approach in viewing the local issues in electoral campaign, on the one, and parliamentary proposals on the other hand;

- » This system is considered to be very complex to be comprehended by the electorate, and especially its electoral formula;
- » The fact that this system is used in a small number of states leads to the conclusion that the numerous disputed issues that arise from this system still remain unexploited.

Mixed electoral systems can also be found in electoral theory under other names, such as, for example, "systems with compensational proportional representation", "personalized proportional representation", "German electoral system", etc. Apart from Germany, mixed systems are used in New Zealand, Bolivia, Italy, Mexico, Venezuela, etc. Some important elements of this system can be found in some socialist states, such as Hungary, Bulgaria (only during elections in 1990, because in 1993 the proportional electoral system in the Donte variant was accepted), Lithuania the Republic of Georgia, Albania, etc.

Regardless of the terminology variables in the title, the essence of this system is always unchanged. The so-called hybrid or mixed electoral systems have a unique target that lies in the wish to unite the positive characteristics and properties of the majority of proportional electoral systems in order to organize better quality election and post-election process.

Electoral logic states that the best electoral system is a combination of positive elements of previously mentioned systems. A combination that has to remove the insufficiencies of the existing systems and to accept only their positive elements. This combined system is the mixed system that is being used in Federal Republic of Germany after World War II for the elections in the Bundestag. By some authors, this system is also called "compensatory system", or "balanced mixed system".

The newest characteristic of this system is not the fact that the electors have the right to two votes, but that they

exercise the right to vote in two ways: one is within the single mandate electoral units according to the British type of plural system in single electoral round, and the other is according to the proportional electoral system where there exist to ballot papers that match the two ballot processes. The German electoral system falls into the group of personalized proportional systems, or systems of mixed proportional membership as it is still called in New Zealand. Its essence is in the way in which the personal vote is combined in single mandate units, with the principle of proportional representation. The German Bundestag is composed of 656 MPs, with the possibility to increase their number if the electoral results demand that.

Each voter has two votes. The first is the personal vote, which is given to a certain party candidate in one of 328 single mandate electoral units. The second vote is for the party, and the voter gives it for the party list on the level of one of the federal states (landers). Candidates are allowed to compete simultaneously in the electoral units, as well as candidates on the same party lists. Candidates that won the relative majority in the electoral unit are considered elected. But, the second vote is the one that defines the number that determines how many representatives will be in each party in the Bundestag. On the federal level, all the second votes given for the parties are calculated. The parties that will only win more than 5% from the votes on the federal level, or alternatively, that have three direct elected representatives in the electoral units, are included in the allocation of the won mandates based on the proportional lists on the national level. The number of representatives of each party that exceeds the electoral threshold is calculated according to the Hare formula, and then the mandates are allocated among the 16 German federal states.

The number of mandates that the party directly wins in the single mandate electoral units is subtracted from the total number of mandates assigned according to the party lists in the federal states. The other mandates are assigned in the

closed party lists. If a certain party wins more mandates according to the principle of direct mandate in some federal state from what it was allocated, based on the second vote, than that party keeps the surplus, or temporarily increases the number of mandates in the Bundestag.

The German electoral system is not a parallel system, as it is sometimes considered, but is an electoral system with personalized proportionality. It differs from the clear format of proportional representation in a way that the electoral threshold of 5% on the national level excludes small parties from parliamentary representation, but thanks to the proportional system with party lists, in parliament almost all relevant social and political forces are represented. The personal vote for the candidates in the single mandate electoral units has the purpose to provide closer relationship between the voter and the MP. But, in practice, we should not overestimate the advantage of these single mandate elections. In Germany, the elections in single mandate electoral units are mainly based on the party affiliation of the candidates, and not their personality. Hence, the initial hope that the closeness will function is only partly accomplished.

The system of double votes provides the electors strategic division of votes among the existing or possible coalition partners. The division of the votes is a regular practice of voters for the small parties. Considering that candidates from small parties have small chances to win in single mandate electoral units, their voters usually give their first vote to the candidates from the bigger coalition party. In return, the voters of the large parties "lend" their second vote to the smaller party in the coalition, to be sure that they will cross the electoral threshold.

So, the voters strategically use the possibility for dividing their double votes and by that to support coalition partners of "own" parties, or at least to assign their coalition preferences.

This system, despite the fact that it gives highly proportional results, creates an absolute majority in the parliament based on the minority votes. In the past few decades in Germany, the parliamentary majority was not produced. Majority governments are always mainly coalitions, during which all the changes in the governmental representatives were a result of the change in coalition configuration. The German coalition government is mainly stable and voters mostly consider it as legitimate because of implemented coalition cooperation initiative.

At first sight, it is a mixed system, but the mixture of the elements within it does not create a mixed product because the final electoral result is “perfectly proportional”. It should be noted that this electoral system is misinterpreted in the electoral literature, even German citizens themselves do not understand that the second vote is exactly the one that decides the final allocation of the mandates. According to their system insight, they consider the second vote in fact as the second preference (second choice), which is completely wrong. **The German electoral system must be understood as proportional, because it makes a personalized selection for the half of the members of the Bundestag.**

This system is also misinterpreted from another aspect. Namely, apart the claims that the electoral system made an impact on decreasing the number of political parties in the system, there is a completely different truth that states that the reason for the decreased number of parties in Germany considered as the biggest “perpetrator” is the German Constitutional Court which declared the communist and neo-Nazi party for undemocratic, and from there for unconstitutional.

The electoral threshold of 5% on the national level excludes the possibility of small parties to enter the parliament. Regarding the electoral threshold, the German electoral model is not declared as purely proportional, although the positive aspects of this model, especially in the segment of representation of minority groups in parliament, are very evident. It

is completely sure that this combination of dual votes gives the possibility for bigger strategic selection to the citizens. Such drafted strategy opens the possibility to create a more effective system of position and opposition, which, in the case of Germany, appeared to be very successful. Namely, the relations between the opposition and the position parties that function based on principles of corporation and agreement for many years, despite demonstrated conflicts and retaliation in other systems.

The contemporary German electoral system originates from the old proportionality principle that was used during the Weimar Republic by implementing certain changes (electoral threshold of 5% to prevent factions and division among the parties), all with the target to successfully overcome the weaknesses of the Weimar governments.

As basic advantages of the mixed electoral system, according to their supporters' opinion, the following are considered:

- » **First**, the mixed systems are more flexible rather than the rest of the electoral systems;
- » **Second**, the essence of this system lies in the possibility for the voter to vote twice, when with the second vote most frequently makes correction of the disproportion made with the electoral results calculated in the first vote. This can be a very important moment while determining the political diversity of the next government. In that way, such a right can spread political options of the electors;
- » **Third**, this system does not just keep the positive effects of the proportional systems, but it also guarantees geographical representation of the electors.

On the other hand, **the mixed system can have certain weaknesses**: this system is determined as a very complex and complicated system – the complexity is connected

with the effort to use the advantages and the positive sides of the two basic electoral systems, during which the concrete effects that are reached at the end may, and mostly, deform their basic characteristics, and **complexity** not just from the technical aspect, but also from the way on which the system is organized.

The negative aspects of this system can be overcome by accepting certain suggestions that are in favor of the personalization principle.

CONCLUSION

Regarding the way in which different electoral systems function in the world, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that each electoral system is the final product of separate national political circumstances. The issue of how a single electoral system functions, creates certain consequences that essentially are reflected within the whole system, and actually tests the concepts of representative democracy.

If we focus our attention only on those systems that were mentioned as basic models, we can underestimate the capability of the electoral systems to constantly create new variants and electoral combinations. As we previously mentioned, there are not just two possible types of electoral systems that we can choose, major and proportional. The different variants and subvariants of the electoral system demonstrate the complexity of the contemporary electoral system.

The selection of a concrete electoral system is not just a common technical decision. Different variants of electoral systems exist among countries, and more the variants of the electoral systems that exist within a single state from a single electoral round, but also the influences that the electoral system leaves during defining the final electoral results. The differences that exist between mechanical electoral rules, on the one, and concrete electoral result, on the other hand,

mostly are not evidence that in the country unfair elections of electoral manipulation exists. On the contrary, these differences are a good indicator that the result of calculating the different preferences of millions of voters cannot be foreseen totally and with complete accuracy. And moreover, it is a determiner that the final result from free elections can never be controlled.

3. ELECTORAL SYSTEM IN THE BROADER SENSE

3.1. Concept, definition and types of electoral units

During the wider definition of the electoral system, theoreticians, despite the electoral formula as a basic element, take into consideration the wider components that also make the complete electoral system. Among those components, of course, the most important place is taken by: electoral unit, or its size, defined through the number of the representatives that are elected within the unit, and the electoral threshold, or legal or effectively determined prohibit clause, by which in advantage the minimal support necessary for one party to be represented in parliament is being determined.

The electoral unit is usually defined as a unit in which the won electoral results are “interpreted” or are transferred into mandates, or in parliamentary posts.

However, electoral units are determined according to different criteria: geographic, or territorial, as the most common, educational, ethnic, etc. Unlike this definition, Lijphart defines the electoral unit from the aspect of its size, or from the concrete number of representatives that have to be elected from it.

Hence, when the proposal of an electoral unit is being reviewed the proposal of its size is inevitable.

The size of the electoral unit is not determined by territorial definition, but by the number of mandates that have to be

elected from it. Therefore, the size of the electoral unit and the selection of the model or the technique of calculating the won votes are not considered to be the two most important proposals that compose the electoral system.

While, very often, there is a close correlated connection between the type of the electoral model and the size of the electoral unit, or proportional model prefers more the larger electoral units or the country as single electoral unit, while the majority model mostly and most effectively is accomplished in single mandatory electoral units. The more the electoral unit reduces size, the more the disproportion between the given votes increases and vice versa.

So, there is an inverse relation.

The size of the electoral unit influences the proportion of the won results, because the smaller the electoral unit is, the smaller is the degree of proportionality. The larger the electoral unit is, the larger is the degree of proportionality.

So, there is proportional relationship.

In theory, two ways or approaches are known and with their assistance the issue of the size of the electoral units is organized:

- » The total number of citizens (based on the previous normatively determined number of citizens that will elect the concrete mandate); and
- » Total number of listed voters in electoral register (Portugal example).

The first and the second way have a common purpose – to reach bigger homogeneity of the electoral body that will provide larger realization of the equality principle of the electoral right of the citizens and bigger compactness of the state. Determining the size of the electoral unit is an inevitable segment in modeling the electoral system. The main theoretical

discussion among experts of electoral issues is in the connotation with the positive, or negative sides of uninominal (single mandate), middle (units with 6-10 mandates) and large electoral units (with 10 or more mandates), or the country as single electoral unit.

So, the supporters of the single mandate electoral units consider that these units provide the closest contact between the electors, on the one, and candidates, on the other hand. This connection does not end, but on the contrary lasts and broadens after finalizing the electoral process.

But, uninominal electoral units hide only danger connected with the number of citizens, or the number of voters that elect the candidates. Because of the numerous circumstances (not-upgrading the electoral registers, increased population in one region unlike the decreasing in another, etc.) there is a possibility of unequal representation of the citizens in the representative body.

This danger hides the possibility of forming the so-called "artificial" electoral units that are not connected with citizen's interests. Apart from the single mandatory, the advantages of more mandatory electoral units are mostly connected with certain sociological, ethnical, gender, or administrative moments. So, it is considered that in more mandatory units more important is the moment of bigger representation of the minority or ethnical groups rather than in single mandatory electoral units. The same refers to the representation of women in politics.

But the biggest disadvantage assigned to more mandatory electoral units is the possibility of open manipulations during their "alteration". It is indisputable that determining the size of the electoral unit is one of the most powerful instruments for winning power. The electoral units are the creators of power in politics.

3.2. Electoral threshold (the prohibitive electoral clause)

The electoral threshold is another important element in the electoral system. The electoral theory mostly defines it as a minimal level of support necessary for a single party to participate in the functioning of the representative body. Electoral threshold can be defined by law that is the so-called formal, electoral threshold. This threshold is mostly applied on the electoral units individually. In certain countries there is also the so-called factual electoral threshold. This threshold is mostly applied on national as well as on the level of the electoral units individually. In certain countries, there is the so-called factual or effective electoral threshold that is not provided in law, but its function is determined by the other two dimensions of the electoral system, especially from the size of the electoral unit.

Factual electoral threshold is connected with the mathematical fact, which is not defined by a certain percentage, as is the case with the legally determined electoral threshold, but by accepting the threshold of representation and the threshold of exclusion.

So, **the threshold of representation** means minimal number of votes that single party can win under most favorable conditions, while **the threshold of exclusion** means minimal number of votes that under most favorable conditions can be insufficient for a single party to win a mandate.

Or, in other words, we refer to the highest and the lowest threshold. If the party crosses the lowest threshold, it is possible to win a mandate, and if the party crosses the highest threshold, then winning the mandate is guaranteed.

Namely, small electoral units have the completely same effect as the high electoral threshold, and vice versa. As the

electoral unit increases, the electoral threshold decreases, or, as the electoral unit decreases, the electoral threshold increases.

CHAPTER 4



THEORETICAL RELATIONS BETWEEN THE ELECTORAL AND THE PARTY SYSTEM



1. SEVERAL THEORETICAL IDEAS FOR THE RELATION BETWEEN ELECTORAL AND PARTY SYSTEMS

1.1. Theory of Maurice Duverger

The elections are held in the interest of the political parties, political parties exist because of elections, elections are organized to represent the content of the political area in the country, electoral systems can function only within the party systems, etc.

These are just part of numerous theoretical constancies contained in the political and legal theory that represent the concrete relation of the connection. Between elections and political parties, and in that sense, also between electoral and party system in the country.

The relationship of these relations is very often roughly simplified, or the issue of dependence and connection of these two systems is viewed exclusively through an explanation of the connection between the electoral formula and number of political parties in the system.

So, the final relations that are built between the electoral and the party system are reduced and explained in a restrictive way.

The restrictive relation between these two systems is best presented by the "sociological law" or sociological theory of Maurice Duverger.

The relation and the influence of the electoral model, which in a concrete way determines the number of political parties, which appear in the party system.

So, according to Duverger, 1. "The proportional electoral model creates conditions to form multi-party system... 2. Majority model in two electoral rounds creates less related politi-

cal parties... 3. The plural model leads to building pure dual party system”.

This means that the majority electoral model in single electoral round and plural electoral model (model of relatively majority) favor dual party system, while the majority electoral model in two electoral rounds and proportional electoral model favor multiparty system.

The reaction that appeared in science groups in relation with this law of Duverger are extremely polarized, regarding his scientific research status and also regarding his causal validity.

Regarding the scientific research character and status of the law, the opinions in theory move in the same line.

Namely, all theoreticians that view and criticize this law of Duverger undertake the restrictive interpretation of the relations between electoral and party system and cannot give valid research of the context of those relations.

Referring to the proposal of the causal noxiousness and durability of Duverger suggestions, in theory, two important groups of ideas emerged.

The first group is composed of those theoreticians that consider that Duverger simply “missed” the causality direction. According to them, the party system determines the electoral system, and not vice versa.

The second group is composed of those ideas that broaden the cause connection between the two systems with the social, or with social determinants, emphasizing that party systems are primarily dependent on the number of differences that exist between the citizens on social plan, and not on the factual number of the political parties. The electoral system in that sense has only a secondary role.

According to this group of theoreticians, multiparty systems that existed in Europe decades ago are the result of highly polarized social differences, and not from the character or type of the electoral system. The proposal that the so-called sociological law of Duverger was and still is unaccepted from wider group of political theoreticians? Where are its weaknesses?

The first and maybe biggest weaknesses of this law or theory lies in its final sense and actualization.

Through it, Duverger had the target to explain the so-called "institutional determinism", according to which social and broader social differences do not have a crucial meaning for the system as the two institutional forms of the political systems in one country have, or the relation between the electoral and party system.

This narrow and restrictive explanation of social relations, according to Duverger, can influence the relations that are built between these two systems.

Duverger's so-called "social" is replaced with "institutional determinism" because of a very simple reason.

The conviction that socially different defined groups are always capable to organize themselves on the political scene ignores the problem of collective, institutional actions...

The number of social differences relatively increases the number of political parties in one society, but for Duverger, that is not, nor can it be sufficient, and the only reason that influences the nature and the character of the party system in the country.

The sum of the social differences in one system cannot a priori imply political differences. Because of that, each extensive explanation of the relation between the electoral and the party system will only relative its sense without any final effect.

It is necessary to overcome the differences between the institutional and sociological ideas regarding the proposal if the electoral system can make changes in the party system and vice versa.

If, on the one hand, we agree with the Duverger's theses that electoral laws really influence the capability of the political parties to survive or to disappear from the party scene, then we will have to undertake the theses that political parties manipulate by creating the electoral laws in their benefit whenever they are given a chance.

The winner of the party scene is the one that frames the constant electoral system is interested to find the motive for its change, especially if he sees that the old electoral rules do not "serve" his interests.

Apart from neglecting the role and meaning of the social differences in society, in the context of determining the character of the electoral system, the proposals and assumptions of Duverger led to increased respect for the interactive effects between the social and electoral structure.

The social differences in society are a determining factor that has an influence on the number of political parties within the system, and by that also to the change of the electoral system. Namely, the increased influence of the sociological methods and theories in political science in the 1950's, especially in the US, has made pressure over the dominance of the attitude that the party systems are products of the electoral systems.

Today, more and more acceptable ideas that go in line with it—that electoral systems can modify, but not transform, socially determined party systems. It is clear that political parties are not just a product of the social forces in society, but they are part of the institutional structure in society.

Maurice Duverger talks about the relation between the electoral and party system above all, from the aspect of psychological and mechanic effects that come from their mutual cooperation.

While the psychological effects refer to the way political parties and voters react to electoral rules, the mechanic effects have an influence on the final selection or the final result of the elections.

Regarding the fact that the electoral system is one of the factors that influence the shape of the party system, it is necessary to make wider historical analysis in order to view whether or how much the electoral system has a decreased or increased influence over the party system.

Regarding the direction of the actions of the electoral over the party system, the single tendency cannot be expressed which will be extracted regardless of the concrete social and political factors in the state. But, that, on the other hand, does not mean that we relativise the meaning of the electoral system.

While orthodox institutional analysis almost always connects the growth of the party system in one country with the selection of a concrete electoral model of representation, contemporary electoral studies in huge part examine these ideas.

Although the base of contemporary analysis is found in the mutual relation between electoral rules and mechanisms, on one hand, and the development of the party life in the country, on the other, although, the preference of a certain type of party system is not just the result of its concrete relation with the electoral system.

Or, the treatment of the changes in the party system exclusively and solely from the aspect of implementing the factors of the electoral system, is pointless. The changes that

happen in the electoral and the party system are closely connected with the social – structural conditions and factors incorporated into the wider relations of the social system.

In this context, there are also Duverger's ideas according to which the relation between the electoral and party system is neither mechanical nor automatic. A certain electoral system is not entitled to produce a certain party system. It only puts pressure on the direction of its creation. The electoral system is a force that acts among the rest of the forces, some of them also make an influence in the opposite direction".

According the theoretician's considerations in political and in legal ideas, Maurice Duverger' law is unacceptable because of three main reasons: empirical, theoretical and methodological.

Empirical inadmissibility due to the denial of the consequential influences attributed to the elementary types of electoral systems, which this law did not take into consideration.

So, in reality, there are countries in which a multi-party system is being built in circumstances of organizing elections according to the plural electoral system with single mandate electoral units, or dual party system combined with the proportional electoral system.

Theory inadmissibility is argued with incomplete explanation of the rules and exceptions from the assumed casual relation. Also, it is not completely explained in which social circumstances this law is valuable. The law has no space left for further improvement.

Methodological inadmissibility is extracted from one side dimension of this law. It does not have any comparative qualifications that will be able to set it on a wider comparative – scientific discussion, therefore it is said that this law functions best only on local level.

1.2. Contemporary theoretical ideas on the relationship between the electoral and party system

The theoretical dispute about the relation between the electoral and the party system cannot be reduced to only the so-called social law of the theoretician Maurice Duverger, but it continues and broadens in a wider sense.

Despite the two key elements of that interaction, contemporary theories include a new, third element that will need to completely explain the content essence of this relation.

Unanimously is concluded that the new element is the parliamentary mandate as a product of interactive connection of the electoral and party system.

Or, in simple words, the contemporary theory opinions explain the interactive connection of the two systems in a more extensive way. An electoral system has influence either to reorganize the party system in accordance with won votes of each political party that participates in the elections. The electoral through party system is directly set in relation with the won parliamentary mandates.

Regardless of its type and character, it is a rule that the electoral system has an influence on the party system, or on the process of decreasing or increasing the number of political parties that function within the system. So, a mono-type of electoral system stimulates the stronger political parties that function in the system. So, a mono-type electoral system stimulates the stronger political parties on the grounds of the smaller, and vice versa. It directly reflects the size, or the interactions of the forces between the parliamentary groups in the representative body.

Different effects that occur as a result of the connection between the electoral and party system, in practice intensify, decrease, repeal or are deformed under the influence of

the concrete social and political conditions that exist in the political system. That means that a unilateral review of this interaction leads to a unilateral conclusion for their interactive relation.

Despite the concrete social and political conditions in the country, **the proposal for parliamentary majority** is also important and belongs to one or more political parties in parliament, as well as the meaning of the electoral system in process of its formation.

While in theory, **two possible situations connected with the parliamentary majority** are reviewed or the proposal for interaction between the electoral system and that majority:

- 1. State of the so-called earned majority** or majority that is organized in the parliament by applying any type of electoral system; and
- 2. State of the so-called fabricated, artificial majority (manufactured majority)** that is created exclusively through applying the concrete type of electoral system, or with its stronger or weaker disproportional effects on the citizen votes and won MP mandates.

In this context, Daglas Rae will conclude that the parliamentary majority of one or more political parties in the representative body does not always make an effect of absolute party majority in the parliament, but is more a result of disproportional effects of the electoral system itself. These effects further reflect the electoral system itself. These effects further reflect on the so-called bias, or on the process of establishing the results from the elections in compliance with got votes and won mandates.

While disproportional effects of the electoral system are mostly seen at majority electoral systems which "offer" ma-

majority parliamentary mandates to the party “minority” won at the elections mostly. The majority formed in that way has the character of artificially formed majority or manufactured majority.

Although more rarely, but the proportional electoral system can also produce mandatory majority in terms of party minority in compliance with the won votes on the elections.

Lipset and Rokkan’s ideas are interesting in compliance with the interactions between the electoral and party system. Apart from Maurice Duverger, according to whom the type of the electoral system which the country applies is directly determined by the type of party system of the country, Lipset and Rokkan accept the conclusion that the party system is the consequence of social divisions in the country.

In accordance with their thoughts, electoral systems modify the socially determined party systems without any bigger essential influence. The party systems, according the way they explain and process, are formed according to the four lines of determined social conflicts (divisions) that were created as a result of the historical development of the social system, following the pattern: center-periphery, state-church, agriculture–industry and owners–workers.

The main determining factors in forming the contemporary party systems are the answers to the following proposals: which disputes have the most dominant meaning for the system, when they appear and in which way the aroused conflicts are solved.

Hence, Lipset and Rokkan, when they explain the interaction between the electoral and party system, they come to a conclusion that is completely different from the Duverger.

The party system is, above all, socially determined. The electoral system can modify, but definitely cannot transform the party system.

As a direct consequence of the previously presented theory, in electoral theory appear **modern, contemporary sociological theory that draws the most adequate conclusions, and taking into consideration the positive experiences of Duverger ideas, on the one, and Lipset or Rokkan, on the other hand.**

According to this theory, the systematic development, from the aspect of influence of electoral over party system, goes in **two phases.**

The **first so-called initial phase** of system democratization, the electoral system plays secondary role in the process of party shaping the system.

The structure of an “installed” institutional system has a dominant meaning. The institution of the system, or state bureaucracy is the one that determines the possibilities of the political parties to compete for winning the priority places in public services.

And, because the electoral system does not represent a single type of institutional structure within the state that influences the nature of the state party system, which means that the institutional interaction and the relation among the institutions of the system get prior meaning.

In the second phase, this theory explains, above all, the connection of the electoral system with the process of democratization of the country. The content and the quality of the electoral system depend on the development of social – party priorities and on the democratization of the system as a process.

Hence, it is necessary to make a distinction between social democratization processes and the democratization of the system.

The first process marks the democratization of state institutions, while the second is democratization of interactions between state institutions and civil society.

General conclusion is that in the so-called transitional Europe, the process of democratization of state institutions is in line with the imitation logics, importing and "transplantation" of the institution in the western world in the name of some superior "social interests". Notorious is the fact that in these turbulent systems not just political, but also economic institutions are taken that successfully function in other part of the world, without taking into account whether those institutions match the ideas, tradition and mentality that rule in these countries.

"Copying" of institutions mostly had the purpose to speed up the processes in the state and system maturing in post-socialistic countries. But, what obviously, these institutions lacked was their predecessors. They have empty backgrounds. The two main reasons why the systems of the socialist regimes failed in all post-socialist states, lay in the failure of the institutions to make social and system integration, that are located as a basic promoter of that gap.

The gap was directly reflected to the party-political scene, or the system. The instability of party support by the citizens, as well as insufficiently built party identities are the side effects of the multi-decades long mono-party rule. These negative moments at the party scene were directly reflected in electoral politics. The lack of stability of the electorate was directly reflected in the insufficient readiness for compromise among party leaders. The relatively high electoral instability directly implied political immoderation. The basic determinants that produced electoral instability are:

- a) The degree and speed of changes in the electoral system, the number of political parties and their weak identity;

- b) Mobilization of the social differences, that mostly is quite weak as a result of undeveloped civil society in the previous system.

So, contrary to the orthodox institutional analysis of Maurice Duverger and his followers, contemporary electoral studies take a step forward, where electoral and party systems are viewed from the aspect of the democratization of the political system.

The degree of democratization of the political system is in a large part influenced by the development of the electoral system significantly reflected the development of the party life in the country.

Hence, contemporary concepts direct their analysis initially toward the study of institutional factors that further undoubtedly influence party life and the party system overall, where they view and value their total influence in the context of social ambient in which they function.

1.3. Theoretical ideas on the interaction between the electoral system, model of democracy and systems of organizing the government

The issue about the character and the type of the electoral system in one country is mainly determined by the accepted democracy model, but also by the character of the political, and from the character of the political and social structure.

The system functions that are practiced by the two divergently different electoral models (majority and proportional), and their numerous emergent sub-variants are directly dependent on the democratic model according to which the political dimension of the system is organized.

Hence, the character, the values and the functions of the electoral system are determined in accordance with the regulations and the principles of concretely applied democ-

racy model. Therefore, in the theory of (Arend Lijphart) it is mostly said that plural electoral systems are connected with the majority model of democracy, while proportional electoral systems with the consensual model of democracy.

But Lijphart studying the issue of connectivity among electoral systems with the democracy models, points to another moment, important for a complete review of this concrete interaction. That is the issue that refers to the system of organizing the government, or concrete proposal from presidential and parliamentary system as two main systems of organizing the government.

The relation that is mostly described within democratic theory, refers to the mutual influence on the electoral system, the model of democracy and the system of organizing the government, is explained in the following manner: if the majority of the electoral system is accepted, in terms of the presidential system of organizing the government, in these conditions the democratic model that is mostly preferred is the majority.

The proportional electoral system, institutionalized in the parliamentary system in organizing the government, mostly prefers a consensual model of democracy.

Of course, we must not forget the fact that the selection of the system of organizing the government that is the central issue for which the consent should be reached by the creators of the constitutional and the political system in the country. In reaching consent, the other components are imposed as necessary.

It is concluded, also by Lijphart, without decreasing the meaning of the electoral system, that the concrete selection whether the presidential or parliamentary system of organizing the government is the most important institutional activity in contemporary democracies.

Although it is clear that behind each institutional solution in the system, the theoretical concepts and principles are not crucial but, above all, the concrete decision of the main political subjects that make decisions in the country, however, theory concepts and ideas make the base of the institutional concretization. Determining political interests, targets and values of the main actors in the political system must be in coordination with generally accepted standards and rules of organizing the theoretical concepts, models and systems.

The character of the constitutional and political system in the country is a very important factor that is considered in the constitution of the relation between the political subjects. But the formal, constitutionally-legal institutionalization of the presidential, parliamentary or a combination of these two systems of organizing the government, on the one, and theoretical acceptance of some model of democracy on the other hand, does not guarantee ipso facto nor favorable, or unfavorable political development of the country. The interactions between these three elements are regulated in accordance with the conditions that exist in certain historical-political and socially-cultural ambient. Because in practice very often this moment is neglected, very often we are witnesses of *de jure* formed system, on the one, and *de facto* reality, on the other side. The division that exists between theory and practice is expanded as much as the politicians with their concrete behavior allow that.

That is why when we talk about the connection of the electoral systems on the one, and democratic values in the system of organization of the government, on the other hand, it should not insist on maximizing the meaning of one or the other dimension. On the contrary, the attention should be concentrated in the direction of achieving a balance between these categories.

Today, almost all post-socialist countries from Central, Eastern and South Eastern Europe in their democratic constitutional systems are embedded in the constitutional forms

that match consensual democracy (the parliamentary system of organizing the government and the proportional electoral system). The advantages of a parliamentary system for new democracies are perceived through supremacy of this system to regulate various forms of political clashes. On the other hand, proportional electoral system provides to be represented by various social interests in parliament, in the majority as well as in the minority.

What is achieved with the proportional electoral system when we talk about adequate representation of the interests of the social segments in the parliament, it often loses the meaning when the problem appears to be the problem of the ability to govern the system. Diamond describes it as a problem with "concentration and autonomy of the power for election and realization of effective and fast decisions".

Lijphart even claims that the election between the majority and proportional electoral system, on one, and parliamentary and presidential system of organizing the government, on the other, are two key selections round which the spears collide over the constituents in post-socialist countries. According to the author, "the combination of the parliamentary and the proportional electoral system is an attractive combination for new democracies or for countries that are still in the phase of democratization". But theoreticians and Lijphart himself, consider that the attempts to determine the correlation between the electoral system, on one, and democracy models on the other, as well as the connection of these categories with the system of governmental organization should be toned not rigid and strictly schematically placed.

Hence, the conclusion that the subject of the character and the quality of the electoral system are completely certain and cannot be viewed separately from the issue of democratic values, as well as the analysis of the functioning of electoral institutions in the concrete model of democracy. So, it is about two mutually connected spheres that are not completely independent.

When the interaction between electoral systems and democratic values in the concrete system of organizing the government, the meaning of only one side should not be emphasized over the other. There should be a balanced overview about the relationship. During the process it should not be forgotten that the electoral system itself can influence stability and also the efficiency of political institutions within the system. The electoral system can influence the construction of a more consensual or a more conflict model of regulating political interactions. Lijphart concluded that the selection between the so-called "big alternatives" on institutional plan (proportional electoral system – parliamentary and majority electoral system–presidential system) most directly determines the model of democracy, where this connection does not depend only on theoretical arguments.

It is also worth mentioning the tendency in former countries of transition, which is the process of forming "inter-types" in organizing the government, or combinations between presidential and parliamentarian systems of organizing the government. These combinations on organizational plan are mostly a product of the crises intervals in totalitarian and authoritarian regimes. Besides that, they are often attributed by temporary character, their supporters claim that they have the predisposition of permanent survival, because within themselves they unite the positive effects of the two pure forms of organization of the state government. Especially successful is the link when there is a combination of the positive elements of the "pure" parliamentarian system, and to "pure presidential" system in a single system.

For example, when in a single system positive effects of the direct elections of the president of the country and the stability of the executive government are connected on one, and the flexibility of the parliamentarian government and the prime minister, on the other. Most of the post-socialist political elites opted for the implementation of a presidential or semi-

presidential in accepting the semi-proportional electoral system, which was the main reason for institutional conflict and crisis in the contemporary democracies.

Empirical data shows that from 1990 until the end of 1996, proportional electoral systems were transformed into a dominant institutional model of elections in contemporary democracies of Central and Eastern Europe. If the first free and direct elections in 1990 were conducted according to the proportional electoral system in 37,5% from the so-called new democracies, in the beginning of 1996, the proportional electoral system was institutionalized in 57,9% of countries in this part of Europe.

Its dominance is also noted in combined electoral systems. The consequences from this developing trend in the part of the electoral system were mainly connected with the appearance of multi-party systems and creating coalition governments.

On the other hand, at the end of 1996, in most democracies the presidential and semi-presidential system of government was institutionalized. Although it is mainly connected with the majority electoral system (the examples of Belarus, Ukraine), or with combined electoral system (Croatia, Lithuania, Russia), in most countries it was connected with the proportional electoral system and with multiparty system (Moldova, Poland, Romania, Serbia). Apart from the fact that theoretically, proportional electoral system functions best within parliamentary democracy, it should indicate that in reality we have frequent intersections of these two institutional structures.

It's a fact that presidential governments function with a lot of obstacles with the oppositional majority in the parliament. This condition mostly causes clashes between the executive and legislative government, which is mostly solved with presidential bypasses by the parliament and creating new parapolitic bodies that undertake the competences. In most

difficult cases, the president decides to declare extraordinary state, as well as how to dismiss the parliament.

From all of this we can conclude the following:

There is a certain interaction between the interaction electoral system – model democracy – system of organizing the government. But, interactive connection of their concrete forms in reality is not always corresponding with those found in theory. The connection of the majority, or proportional electoral system with certain models of democracy and certain systems of organizing the government in theory, is not always necessary in reality.

The claims of Friedrich Naumann that the consequences of proportional elections are viewed as an inability of the system plan to organize parliamentary government, because if the fact that both the proportionality and the parliamentary system are mutually exclusive, are almost completely relative and refuted in practice.

2. INTERNATIONAL AND EUROPEAN STANDARDS FOR ELECTIONS WITH SPECIAL REVIEW OF THE CODEX OF THE VENICE COMMISSION FOR GOOD PRACTICES IN ELECTORAL ISSUES

Contemporary representative governments include three basic democratic principles:

- » Restricting absolutism
- » Legitimizing the government through the people's sovereignty and
- » Government transfer in the limited interval from the citizens on the political institutions through regular, free and fair democratic elections.

Today, no politician, scientist or regular citizen can contest the claim that each representative government should be

elected in elections. Democracy, human rights and the rule of law are the three main carriers of the European constitutional heritage on which also repose the European electoral values. Hence, the introduction of the international and European standards in the elections is important democratic guardian whose main purpose is to protect the democratic character of the representative government.

By enforcing these standards democratic rules are established in the international electoral race. International democratic standards in the sphere of human rights and creating institutions are the main guardians in sustainability of the democratic political and legal systems and their constitutional development. In the era of globalisation, contemporary national countries are recognized as democracies if they implement and respect these standards.

While, the term "standard" is comprehended as a behavioral rule as well as a rule for estimating the behavior. The standards are established by the government, but are developed as a result of traditional actions or achieving the consensus to solve certain open issues. The concept of international standards includes some universal, generally accepted canons of state behavior, corporations and citizens. The grounds of the international standards are found into constitutional values and principles of the national democratic states

It is a fact that all standards have roots in democratic constitutional development. Hence, European standards come from the so-called general European wealth. The influence of international and European legal standards is overviewed from several aspects.

In accordance with the intensity of the responsibilities and the strength for building international and European legal standards, we can differ at least three ways of influence on national constitutional development in implementation and application of the standards.

International standards belong to and can be found in the **so-called "soft law" or in obligations that do not come from the agreements, or from "hard law"**. They do not have an obligatory character but often know how to make international law "harder" and to appear as predecessors of the international agreements.

Hence legal instruments can be classified in two groups: in the first there are instruments that are legally obligatory, and in the second those that have no obligatory effect. Despite the opinions that agreements are classical international legal instruments with first obligatory effect, it is more obvious that compared with them, legal standards and "soft" law have concrete advantages, and in certain areas are far more acceptable. The most specific method of implementing the international legal standards is the international and comparative legal approach toward them. It is considered that the fourth generation of national constitutions is made in accordance with the primacy of international law.

The constitutions of new democracies, among which we should number the Republic of Macedonia Constitution from 1991, have adopted numerous standards and have included special provisions that introduced the principle of the supremacy of international law. What refers to international standards in the elections, if the same are an integral part of international agreements, the same are included in the national legal order in the moment when the country makes their ratification.

Depending on whether the **monist or dualistic system of the protection of human rights and freedoms in national constitutions** has been accepted, various obligations are confirmed to implement the responsibilities from the agreements.

So, according to the European dominant **monist human rights protection system, international agreement be-**

comes the integral part of the national legal order with its ratification by the governments in the country.

If the country accepts the **dual system, implementation of the responsibilities from the contracts is not done by ratification, but through creating a special law or through direct inclusion of its provisions in the permanent national legislation.**

Comparative analysis in European systems shows differences regarding the position of international agreements in the national legal orders. **In some countries such as in Belgium, Luxembourg and Holland**, the provisions of international agreements dedicated to human rights have supranational effect and the same are set above the national legal system, replacing the authority of constitutional norms. **In accordance with the constitutional practice of other countries, such as, Austria, Italy and Finland**, international human rights agreements that are ratified with parliamentary majority have the same legal binding effect as the constitutional provisions of the national state.

According to the third countries practice, the implementation of the obligations from international agreements, and in compliance with the European monist system, is accomplished as a responsibility according to which the legal power has larger meaning than the regular one, the parliamentary legislation, but is under the meaning of the national constitutions. This practice is seen in Bulgaria, Germany, France, Greece, Cyprus, Portugal, and Spain and in other countries.

In Czech Republic, Lichtenstein, Romania, the Russian Federation and Slovakia, only those international agreements that work on human rights are set over the regular legislation. The primate in standards of international law should always be considered as minimal. Whether in the area of human rights or in the electoral laws the national constitutions

implement sub-democratic standards and rules, and then the national provisions should be respected. The process of implementation of international agreements that establish international standards in the national legal order is different from the interaction that is completed between the legal order in EU, on the one, and the legal orders of the member –countries, on the other.

If the European standard is established in the foundation contracts of the EU or any other act in the Union, in accordance with the theory of the sovereignty transfer, the same will be dominant and related to nationally constitutional norms with a legally binding effect after its acceptance EU member-countries. Hence, the implementation of international legal standards has no similarity with the obligation to apply the **acquis communautaire** in adopting the national constitutions and assessment of the balanced national legislation within EU legislation. The implementation of the **acquis communautaire** has an aim to provide supranational, direct and horizontal effect between the primary and the institutional law in the EU. This follows the EU law that has supranational, direct, momentary and universal effect on all EU member-countries. On the other hand, the implementation and application of international standards can also be viewed from the aspect of the content of global and social constitutionalism. In the interest of establishing the meaning of the international legal standards in the area of human rights, and especially in the sphere of elections, as well as within the context of global and social constitutionalism, firstly the essence of these phenomena should be explained.

The term **global constitutionalism** has several different connotations. From a comparative aspect, **global constitutionalism** is an instrument for analyzing applicable constitutionalism in various national models of constitutional governments in the world, also from the aspect of constitutionalism in contemporary globalization processes.

Scientists tried to describe a new phenomenon or a new scale in the development of constitutionalism that appears on a global level. They treat it as global, but also as another form of governing, where power should be framed by constitutional limitations.

The supremacy of international law increased the role of international organizations, such as the World Trade Organization, the Council of Europe, etc., as well as the development of legal instruments for the protection of human rights on supremacy level that can be viewed as creating “factory of global constitutional beginnings” that require limitations for the actors in the newly formed global government.

Within the frames or this content of international legal standards which are in interaction between national and global constitutionalism. The intensity of their legal strength is stronger in frames of national constitutionalism. It is also present in the federal content in the process of affirming the interaction between the primary sources of the EU and constitutions of EU member-countries.

In the global constitutionalism, there is compatibility of democratic standards, but not the hierarchy of the constitutional orders.

Globalisation is still searching for its constitutional order and the rule of law, so the connection between global standards and national constitutional orders should be based on the principle **pacta sunt servanda** (head from contract law with the meaning that signed agreement of the contracting parties is the law, or that the contracting parties are due to behave in accordance with the provisions of the contract and also toward legal provisions). What the contracted parties undertook binds them. They cannot unilaterally quit the responsibilities undertaken.

The contracted parties cannot willfully change the subject and the content of the contract, or the debtor cannot pay its debt in any other way, or another time and in another place apart from the previously assigned. In international law this is the base head that means that contracts must be conscientiously executed, states must commit to the international obligations as were accepted in the text of the contract. The state, by accepting the international contract, factually gives up one part of sovereignty.

According to the Charter of the UN, the non-performance of international contracts retreats and international responsibility of the country. That, although does not have absolute implementation. International law knows the head that the contracts respond the circumstances and the conditions under which the same apply, so hence implies the proposal for their revision if the difference appears between the present circumstances and those that existed in the time of concluding the contracts (**clausula rebus sic stantibus**).

According to this fact, the meaning of international standards has increased, and the same are the compensation of the weaker legally binding force of the latest appeared supranational constitutionalism on the global level.

According to Maduro, national constitutions are based on three pillars under the influence of the global constitutionalism, because it changes the role of the constitutions in the national countries as the biggest expression of sovereignty and as criteria for the validity of the legal system:

- a) National constitutional self-determination through the prism of self-governing,
- b) The form for participation, or the forms of distribution of power, and
- c) Electoral representation.

These three pillars are under direct influence and on the global governing.

Following the thoughts of Maduro for the three pillars of the construction of the constitutions on the national and on the global plan, we follow up the **international standards as the fourth pillar** through which the appearance of global limitations of the rule is transferred toward national constitutionalism as a universal criteria for the constitutional governing. It is known that in the past, every attempt to suggest international standards in the area of elections faced counterargument that it is a disruption of the state and of national sovereignty.

Hence, it is necessary to talk about **social constitutionalism** as a main trend in the fourth constitutional generation. The social constitutionalism is connected with the increased number of subjects that participate in the decision-making process. **Democratic election principles, proposed in the instruments created by supranational, universal, regional or non-governmental institutions, are not abstract formulas on which the signatory countries agreed, but they are the base of the constitutional evolution of national countries that come from the general, mutual European treasure.**

The evolution process and introduction with the general European standards in the elections can be viewed through dioptry of the two opposite trends. In the international community, the effort to suggest a coherent system of standards on democratic elections on supranational level was initiated during the second half of the 20th century.

The world then practically started to better understand the meaning of free, fair and competitive elections for sustainable democratic power and human rights in the world and on the European continent. Although the construction process of the instruments of international and European standards in the area of elections based on consensus was not fast and easy. International and European standards were mapped from var-

ious actors on the international legislative scene—universal, regional and non-governmental organizations. Some of their suggestions were adopted as provisions in international contracts or soft law, connected with supranational standards for elections different in size, the contracting parties as members of the relevant organizations and their legally binding effect.

The short list of international and European instruments, and draft-contracts and “soft law” contain provisions for supranational standards for the principles of democratic elections that are grouped in several groups. Strong (forceful) narrow (**hard core**) of international rules is composed of:

- » **Provisions of the international contracts adopted by the UN;**
- » First Protocol of the ECHR; and
- » Relevant jurisdiction of the European Human Rights Court.

Universal international standards that refer to the principles of democratic elections are contained in the provisions of the contract law in the UN:

- » **Article 21 from the Universal Declaration for the Human Rights since 1948;**
- » **Article 25 (b) from the International Convention for Citizen and Political Rights;**
- » **Article 1 from the Convention for the Political Rights of Women since 1952;**
- » **Article 5 (c) and (d) form the International Convention for Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination of Women since 1979.**

The core of the European rules is contained within:

- 1. ECHR, Protocol 1, Article 3** states the following: “the contracting parties undertake to hold free elections in reasonable intervals by secret ballot, under conditions which will ensure free expression of the opinion of the people in the selection of the legislature”;

2. **Convention for participation of the foreigners in the public life on local level, Article 6** refers to the right to vote on the local elections;
3. **Jurisprudence (court practice) of ECHR refers to the implementation of the ECHR, Protocol 1, and article.**

“Soft” international law and European legislation contains compulsory international and European regulations in:

1. **The recommendations from 2002 for elections of the Venetian conditions or Code of good practice in electoral issues;**
2. **The existing recommendations for the democratic elections of OSCE and participating-countries since 2003;**
3. **Declaration for the criteria of free and fair elections adopted by Inter-parliamentarian Council on its 154th session in 1994 (Paris, 26th March 1994).**

3. EUROPEAN ELECTORAL LAW

Within the communitarian law in the former Community, the present EU, the European citizenship was established and the electoral rights of the citizens in the EU on the local and on the parliamentary elections within the Union. Without any doubt, the implementation of international and European legal standards in the sphere of elections there is no similarity with the supranational and direct, momentary and horizontal effect of the communitarian law, in countries as for example, Holland, which accepted the pure monist system of transportation the international provisions in domestic legislation. Each comparison between these two phenomena can be relative and can be valid for only 28 EU member-countries which are also member-countries of the Council of Europe.

The list of laws of the EU that refer to the elections are composed of:

- » Agreement on EU functioning,
- » Council Directive 93/109 in EL
- » Council Directive 94/80 in EL
- » Court decision from 10 June 1993, Liberal-democrats vs. European Parliament case C-41/92.

These provisions and the relevant amendments in the national constitutions and electoral laws presented the right to vote on the local levels of the citizens in the Union, as well as the right to vote on the elections in the European Parliament.

The right of participation for European citizens on the local and on the elections for the European Parliament in EU member-countries in compliance with the place of residence broadens the principles on the universal (general) and equal right to vote. That undoubtedly created significant step in the process of creating closer Union with the European people.

The Treaty of EU functioning re-affirmed the passive and the active electoral right of the EU citizens on the local and elections in the European Parliament when the country where they stay and live is different from their parent country.

The contract for EU functioning reaffirmed the passive and active electoral right of EU citizens on the local and elections for the European parliament when the country in which they reside and live is different from their home country. So, according the contract for EU functioning, European citizens have the right to elect and to be elected in the European Parliament elections, as well as in the local elections in the member-countries where they reside, under equal conditions as those of the people in the country.

Increasing the number of international standards is an indicator of the progress of peaceful cooperation, democra-

tization and constructing the rule of law in the international community. It is about instrument in the process of harmonizing and implementing the best values, principles, practices and techniques of democratic elections, through which the constitutional governments are legitimated. Simultaneously, the increase of international standards of the elections means obeying the need to respect the national traditions. International contract and "soft law" carefully created the unity through protection of diversities.

Undoubtedly, the process of increasing international standards should be respected in conditions when international instruments of elections are missing. Although the increase of international and European standards also have other important effects on elections. Under the assumption that the national state is a member of several international organizations that have adopted various instruments in the area of elections, the proposal about the compatibility of their provisions with those of the domestic legislation arose. The ideal state exists when the ambiguity can be overcome by the existence of a clear hierarchy of the elections within existence of clear hierarchy and the standards proposed by international organizations.

The differences in the volume and in the detailed standards and in the countries to which they refer to are normal and should not create serious problems in implementing international obligations. The right of the EU to have a strong binding effect of the EU member-countries. Based on the communitarian method, although, EU legislation does not have the same binding effect as federal law. The conflicts between some provisions from the contracts and "soft law" are not counterproductive, because "hard law" always dominates. Although, the conflict provisions from one same legal order can be an obstacle in implementing different standards in the legal system.

In search for a system where supranational standards in the sphere of elections will appear, international organization, the Council of Europe and the European Commission are concentrated on promoting the macro conditions as values, guardians of the democratic content of free and fair elections. So far, **only fundamental micro conditions are reviewed in European "soft law"**. The detailed regulative of organization of elections and selection of the electoral systems are left as issues in traditional jurisdiction of national societies. The concrete techniques of monitoring the elections are successfully developed and implemented within the OSCE. Although, the demand of adoption of the Convention for electoral standards, electoral rights and freedoms by the Council of Europe should cover the most essential parts of "soft law". The Convention should treat the recommendations (directions) for organizing the elections in the shape of a mutual contract, as an element of "hard law", which will be treated as a significant step forward in the process of harmonizing European standards in the sphere of democratic elections.

In January 2003, the Parliamentarian Assembly of the Council of Europe won the **Code of good practices in the electoral issues as a meaningful codification document**. Its basic target was to explain the elementary rules for electoral issues with an aim to provide and detect the quality of the democratic elections. On the 9th October 2003, the Ministers Committee confirmed it as a referent document in its answer of the Recommendations 1595 adopted by the Assembly nine months earlier. In the codex itself, is reflected the whole "European electoral wealth", the wealth that the Council of Europe, as the guardian of the democracy, human rights and the rule of law, presented in one document with the assistance of the Parliamentarian Assembly, the European court of Human Rights and the Venetian commission. It concerns the European electoral wealth that has to be protected, enriched and used. The decisions of the ECHR connected with the im-

plementation of Article 3 of the Additional protocol of ECHR adopted some concrete regulations. The Council of Europe created a document with a target to unify the electoral rules.

And even more, the Council of Europe, with the assistance of this codex got the necessary instrument for cooperation with other international organizations that help countries to hold successful elections or are included in monitoring their implementation: OSCE/ODIHR, EU, ACEEEO. Also, the codex made conciliation of the positions and requests of the various organizations that are not always completely identical. **For electoral proposals, on international level, the most important is Article 21 from the Universal Declaration for the Human Rights (“the will of the people is the base for the authority of governing”) and Article 25, Paragraph 6 from the International Convention for the People and Political Rights since 1966,** in which the basic principles are determined.

But, a Europe that promotes democratic values and, especially the Council of Europe, have an obligation to be more precise and directed toward a clear determination of the standards and their respect. Democratic elections have to be the only legitimate and nonviolent means for the election of political power. Democratic elections must be the only legitimate and nonviolent means for electing the political government. Democratic elections are the only means, which provide a stable civil society and sustainable development of the country, governed in accordance with the principle of the rule of law. There is no more legitimate political government than the one that comes out from fair and democratic elections, held by the principle of general electoral right, respect the principle of general electoral right in accordance with the implementation of the principle of the general electoral right in accordance with the implementation of clear and stable rules of the game, with the results acknowledged as correct by the international community.

3.1. Content of the Code

The code contains two elements:

- » **Directions and**
- » **Explanatory report**

European principles are contained in the direction. The report are lists the explanations and directions, as well as adequate qualifications.

The meaning of the five principles is underlined:

- » Universal electoral right;
- » Equal electoral right;
- » Free electoral right;
- » Secret electoral right; and
- » Direct electoral right

1. Universal (general) electoral right means that all people have the right to elect and be elected. By implementing this system, the code considers the following criteria as legitimate: government, citizenship, residence, and cases when it is necessary to renounce the electoral right.

The principle of general electoral law covers **active (right to vote) and passive electoral right** (the right to be elected) in accordance with concrete rules and conditions that each citizen has to obey. In accordance with the **Convention of the Council of Europe for participation of foreigners in public life on the local level** much stronger is the tendency to accomplish the local political right of foreigners that reside in another country for a longer period. Also, the principle for the general electoral right stipulates the issues that refer to the residence, the condition under which the citizen can lose the electoral right, the evidence of the electoral right in the electoral register, and the submission of the candidacy.

2. Principle of equal electoral right includes issues for equal height of the vote and **equal electoral power:** man-

dates must be equally allocated between the electoral; **principle of equal opportunities**: this equality must be guaranteed to parties and independent candidates. Within this principle the **neutral interaction of state institutions** is included especially toward: the electoral campaign, media coverage of the electoral performances, especially on the public service and the budget financing of the parties and electoral campaigns.

The equality can be **strict**, when **the political parties should be treated on equal basis regardless of their momentary parliamentary strength**, or **proportional**, or the parties must be treated in accordance with the results won in previous elections. The equality of the possibilities should refer to the time limit of representing the candidates in public service, in the exploitation of public financial means, or in some other form.

In accordance with the freedom of expression, there should be a legal provision that **determines the minimal approach to the private audiovisual media for advertising and electoral campaign of all participants in the elections**. Financing the political parties, the candidates and the electoral campaign must be transparent. The principle of equal possibilities, in concrete cases, should lead to the limitation of the expenditures of the parties, especially in the part of media advertising.

In relation of equality and national minorities, it is necessary to allow party representation of the interests of the national minorities, as well as equal and pair representation of genders.

3. The principle of free electoral right includes issues connected with the **freedom of the electorate to built their own opinion**, while the state government and the institutions must look after sustaining their neutrality, especial-

ly in the media, financing the parties and the candidates, the right to a public protest, etc.

The state government has numerous positive obligations regarding this principle, among which it is due to accept and to get in function the candidates that won the elections, to allow the electors to get introduced with the lists and election candidates, for example, through adequate article, this information must be available in the languages of the national minorities. Adequate sanctions must be established if the neutrality of some state institution or body is threatened or if the freedom of the electors to form their own opinion is threatened. The freedom of electors to present their wishes belongs to this principle and the same has to interact with the electoral result. The vote process must be simple; the electors always should have the possibility to vote in their electoral posts.

4. The principle of secrecy of the electoral right.

The secrecy of voting is not just a right, but also a duty. Non-compliance to this principle must be punished with disqualification of each electoral paper whose content is public. The voting must be personal. The family vote and any other form of control during voting of one elector to another must be prohibited. The violence and the interference of the secrecy of the electoral right must be sanctioned.

5. The principle of direct electoral right and

6. The principle of periodically of elections.

3.2. Conditions for the implementation of the principle

1. Respect the basic rights of the human and the citizen:

- » **The freedom of expression and freedom of the press,**

- » **Freedom of movement**
- » **Freedom of association and organizing the political targets, including the right to form political parties.**

The limitation of these rights and freedoms must be in compliance with the law, in accordance with public interests, and match with the proportionality principle.

2. The basic elements of the electoral system and especially the institutions for implementation of the elections, the alteration of the electoral units should not be changed at least one year before holding the elections, or should be constitutional matter, or a matter ordered with higher act of regular law (principle of stability of electoral law).

3. The procedural borders are:

a) The organization of the elections by impartial bodies that will process the electoral law. This proposal has very a significant role if we repeat Stalin's words: Regarding the elections, the only thing that is worth is who publishes the electoral results!".

It is not clearly stated that the ruling majority cannot monopolize the power in these electoral units, because each monopoly is a source of abuse.

Where the long tradition of activism of independent administrative electoral governments, those who have the political power exist, it is necessary to go to the construction of the **independent and impartial electoral administration** on all levels, from the state electoral commissions to the electoral boards.

The SEC must be a permanent body. It must be composed of **at least one member from the judiciary, representatives of the parties that participate in the parliament activities,**

or have won at least a certain percentage of votes in the last elections, and independent member experts on electoral issues. The representatives from national minorities can be included. The political parties must equally be presented in the electoral commissions or must be able to monitor the activities of the impartial body.

Only a transparent, impartial and independent electoral administration can provide the conditions for quality electoral process, from the pre-electoral period from the official publishing of the electoral results. In those countries where the administrative governments have a long tradition of independence from the political governments (Sweden, Belgium, Denmark), the public administration is mostly included in organizing the electoral process. In these countries, there is an administrative way to organize the electoral administration. In compliance with the reports of the Bureau of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe for monitoring the elections, and in these countries there are numerous insufficiencies that refer to the electoral administration: lack of transparency in the activities of the central electoral commission; various variants in interpreting the ways to count votes, politically polarized electoral administration; controversies in appointing the members of the SEC; members of electoral commissions nominated by state institutions etc.

The members of the SEC are preferably appointed in line with legal experts, political analysts, mathematicians, or other experts of electoral problematic. Equality can be strict on proportional levels. Members of the electoral commissions must get standard training. It is preferred for the electoral commissions to enact decisions with qualified majority or by consensus.

b) Monitoring the elections.

c) Effective system of protection. The complaints in the second degree can be viewed by courts, special electoral

courts, or the Constitutional Court. Up until now, there is not even one provision referring to the complaints in front of an international court different than the one that is possible to look for protection through the ECHR, in accordance with the Article 3 from the Additional Protocol.

4. Electoral system

The essence of these principles has laid the international norms. The general electoral right is contained in Article 25 (b) in the International agreement for Citizen and Political Rights, and the general European rule is in Article 3 from the Additional Protocol of European convention of human rights, in which explicitly the right for periodically of elections in reaching the free and secret electoral right is stipulated, and other principles are acknowledged in precedential area of human rights. The right to direct (intermediate) elections by the Court in Strasbourg.

The electoral regulative recommends to regulate and organize special **independent and professional electoral administration on all levels**. During that, the electoral literature is familiar with three models of organizing the electoral administration:

- a) Bureaucratic or individualistic
- b) Professionalized
- c) Combination with members of the political parties.

It is necessary to think if it is better to implement two teams, **narrow and wider team of the electoral institutions**.

The electoral administration can be organized in few different segments.

In some countries, the electoral administration is composed of public officials or personnel employed in the public sector, then judges or election experts. This neutral or profes-

sional model is mostly used when the UN or other international organizations involved in the process of constructing the electoral administration in some country. In the countries where the level of trust in the public administration is low, or in which the judiciary is not independent enough, this model can input great distrust within the electorate, but also among the participants in the electoral process.

In these countries, it is found that it is much better to go to the individual election of individuals, experts, that are professionally proven in electoral issues and appointed from the legislative or executive government. Repeatedly, this model of individual election functions well if the electors and the parties trust the independence and integrity of the appointed individuals. The electoral administration can include, but also can exclude the party's representatives. This model has an advantage in the potential de-politisation of the electoral administration, also in building trust in the state where there are doubts about the honesty and integrity of the electoral system. In those countries where citizens trust the government, which forms an independent public administration, electoral administration is mostly a part of public administration.

In those countries with a history of party domination and manipulations in the electoral process it is necessary to implement independent electoral administration separated from the domination of the ruling party. Although it is supposed that the State's Electoral commission is an independent institution, it nevertheless, is a public institution that is dependent on the government in the financing aspect.

In some countries, there exists a **balanced system of representing the electoral administration.** This representation is a mechanism of weight and counterweight. The other systems adopt the combination of these mechanisms; some

of them have an independent commission with political balance. Some systems strive to provide neutrality of the key election administrators through their inability to be politically engaged. They are named for a mandate with longer period compared with the mandate of the government without possibility the government changes, except in exceptional cases, when there is a violation of the laws.

An example for such a type of administration exists in India, where the SEC is a permanent and constitutionally established body. The president of the SEC and its members are elected by the president of the state in a period of 6 years' mandate and they can be replaced only by procedure of impeachment in parliament. In Canada, the president of the SEC and its deputy are not allowed to vote in the federal elections. The neutrality and non-party characteristic of the electoral administration is a crucial integrative factor.

In a lot of the countries, especially in the post transitional, some parties still consider the only way to win the elections is to control the electoral administration. If the parties and the electors consider that the electoral administration works biased, even when this constellation is not true, it can disrupt the elections' credibility and decrease the legitimacy of the electoral results. This situation also, can be a reason for a loss of mandates, or the parties to boycott the election results. The equal treatment of the electoral participants, including equal opportunities, as well as, an equal approach in the electoral process, are the composing parts of the qualification fair elections. This means that the participants in the elections should get an equal treatment by the electoral administration, from the media, from the state institutions, the public opinion research agencies. The voters should have equal approach to the electoral register.

The range and the complexity of the Code cannot be adequately understood without being read together with the report that contains the explanations. On its own Resolution, from 28 January 2003, connected with the Code, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe has determined this document as a step forward in the process of harmonizing the standards in organizing and monitoring the elections, but also in establishing procedures and conditions to organize the electoral process. The wish to see all the member-countries as they reevaluate and /or revise electoral rules in the light of the Code are stated in the Resolution.

Along with this Code, the Association of the elected officials in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe in its part, has prepared a draft-convention for the electoral standards, electoral rights and freedom that was sent to the bodies of the Council of Europe. By signing the Good Practices Code on 28 January 2003, the Assembly, by its Recommendation 1595 (2003), suggested the Committee of Ministers to transform the Code into the convention, having in mind the work of OSCE (ODIHR) and draft-document of ACEEEO. Unfortunately, in its answer addressed to the Parliamentary assembly adopted on 9 October 2003, the Committee of Ministers concluded that it is difficult to determine a legally binding instrument for the electoral proposals and that the preparation and approval of the convention in this plan is too early.

PART FOUR

**EUROPEAN PARTIES
AND THE PARTY SYSTEM
IN THE EU**

CHAPTER 1



BASIC REMINDERS OF THE EUROPEAN INTEGRATION

1. WHY EUROPEAN INTEGRATION?

As it was mentioned before, the idea of a united Europe was just a dream in the minds of philosophers and visionaries for a long time. So for example, Victor Hugo spoke about his idea to create the "United States of Europe" that would be inspired by humanistic ideals.

But, the big dream of the European Union was destroyed by the big losses and consequences that the European continent suffered after the two world wars ended. The end of the Second World War had lit a new sparkle of hope for the European countries. The people who managed to pull out from the totalitarian system decided to put an end to the hatred and rivalry in Europe and to build long lasting peace among former enemies.

Namely, in the period between 1945 and 1950, numerous encouraging statements were received. Above all, those sent from Konrad Adenauer, Winston Churchill, Paul – Henri Spaak, Alcide de Gasperi and Robert Schumann, with a convincing tone that European citizens must bravely enter the new era of their own development.

In compliance with their ideas, Western Europe deserved to build a new order based on the mutual interests of its citizens and nations, and ordered according to the jointly concluded agreements in which the principles of rule of law and equality among all citizens are especially emphasized. At the same time, they were supporters of two organizational principles: the principle of state alliance and the principle of federal state. It has to be pointed out that the idea for European unity was not related only to one political concept at any time or with one integration model, but with numerous mixed models that were directed regarding the political and economic interests of the member- countries.

Important incentive in uniting the western European countries was made by the Marshall Plan and economic rehabilitation, adopted by sixteen western European countries.²³⁴

This exact plan made direct influence in forming the Organization of the European economy cooperation in 1948, with a basic purpose to direct American aid and to coordinate national economic policies of the western European member countries.

This initial step of uniting was followed by military –strategic realignment of the European countries. So, in 1947, Great Britain and France made a joint defense deal which was the base for forming the Western European Union in Brussels. One year later, the Northern Atlantic Pact (NATO) was formed with the direct mediation and interest of the US, with an aim to reach greater stability in Western Europe and in the context of the cold war.

An especially important phase in western European unity is the Hague Conference, held in 1948, during which all the more relevant federal movements of Western Europe were present.

Actually, on this exact conference, the ideas for uniting the western European countries in one federation entity were proclaimed. **The noisiest representative of this idea was the European Union of federalists, as well as the French nongovernmental organization "Federation", which were direct founders of the International European Union Movement Committee.**²³⁵

This Committee organized the first conference in Hague, where Winston Churchill was the chairman, British prime min-

²³⁴ This help was not accepted by the Eastern European countries and the countries of the former USSR. The plan of former US state secretary, Marshall, as a condition to get aid benefits determined the obligation to unite the countries- beneficiaries of the financial aid. See: **Dr. Gordana Ilic Gashmi (2004), Reforms of the European Union – institutional aspects, IGP "Prometheus", Belgrade, (pg. 19-24).**

²³⁵ For more on the work the form of organization and the Committee members, see: http://www.europeanmovement.eu/fileadmin/files_emi/pdf/BrochureEnglish20.04.05.pdf.

ister at the time and the founder of the movement “United Europe”. The most significant resolution from the Hague conference was the forming of the Council of Europe as an international organization that was supposed to strengthen political support between the members –countries, as well as developing the principle of parliamentary democracy and the protection of human rights. Despite the development of all these segments, the role of the Council of Europe in the process of the European integration is exceptionally high. The existence of the Council of Europe is considered as a lobby in creating the European Union.

Otherwise, the original and revolutionary idea for European unity in today’s meaning of the word was initially exposed by **Jean Monnet (former president of the Planning Commission of the Government in France) in front of former president of the Government and minister for foreign affairs of France, Robert Schumann, on 4 May 1950.**

Robert Schumann accepted Monnet’s concept and prepared a Declaration for forming the international organization with supra-national elements and specific institutional structure that will have to provide and guarantee joint production market and coal and steel exploitation within the European continent.

In the Declaration, disclosed on 9 May 1950, Robert Schumann suggested forming a joint market with two significant economic areas that since were used exclusively for military purposes: the usage and available coal and steel.²³⁶

Through controlling these raw materials, Schumann suggested the economical and political integration of post-war Germany into the Steel and Coal Union and its alliance with France and other allied partners.

Transfer of the sovereignty was suggested in the Declaration from the member-countries from the Union into the

²³⁶ For more detailed content of the Declaration, see: <http://europa.eu/abc/symbols/9-may/decl.en.htm>

independent organ, known as Supreme power, appointed to execute the authorizations that till then were appointed to the member-countries in these areas, as well as to adopt mandatory decisions to be implemented in the national systems.

Cooperation between the member-countries of the Community in these areas, in accordance with the **Declaration, should be closer than traditional intergovernmental cooperation.** But, the Declaration did not have only economic interest. Deep inside it contained a wider political context. It proclaimed that Europe should be built on a federative ground. The creating of the European Union of coal and steel was intended to be the first step in that direction. Through the economic integration that blurred the crucial economic interests of the European countries, Schumann recognized the demand for political intelligence through creating conditions for mutual trust between the states, and based on the concrete achievements that stem from mutually created politics.

Although the appeal of the French minister of foreign affairs was directed to all European countries, only five of them, Germany, Italy, Belgium, Holland and Luxembourg, gave a positive response. Hence, only six countries signed the European Union Treaty of Coal and Steel on 18 April 1951 in Paris.²³⁷

Based on the Paris Treaty from 1951, Germany undertook the reconstruction and reindustrialization of its territory, while France introduced a framework for planning its own production of coal and steel. Joint production and distribution of coal and steel was managed through ministry meetings of the governments of the EU member-countries.

The only thing that Schumann and Monnet were right about was the idea that these intergovernmental discussions will be postponed, undecided, disagreed because of the fact

²³⁷ The text of the Treaty is available on:
<http://europa.eu/legislationsummaries/institutionalaffairs/treatiesecscen.htm>

that each government continued to defend their interests. According to them, the efficiency in the decision-making process can be guaranteed only through delegating the responsibility for the realization of the political ideas through daily political management in the so-called supranational body.

Actually, this combination of intergovernmental process of decision-making and political initiative and managing from the supranational executive or the so-called "Monnet's method", was the organizational model contained in all future treaties.²³⁸

2. SHORT REVIEW OF THE THEORIES OF EUROPEAN INTEGRATION

European integration is defined as a process of political, legal, economy, social, and cultural unity of the countries in one mutual form with the purpose to create and protect the mutual interests in these areas.

In theory there are several basic theories of integration:

- » federalist theory,
- » functionalist theory
- » neo-functionalist theory
- » intergovernmentalism,
- » liberal intergovernmentalism,
- » "new institutionalism" theory in rational election and
- » constructivist theory.

2.1. Federalist theory

The appearance of federalist ideas was a consequence of the invidious state in which there was great number of western European after the end of World War II against a strong US and countries from the former USSR.

²³⁸ The total explanation of the Monnet method that refers to the development of the European Union is given by professor Pier Gerbet. See: <http://www.ena.lu/jeanmonnetmethodexplainedprofessorpiergerbetparis23january2004-02-13717>

According to the federalists, western European countries in an unified federate entity is a consequence of the previously enacted political decisions from the politicians and nations based on joint political and social- economic interests and aims. So, according the federalist theory, at the beginning of the integrative process, united federative state with horizontal and vertical government division whose institutions would feature transferred authorizations from the national governments of the member –countries.

Formal-legal, autonomous units within the federation should renounce the vast part of their own sovereignty and to subordinate themselves under the mutual sovereignty of the institutions in the united community.

Federalism is defined as a way to solve traditional differences among sovereign countries, where the dominance of one country over the other is exceeded and where part of the sovereign rights of the countries are transferred to a supranational community. Hence, sovereignty is no more separable and is no longer understood as a permanent conceptual category, but the accent is placed on transferred state sovereignty and to the joint institutions that use the transferred sovereignty for the community benefit. The federal character of the Community is viewed as a gradual process in which the members will further keep their distinctions and identity.

Federalism as a theory represents the idea for constitutionally divided sovereignty between at least two territorial units: national and federal. The citizens are politically obliged toward the governments of both units.

Federalism, according to these theory supporters, is best described as a political system in which there is a clear division of the government between central (European) and regional (state) government. Such a position of the federative

system, according to them, has a clear division also to the responsibilities of the separate governments.

One of the most prominent representatives of the federal theory is the political activist from Italy, **Atiero Spinelli**, according to whom, "the national countries within the federative country lose their rights to ownership because of the fact that they cannot guarantee the political and economic security of their own citizens".

Spinelli dedicated most of his life to the federal cause as a member of the European Commission and European Parliament, where most dedicatedly he fought for implementing deeper European integration between European countries.²³⁹

2.2. Functionalism theory

The theory of functionalism appears as a result of the increased influence of politics in the European Union and diversion of the responsibility in solving the problems of the national countries and the common bodies and institutions in the Community.

In accordance with this theory, the role of national governments progressively decreases as the pace of integration increases, actively encouraged by various functionally based and mixed national relationships.

Functionalism can be identified as a "classical theory of regional integration according to which the mutual demand for technocratic management of the economic and social politics leads to creating international institutions and bodies".²⁴⁰

²³⁹ After World War II, the federalists were very strong in realizing their ideas. They thought that the nation state is very aggressive and with unstable institutions because of that it has to be replaced with pan-European institutions, or with federalization, which main task will be the protection from the appearance of further military conflicts and spreading nationalism in Europe.

²⁴⁰ Cited according to: **Dinan,D.(2000), "Ever Closer Union: An Introduction to European Integration", Boulder/London: Lynne Rienner, (pg. 245).**

The functionalists constantly try to eliminate the role of the national country through canceling the idea of traditional authority that it has. One of the main arguments which defend this thesis is that national countries are the main reasons for causing wars.

Also, according to functionalists' ideas, countries cannot satisfy the requirements of their citizens. The only thing they know is to divide their citizens to be their enemies. Because of that, national countries have to be put under control in order for peace and tranquility among the people.

Functionalism is based more on the principle of cooperation, rather than on the principle of integration. The center of attention of functionalism is the focus on cooperation. The functionalists think that human nature is mainly rational and in fact very cooperative.

Following Kant's ideas, functionalists think that human nature has a very positive energy, which mainly believes in the idea of human development and progress. They believe that a rational and peaceful progress of civilization is possible and that the conflicts and disharmonious developments are not of typical human nature.²⁴¹ Hence, functionalists believe in the positive idea of human nature and human development vs. country's centrist oriented paradigm of the "power policy".

Being members of national countries in international organizations is the exit from the destructive force that these countries can create by their acts. The development of international organizations is the beginning of the end of the autonomy closeness of industrial societies. According functionalists' ideas, experts and technocrats are the main creators of cooperation within the supranational bodies and institutions, much more than the official representatives of national governments.

²⁴¹ See: **Rosamond, B. (2000), Theories of European Integration, London: MacMillan Press, (pg 31).**

The founder of the functionalist theory is **David Mitrany**, who appeared in extremely complicated and complex time for Europe, in the second half of the 20th century, when actually the main reason to form a common international organization whose purpose was to prevent the political conflict between western European countries. Mitrany is the representative of the existentialist international institutional bodies, with their own authority and identity that will look after the interests of national countries in several important areas, such as, security, transport and communications. He thought that these international bodies should have autonomous tasks and powers, responsible for solving concrete questions in concrete areas similar to national governments, only on various levels.²⁴²

What is significant and has to be noted is that functionalism confronts the continental unification or regionalism. Theoreticians who support functionalism think that regionalism has a tendency to create inter-regional tensions and antagonisms. Regionalism supports the protection of borders and national entities which is opposite to the principle of flexibility and openness that is preferred by functionalists. Mitrany himself has directly resisted the federal and the regional type of unification within the European continent.

While at the federal type of unification, countries are limited to the rights they get based on their membership in the Union, the regional type of unification insists on creating treaties on political bases and aims at always supporting the interests of the bigger countries. European Union for coal and steel was interesting for Mitrany because of the fact that it contained functional solutions for a concrete set of sector questions that appeared in postwar Europe. According the functionalists views, "the European integration was a triumph of rational and technocratic over the political".²⁴³

²⁴² See: **Kurt, Ümit (2009), "Europe of Monnet, Schumann, and Mitrany: A Historical Glance to the EU from the Funcionalist Perspective", European Journal of Economic and Political Studies EJEPS 2, (2), (p. 45-50).**
<http://ejeps.fatih.edu.tr/docs/articles/24.pdf>.

²⁴³ Same, (pg. 52).

2.3. The neo-functionalism theory

The theory of neo-functionalism explains the functionalist theory a step forward because it imposes the demand for the development of the official supranational organizations, such as, among the others, the European Union with its own sovereignty and status in various segments that were previously reserved only for nation states.

Haas, Lindberg, and Scheingold are considered as founders of the theory of neo-functionalism.²⁴⁴

This theory holds the attention of the supranational actors in the process of European integration, with a special accent on transnational elites that “manage” this process.

The most essential concept of this theory is “functional overflow”. That happens when the integration in one area results with requests for integration in other areas.

“The overflow” is not just economical (functional) but political. The first appears when the incomplete integration overlooks the efficiency on the existing policies and institutions. This creates an incentive for the institutions to enlarge and to deepen integration, or to create new institutions and new policies. So, for example, it is considered that the economic and monetary union is a result of the economic “overflow” from the so-called program for a single (only) market, according to which, the program cannot be considered complete until the EU reaches a single currency on the whole territory. On the other hand, the political “overflow” exists when the existing supranational structures of the EU initiate the development of new political organizations for the support of their increased power and responsibility. This type of “overflow” increases the corpus of competencies of the EU by simultaneously deepening integration in other areas.

²⁴⁴ See especially in the work of: **Nye, Joseph S., “Comparing Common Markets: A Revised Neo-functionalist Model”, published in the publication: Lindberg, L.N. and Scheingold S.A. (1970), Europe’s Would-Be Polity, Endlewood Cliffs: NJ: Prentice Hall. See also in: Jorge Juan Fernández García, Jess E. Clayton and Cristopher Hobley (2004), The Student’s Guide to European Integration, Polity Press, (p.30-32).**

The basic argument of this theory is that the European integration is a determination process in which, according to Lindberg, "concrete action is connected with the concrete aim. The action creates conditions in which the original aim will be reached if further actions are to be undertaken that will create conditions and necessities for further development".²⁴⁵

As a part of a wider "liberal school" for international relations, neo-functionalists believe that the driving forces in the background of these processes are much more social interests organized through different forms of interest groups, rather than sovereign national countries.

They think that interest groups and political parties insist on the further political integration into the EU by promoting the economical, ideological and other interests. Without any doubt the European institutions, especially the European commission, stands for delegating more power to the so-called "supranational" institutions, with increased influence in creating political policies in the EU.

Neo-functionalists think that the integration is accomplished through two connected processes:

- » **the first is social**, where the social actors look for integration and the request is satisfied through the implementation of the existing rules, institutions and European structures in ways that continue the integration, while;
- » **the second process is technocratic**, by which the leadership is provided through "power of experts, the ability of the supranational technocrats to establish the agenda and the capability of the Commission to conclude "deals"". ²⁴⁶

So, the essence of political integration is in the appearance of "the system of collective enacting decisions".

²⁴⁵ Cited by: **Sajmon Hix (2007), Political system of the European Union, Official Gazette, Belgrade, (p. 34-35).**

²⁴⁶ In this constellation, it is widely written by: **Carporaso, J. (1998), "Regional Integration Theory: Understanding Our Past and Anticipating our future", Journal of European Public Policy 5, (p.12-16).**

The basic criticism of neo-functionalism is that this theory cannot explain the inconsistent nature of integration apart from the capability to identify the conditions of supranational influence and their capability to promote the demand for further integration. A good example in this context is the Compromise from Luxemburg since 1966, which allowed implementation on the right to national veto for all questions of the entire member-countries which de facto delayed the integration process in the 1970s.

Neo-functionalists are also criticized because of the big power they give to transnational elites and supranational organizations in tracking the integrative path opposite the will of EU member-countries. A main disadvantage of the neo-functionalists considered is the support of the idea for strengthening the so-called "Intergovernmental" elements in the European Union.

2.4. Inter-governmentalists theory

The most distinguished representatives of the inter-governmentalist or intergovernmental theory are **Hoffmann, Taylor, and Moravcsik**.

In line with the "realistic school" in international relations, the theory of intergovernmentalism considers that European integration is primarily guided by the interests and stocks of European national countries.

In this sense, the basic priority of the governments of EU member-countries is to protect their geopolitical interests and especially, national security and national "sovereignty". According to this theory, the governments of the member-countries determine the priorities in the process of European integration and remain in control over the results of this process.

According to the representatives of this theory, the decision-making process on European level is a zero-sum-game where, according to Hoffmann, "the losses are not compensated through profits from other priorities: nobody wants to be cheated",²⁴⁷

Apart from the neofunctionalistic "logic of integration", intergovernmentalists follow the logic of the differences that suggested that the areas which are of key significance to national interests, the nations prefer security or self-controlled insecurity.

The main criticism of intergovernmentalism is that is focused on the "historical creation of the negotiations", where the role of the daily decisions is overlooked. The representatives of this theory think that the state is the only unilateral subject, ignoring the fact that the state is composed of several different elements (such as, constitutional institutions and the regional governments) with their own priorities and agendas.

This theory overlooks the role of the non-governmental subjects, such as interest groups and multinational corporations. Hence, the theory has a problem to explain the enlargement of the EU, especially creating new institutions, such as First Instance Court (present General Court) or increased competencies of the Commission, in areas such as structural funds.

2.5. Liberal-intergovernmentalism theory

Both various approaches, functionalism and intergovernmentalism, in fact, are two big monolith pillars of European integration since the 1970s. The next researcher's generation, who offered kind of different theories, was forced to explain which part of their opinions is connected with these dominant theories or what makes them different.

²⁴⁷ Cited from: **Hoffmann, S. (1966), "Obstinate or Obsolete? The Fate of the Nation-State and the Case of Western Europe", *Daedalus*, 95/3, (p.882).**

So, the newest integrative theories successfully adjusted themselves both to the classical theoretical approaches and went a step forward in the scientific development of European integration.

First, Andrej Moravcsik developed the so-called theory of "liberal-intergovernmentalism"²⁴⁸ That is a third degree model composed of:

1) The liberal theory for forming national preferences (selections) with: 2) inter governmentalistics model of negotiating on the EU level and 3) model of institutional selection with a specified role of international organizations.

In the first, or liberal level of the model, the national prime ministers of the governments viewed their own national interests within their own situations, as well as their interests through articulating the national preferences toward the EU. These national preferences have a complex character because they reflect certain characteristics of the national economy, party interests in the country and the interests of the institutions of each member –country. So, at the beginning, national preferences are created according the domestic demands and are not in accordance with the model of the EU's interests.

In the second, intergovernmentalist level, national governments put the national preferences on the negotiating table in Brussels. The completed treaties reflect the relative power of each single member –country, and the supranational organizations, as the Commission; have little or no influence on the political result. Compared to neo –functionalists, that emphasize the role of the Commission and the joint interests of the member countries in the Council, Moravcsik and the other

²⁴⁸ See the article: **Sandholtz, W., "Choosing Union: Monetary Politics and Maastricht", *International Organization*, 47, 1993 (pg. 1-39)**. These interests are defined and redefined in an international and institutional context which is included in the EU itself. There is a little theoretical area in which national interests are formed within the context of negotiating with the EU. For more details on this: **John Peterson and Elizabeth Bomberg (1999), *Decision –Making in the European Union, Palgrave*, (pg.14-15)**.

representatives of this theory emphasized the difficulty of negotiation between the member –countries and the meaning of the negotiation power for the most significant EU decisions.²⁴⁹

According to Moravcsik, each level is a representative of one of the classical integrative theories. In the first level, there is a “request” for European integration by the domestic economic and social actors.

Similar to the neo -functionalist theory and the liberal theory of international relations, these actors have economic interests that compete to be promoted by the national governments in the EU decision- making process.

On the second level, European integration is “provided” through intergovernmental negotiations in direction to reform the treaties of certain budget privileges. The representatives of liberal intergovernmentalism, as well as the intergovernmentalists, consider countries as unitary subjects. In this sense, supranational institutions have limited influence on the final political effects.

But, apart from the classical realistic theory, Moravcsik will conclude that state interests are guided much more by economic rather than geopolitical forces and interests. Hence, state interests are not always exactly determined. They are in line with the interests of various groups that lead the politics in the country.

The liberal intergovernmentalism as a theory focuses on the huge decisions in European (Union) history”. The basic assumptions of this theory are that “the countries are rational, self-interested actors, who “read” society requirements...and the states negotiate their differences on the international scene”.

This theory is compatible with the understanding that the EU can strengthen rather than weaken the role of the state by strategically giving possibilities to the European leaders to

²⁴⁹ See: **Helen Wallace, William Wallace and Mark A. Pollack (2005), Policy-Making in European Union, Fifth Edition, Oxford University Press, (pg.17-19).**

create the decisions on the public forums out of domestic pressure. "Governments firstly define the interests and then negotiate among themselves how to realize them".

Governments act more or less autonomous regarding how effectively and how intensively domestic groups put pressure on them with their own requirements. In this sense, writes **Sandholtz**, who thinks that the national interests of the member-countries of EU do not have independent existence, they were not formed in vacuum and then brought to Brussels".²⁵⁰

2.6. Theory of "new institutionalism" of the rational election

The second contemporary theory for European integration is the theory of "modern institutionalism" of rational choice, according to which the actors (member-countries, interest groups or the Commission) try to maximize their preferences in the institutional and in strategically limited environment. According to it, institutions are defined as formal-legal subjects that influence the actors and through providing them with information of through limitation of the subjects with the assistance of the rules for making decisions.

In accordance with the understanding of the "new institutionalism" on the rational choice, the influence that the institutions have over the subjects is limited. The institutions can influence the subjects' strategies, but not their preferences.

This theory is set and functions in accordance with the three-level model of organization (T0, T1 and T2). In the first level (level T0), institutional regulations are chosen or political decisions are enacted (by the governments of the member-countries) based on the structure of present preferences and needs.

²⁵⁰ Ibid, cited work..

In the second level (T1), the new structure of preferences and requirements appears as a result of the conditions that exist in the new environment: the transformed preferences in the member countries, their new power, preferences of the supranational institutions and the new regulations in the process of enacting decisions and political competencies on European level.

In the third level (T2), the new political decision is adopted or is certain new set of institutional rules. As a result of this model, the decisions enacted in the first level T0 "lock" the integration process in concrete direction.

Opposite the Morchavcsik theory, the subjects have incomplete information for this model: in the first level (T0) national governments are not capable to predict their preferences in the second level (T1) or to predict the influence of their decisions through politics of supranational institutions and their political results received in the third level (T2). As a result of this, political elections and institutional reforms often can produce unwanted consequences.²⁵¹

This theory appeared as a result of the effort of the American political scientist to understand the background and the effects of American legislative behavior on the Congress and the results from the politics. These representatives noticed that the model of relative majority that exists in the Congress' decision-making process can be extremely unstable due to the fact that the relative majority in the policy-making process can always form a coalition that will replace the existing legislative.

2.7. Constructivism theory

We refer to a relatively new theory that appears in the process of European integration that has to explain that the human cannot exist independently from its own social environ-

²⁵¹ More details on this theory see the article: **Pierson, P. (1996), "The Path to European Integration: A historical Institutional Analysis", Comparative Political Studies, vol.29, no. 2, (p.123-163).**

ment and its collective systems (“culture” in a wider sense of the word). This kind of approach is opposite to the theory of rational choice, according to which the basic unit in social life is individual human action. The crucial point of the constructivists is the constitutions of the (social) structures and agents.²⁵²

The social environment in which we find ourselves “constitutes” who we are constitutes our identities as social beings.

According to the constructivism theory, institutions are accepted beyond, with an aim to include not just formal regulations, but at the same time, the informal norms for which is expected to “constitute” the actors, or their identities and preferences. The constructivists consider that individual identities are formed or transformed in accordance to their social environment. More and more critics consider that the EU institutions create not just behaviour but also the preferences and identities of individuals and governments of the EU member-countries. This argument is especially emphasized, among others, by **Thomas Christiansen**, according to whom, European integration has a transformative effect on the European “state system” and on its constitutive units. European integration has experienced numerous changes during the years, so it is reasonable to suppose that in the process, the agents’ identity and their interests equally changed.²⁵³

3. THE EUROPEAN UNION AS POLITICAL SYSTEM “SUI GENERIS”

In accordance with some generally accepted assumptions on how the EU functions, the theories of European integration show similarities with the classical system theories for politics, management and the decision-making process.

²⁵² See, also, cited work, **Helen Wallace, William Wallace and Mark A. Pollack (p.22)**.

²⁵³ Ibid, cited article (p.23).

So, for example, **neofunctionalists analysis for forming preferences on national level are similar with pluralistic theories of behavior of the interests groups and the political parties within the political processes.** That is why, in interest of adequate analysis of the processes and relations that happen in the EU political system, it is necessary to ask assistance from the classical theories of the political system and to put in function their findings to introduce the political phenomenon in the European political system.

The EU political system is a creation that is difficult to explore and explain. The various types of governing as well as the complexity of styles, instruments and the institutions in the decision-making process often directs to **two definitions of the EU.**

The first defines the union as a classical international organization, while the other views the Union as a "federative state". It is a fact that, on a higher level from the regular international organizations, the Union is developed from the so-called horizontal system of interstate cooperation in vertical and multi-level structure of enacting decisions without the possibility to turn into a classical federative state.

In an attempt to describe the Union as something "between" these two definitions, **William Wallace** emphasized one almost accepted, but incomplete, opinion that the institutional structure of the Union is "more than a regime, but less than a federation".²⁵⁴

In this dynamic dispute often the analytics agreed that the EU represents a political system "sui generis".

With the purpose to explain what, actually, this formulation means, it is necessary to initiate theoreticians' opinions who deal with political system science and its component parts.

²⁵⁴ It refers to the opinion contained in the work of: **Wallace, W., "Less than a federation –more than a regime: the Community as a political system", in the work: Wallace, Helen/Wallace, William(ed), Policy-making in the European Communities, 2nd edition, Chichester, 1983 (pg. 403-422).**

Namely, Gabriel Almond²⁵⁵ and David Easton²⁵⁶ are the first theoreticians who developed the formal frame for defining and analyzing the essence of the political in general. Although many contemporary political analytics did not except "functionalistic" assumptions and theoretical purposes of their projects, although, their system theory was and stayed the base in science for the political system.

According to these authors, **the democratic political system is composed of four basic elements:**²⁵⁷

First, the political system is a stable and clearly defined set of institutions which are included in the decision- and regulation-making process that regulate their mutual relationships and internal relations;

Second, the political system is composed from citizens and from social groups that, directly or indirectly, realize their political wishes within the system. Indirectly, citizens realize the requirements and the interests through mediator organizations: interest groups and political parties;

Third, the collective decisions in the political system should have significant influence over the distribution of the economic means, but also over the distribution of the social and political values in the system; and

Fourth, within the political system has constant interaction (feedback) between the political output elements- decision, input elements- citizen requirements and their support of the system, new decisions, etc.

What can be noticed during the study of the political system of the European Union is that it possesses all four elements.

²⁵⁵ See: **Almond, G.A., "Comparing Political Systems", *Journals of Politics* vol.18, no 2, 1956 (p. 391-409).**

²⁵⁶ See: **Easton, D., "An Approach to the Study of Political Systems", *World Politics*, vol.9, no.5, 1957 (p. 383-400).**

²⁵⁷ See: **Keman, H., "Comparative Politics: A distinctive Approach to Political Science?", *Keman H(ed), Comparative Politics: New Directions in Theory and Method*, Amsterdam: VU University Press 1993.**

1. The European Union has an institutionally stable and complex system. The base of the institutional "quadripartism", embodied through the existence of the European Commission, the Council of Europe, the European Parliament, and the EU Court of Justice, established in 1950. The treaties that followed afterwards and the reforms they provided to undertake gave these institutions a wide range of competencies in the sphere of executive, legislative and judicial government.

These institutional reforms created a highly developed system of regulations and procedures that show the way these authorities execute these competencies in EU institutions. Actually, probably the Union has the most formal and the most complex set of rules to enact decisions than any other system in the world.

2. In the moment when the EU institutions overtook the governing with the system, the number of the interest groups that tried to influence or to address request to the system has increased. The interest groups that have the biggest power and the institutionalized position in the political system of EU are the governments of the EU member-countries and their political parties.²⁵⁸

The central position of the governments of the member-countries in the system makes the Union similar to other international organizations, such as the United Nations (UN) and the OSCE in Europe.

But, the governments of European Union member-countries do not have the monopoly over the political requirements. On the contrary. These requirements come from the complex network of competitive relations among public and private interests groups that insist on influencing the political

²⁵⁸ Special oversight on this issue in: **Simon Hix, The Political System of the European Union, Palgrave, 1999, as well as in the book of: Prof. Dr. Savo Klimovski and Associate Prof. Dr. Tanja Karakamisheva, Political Parties and interest groups, Faculty of law "Iustinianus Primus" , Skopje, 2 August S, 2006, especially in the part of the interest groups in EU (p.356-365).**

processes in the EU system with the purpose to promote or protect their own interests.

3. The decisions adopted in the political system of the EU are very important and have an effect on the whole territory. For example:

- a) The European union covers all the areas of public politics, including market regulations, social policy, protection and promotion of the environment, agriculture, regional politics, research and development, internal affairs, citizenship, foreign politics, international trade, defense, consumption, transport, public health, education and culture;
- b) The Union enacted more than 80% of the regulations that will regulate the exchange of goods, services and capital of the markets in its member-countries;
- c) Primary and secondary acts of the EU are the main part of the domestic legal order of EU member-countries, when the legislation of EU is dominant in relation to national legislation;
- d) Comparing the budgets of national governments of EU member –countries, the EU budget is significantly smaller, but, although, few member-countries get almost 5% from the gross domestic product from its own means;
- e) The Union and its regulatory politics, together with the rules of the economical and monetary union have a powerful “indirect” influence over the allocation of power and sources among citizens groups and nations in Europe.

Shortly, the EU output elements influence the “authoritative allocation of the values” (Iston) an to “who gets what, when and how” in the European system (Lasvel).

4. The political processes that are held within the European political system are a permanent characteristic of Euro-

pean political life. Namely, the meetings between the chief of states and governments of the member-countries, held every six months, are an example of one such permanent characteristic of the system.

Many times we get the feeling that the Union functions only through organizing periodical summits, similar to other international organizations.

But, the real essence of the functioning of the EU political system is found in the continued process of cooperation inside, among EU institutions in Brussels, and among national institutions of the member-countries and Brussels. This cooperation is evident also within formed departments in national governments, through bilateral meetings among governments and through forms of corporation between private interest groups and government officials in Brussels, or officials on the national level.

The result of this continuous cooperation, which is different from other international organizations, is the political system of the EU that functions daily.

5. The European Union is not a "country" in traditional Weber's sense of the word. The union does not have a "monopoly in the legal use of pressure" through the police or a security system. The power of pressure is under exclusive competencies of the national governments of EU member-countries.

The first theories of the political system consider that the political system cannot exist without the state. In this sense, Almond says: "...reaching the final, comprehensive and legitimate physical pressure is the monopoly of the state, while the political system is interested in the aims, directions and conditions under which this physical pressure takes place".²⁵⁹

²⁵⁹ Cited the work of: **Almond G.A., "Comparing Political Systems", also certain cited work (pg.395).**

Some modern theories refuse the interference of the state and the political system. For example, Bertrand Badie and Pier Birnbaum consider that "...the state should be understood as an unique phenomenon, as a creation developed in a special geographic and cultural context...Although, it is wrong to consider the state as an unique way to govern the society in any time on any place".²⁶⁰

According Badie's and Birnbaum's ideas, the state is a product of counter structure of political, economical and social relations that existed in Western Europe between the 19th and the middle of the 20th century. In this period, a high level of centralization was needed, differentiation, universality and institutionalism. In other words, in different concrete conditions the system management and leading politics can be performed without the presence of the classical apparatus of the state.

This is especially a case in managing the EU system in the late 20th century. Namely, the political system of the EU is set as highly decentralized and atomized, based on the voluntary principle and the principle of the existence of sub-organizations (the existing national countries) that administrated the pressure and other forms of state power.

In other words, European integration produced a new complex political system.²⁶¹ This, of course, arouses the re-definition of the role of the countries in Europe.

Hence, the conclusion that the EU has to and must be studied through the usage of "tools, methods and intercross system theories that are implemented by science for govern-

²⁶⁰ Cited: **Birnbaum, P, and Badie, P., The Sociology of the State, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983 (p.135-137).**

²⁶¹ See more detailed in the work of: **Dr. Tanja Karakamisheva, "European Union and sovereignty- dilemmas and contraverses", Eurodialog, Magazine for European Questions, Studentski zbor, Skopje, 2002 (p.97-107).**

ing, politics and the decision-making process. In this sense, the study of the EU has to be a part of the essence of political sciences".²⁶²

3.1. European Parliament

3.1.1. Historical development of the European Parliament

The first assembly was organized by the Treaty for founding the European Union for coal and steel in form of a Joint assembly (Assemblée). After the conclusion of the Roman treaties for founding the EEU and the EAEC in 1957, the Convention for Certain Institutions Common for European Communities was adopted,²⁶³ regulating common institutions for all three European Communities: Assembly and Court of Justice. The first session of the Assembly was held on 19 March 1958, on which Robert Schumann was elected as its president. From 1958 until 1962, the Assembly was called European Parliamentary Assembly and after 1962 the title European Parliament was adopted.²⁶⁴

As other institutions, the internal composition of the Parliament changed during the time and with each successful enlargement. These changes were more dramatic for the Parliament than for other institutions because its size and the breadth of the European political-party spectrum. The European Parliament (EP) differs from other EU institutions, among others, and because of the facts that these institutions undertook very dramatic changes, developing itself from the adequate debate body into effective and influential legislative organ by increasing its power during the last 15 years.

²⁶² Cited according to: **Hix, S., The Political System of the European Union, London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999 (p.2).**

²⁶³ See: **Convention on Certain Institutions Common to the European Communities, 1957** http://www.ena.lu/treaty_establishing_convention_certain_institutions_commeuropeancommunitiesromemarch1957-020302583.html.

²⁶⁴ See: **European Parliament Resolution, 30.03.1962, OJ C 1962.** http://www.oup.com/uk/orc/bin/9780199566754/hartley7e_ch01.pdf

The key moments in the history of the EP are:

- » 1951, when in the European Community Treaty for Coal and Steel (ECCS) is defined as "common assemble",
- » 1957, with the Roman Treaties it is defined as "parliamentary assemble" (while in 1962, it is renamed to European Parliament);
- » The budget reform law was enacted in 1970 and the changes from 1975 gave partial budget power to the part of the so-called "optional costs";
- » 1974, when for the first time, direct elections were adopted in Parliament, or in 1979, when they were implemented for the first time;
- » 1979, when by the Isoglucose rule established by the European Court of Justice, the Parliament gets bigger influence in the legislative government. Namely, in the process the Court confirmed that the Council of the EU must receive an opinion from the European Parliament regarding all legal acts;
- » by enacting the Single European Act, the power of the Parliament was official so it could enact legal amendments through the corporation procedure in two readings;
- » in 1992 by the Maastricht Treaty and in 1997 by the Amsterdam Treaty, the power of the legal veto has been improved through co-decision procedures;
- » As well as other institutions, the internal composition of EP changed with time and with each successful enlargement. These changes were more dramatic for the EP than for other institutions because of its size and the breath of the European political- party spectrum;
- » 1952, the EP counted 78 members appointed by national parliaments, and only 3 political groups existed - Christian Democrats, Socialistic and Liberal;
- » 1957, the EP counted 148 members assigned by national parliaments with the same groups, until the middle of the 1960s, when the fourth group was formed by the De Gaulle party in France;

- » 1973, the first enlargement of the EP increased the number of MPs to 198 members. The members of the Conservative party of the United Kingdom stayed separated from the rest of the party groups until 1992. The Labor party united with socialist groups;
- » 1979, the first direct elections increased the number of members of the EP to 410. For the first time the opposition parties on the national level were significantly represented in the EP, causing an explosion of numbers of party groups (especially having in mind the extreme left-wing oriented (communist) and right (nationalists);
- » 1986, after Greek (1981), Spanish and Portuguese enlargement the number of members of the EP increased to 518, while the number of party groups increased to 12;
- » 1995, EFTA enlargement together with uniting of Germany in 1990 increased the number of members of the EP up to 626. The consolidation of the party groups, despite the inclusion of the Greens in the late 1980s stabilizes the number of political groups to 7 or 8 lead by the Socialists and Christian Democrats as the biggest groups. Ideologically, the liberals were among them (mostly 3. or 4. By size parties), but much smaller than the Greens, the Ultra Left Wing, Ultra Right and Euro-skeptics.

With the last biggest enlargement of the EU in 2004, the European Parliament counted 732 members elected in direct elections in the member-countries, in the biggest part according the proportional electoral system, while the enacted Lisbon treaty the number of MP increased to 751 members.²⁶⁵ The elections for the European parliament are held every five years, without restrictions of the right for re-election. Thanks

²⁶⁵ The electoral models member-countries use in selection of the representatives in the European Parliament, see in detail in the work of: **MA Tanja Karakamisheva, "European Parliament and elections- uniform European electoral procedure -'for' or 'against'?", published in Anthology "Euro integration of the legal, political and social system of the Republic of Macedonia", Materials from the round table marking fifty years from forming the Faculty of Law "Iustinianus Primus" Skopje, Skopje 2002 (p. 84-94).**

to the direct elections of the citizens of the Union member-countries, the European Parliament is considered to be the single multinational assembly in the world that plays a very important role in the process of European integration.

3.1.2. Competencies and internal organization of the European Parliament

In accordance with the founding treaties of the European Communities, the Parliament had very restricted competencies. By implementing the first direct elections of MPs, the development of the competencies of the Parliament was intensified. So, from exceptionally advisory and monitoring, the competencies of the Parliament started to get budget and political dimension. For the first time, the Parliament got the right to propose amendments to the draft-budget of the Community and to adopt the budget with the Treaty from 1971.²⁶⁶ With this treaty, the Parliament, together with the Council, acquired the right to give the budget decision which releases the executive organ of the government in the Community from any responsibility from executing the budget. Also, in this period, the first allocation of community expenditures was made into mandatory and optional.²⁶⁷

With the Brussels budget treaty from 1975 the Parliament got the right for the final decision regarding the optional expenses, authorization to refuse the draft-budget and the right to enact independently previously agreed budget decisions. These changes led to an increase of the financial competencies of the Parliament. In this period, the first Audit Court located in Luxembourg was organized. By gaining these competencies, the Parliament got a real possibility to influ-

²⁶⁶ This Treaty for the alteration of certain financial provisions in the foundation treaties was published in the "Official Gazette of the Communities": OJ L 2.1.1971.

²⁶⁷ Mandatory were those that came from the foundation treaties and from other legal acts connected with the financing of mutual policies, more in the area of agricultural policy and expenses of the communitarian institutions, while optional were all the others that did not come from the foundation treaties.

ence the formulation and implementation of the joint policies in the Community. Regarding the advisory competencies of the Parliament, it has to be emphasized that at the beginning, its opinion for concrete draft-act to the Commission was with optional character. The Roman treaties, in most part of the legislative procedure, predicted parliamentary opinion that was not mandatory for the Council. Apart the advisory nature of Parliament opinion, it was the Council's obligation, because of what the disregard of these provisions was rated as breaking the founding treaties and possibilities for initiating a procedure in front of the European Court of Justice.

So in the case "Isoglucose" from 1979, the Court of Justice annulled the provision of the Council that was adopted in Parliament to give its opinion.²⁶⁸ If we carefully overview the consequences from the Court of Justice decision regarding the presented case, it turns out that the Parliament, actually, could block enacting some acts, if the opinion was not submitted. Despite that, the parliament has the right to put forward amendments of the opinion of concrete draft- act. Mostly, the Commission withdrew the submitted draft-act to be further elaborated and re- assigned to the Council after the imported alterations from the opinion of the Parliament.²⁶⁹

The increase of the legislative competence of the Parliament follows after the acceptance of the Joint Declaration of the Parliament and the Council in 1975, in which the obligation for the reconciliation of the opinion in the legislative procedure between the Council, as a pillar of the legislative function, and the Parliament.²⁷⁰ The conciliation referred to a limited number of acts of general character of financial nature, while the procedure of reconciliation was held in a special commission of few members of the Council and the Parliament. With the Roman treaties for the questions of the foreign

²⁶⁸ See pg. 188: <http://www.fes.rs/pubs/2004/pdf/14.Reforme%20Evropske%20unije.pdf>.

²⁶⁹ Ibid, cited work.

²⁷⁰ See: <http://www.ena.lu/jointdeclarationeuropeanparliamentcouncilcommissionconciliationproceduremarch1975-020002655.html>.

–political nature the mandatory opinion from the Parliament was predicted. That means before signing the international admission treaty, the Parliament’s opinion was mandatory, but that opinion did not committed the Council.

With the Trade treaties and with the new member admission treaties, the Rome Treaty did not mention the Parliament. In 1973, the Parliament was approved the right to be informed of the progress for the Trade treaty negotiations. Regarding the treaties, the Parliament had the right to enact resolution, but without any legal action. The situation improved after 1983, when the Council regulated the obligation to seek the Parliament’s opinion during the conclusion of significant trade treaties, but that still was not mandatory.

Certain enforcement of the position of the Parliament in these areas was noticed after the adoption of the Single European act, when the new cooperation procedure between the Parliament and the Council was enacted in the procedure of enacting the communitarian acts. So, the advisory role of the Parliament transferred into a cooperation role. The cooperation procedure has to be implemented for issues in the areas of establishing and functioning of the internal market of the Community, social issues, economic and social cohesion, and research.

With the Single European act the legislation procedure changed, or the Council instead of adopting the act of the Commission proposal, decided with the qualified majority and, after the procured Parliament opinion, adopted the joint opinion. Afterward it submitted it to the Parliament. Whether it wanted to change the Commission proposal, the Council could do that only with unanimous decision. The Parliament, after submitting the mutual opinion could also: a) remain passive, b) accept the mutual attitude, c) reject the opinion or d) propose amendments to the mutual opinion.²⁷¹

²⁷¹ See: <http://www.unizar.es/euroconstitucion/library/historic%20documents/SEA/Single%20European%20Act.pdf>

The cooperation procedure was still called “two readings” procedure. The first reading of the draft-act was the introduction of the opinion in front of the Parliament before the mutual opinion of the Council was formed. The second reading was part of the procedure in which the mutual opinion was submitted to Parliament. A new round in conciliating the opinions between the Parliament and the Council happened when the Parliament rejected or altered the mutual opinion of the Council in “the second reading” of the Parliament.

Whether the Parliament proposed the alteration of the mutual opinion, then the new re-examining of the draft –act was made by the Commission. Despite the cooperation procedure, the Parliament further sustained the advisory role in the legislative procedure in adopting the communitarian acts. The consultations had mandatory and optional character. With the Single European act, the competencies of the Parliament in the section of its consultative function were enlarged. So, the council was in charge to seek opinion from the Parliament during adopting the acts that refer to functioning of the structural funds for economic and social cohesion, for the framework programs that refer to research and to technological development, for actions undertaken by the Community in the area of environmental protection, etc. The Single European act changed the Parliament’s position, while concluding the international treaties. So, the compliance from the Parliament was necessary to conclude treaties for admitting new member-countries, to support and other significant international treaties. This way, the Parliament got its right to veto when it decided for new member-countries in the Community. Also with this act, the Parliament had the right to be consulted by the Council for the negotiating platform of the Commission for concluding admission treaty, for admission or some other type of international treaty. In accordance with the provisions from the Single European act, the Parliament had the right to be informed for all the significant questions in the sphere of the foreign policy of the member–countries.

By adopting the Maastricht treaty, the competencies and the position of the Parliament were fiercely changed. Namely, this Treaty for the first time implemented the co-decision procedure which in fact means the improvement of the legislative competencies of the Parliament regarding the cooperation procedure, implemented by the Single European Act.

The co-decision procedure in theory is known as "procedure in three readings". So the Commission submits draft-act, the Parliament gives opinion, and the Council adopts mutual opinion, that presents the so-called first reading of the proposal. At the same time, the Commission submits its proposal to the Parliament and to the Council as two bodies of the legislative government in the co-decision procedure.²⁷²

The Maastricht Treaty predicted creating a special Reconciliation Committee, in which there was an equal number of representatives from the Parliament and from the Council, while the Commission had the right to participate in its work. This Committee was summoned in cases when the Parliament would express direct intention to reject the mutual opinion of the Council, where its task was to make a compromise between the Council and the parliament for the mutual text of the draft-act. This phase was marked as a second reading of the proposal in a period of three months.

If the Parliament, with the absolute majority of votes, further confirmed the rejection of the mutual opinion with the Council, the draft-act was considered as finally rejected. If the Parliament proposed alterations of the mutual opinion, the Parliament submitted the opinion with the altered text of the draft-act to the Council and to the Commission. Whether the Council did not adopt all the proposed alterations, the Reconciliation Committee was immediately summoned, that initiated the so-called third phase of reading the draft -act.

²⁷² See: **Emilie Noel,** "a new Institutional Balance?", in **Renaud Dehousse (ed), "Europe After Maastricht-An Ever Close Union?", Law Books in Europe, Munchen, 1994 (pg. 17-20).**

The Maastricht Treaty predicted the implementation of the new procedure of co-decision between the Parliament and the Council in several important areas, such as: free workers movement, consolidation of the national regulations of the member-countries for the special position of foreigners within the countries from the aspect of public order, public security and health, free service provision, single market activities, initiating the cooperation between the member –countries in the field of education, culture, health system, consumers protection, etc.

The base of the procedure of co-decision was in the fact that a large number of communitarian acts could not be adopted if the Parliament did not approve positive opinion about them. Apart from this cooperation, at the cooperation procedure, the Council sustained the right to give the last word in adopting the acts. In theory, the right of the Parliament to co-decide with the Council for adopting certain acts was called the right to veto, or negative last word in the Parliament. The procedure of co-decision is considered to increase the cooperation between the Parliament and the Council.

Regarding the procedure for giving consent to the Parliament, the Maastricht Treaty extended the areas of implementation. So, the Treaty predicted consent from Parliament in determining tasks, priority goals and organizing the structural funds, in determining the single electoral procedure for MP's in Parliament, during the election of the president and the Commission members, during admission of new member – countries.

In the part of the so-called controlled competencies of Parliament, it should be mentioned that even with the first founding treaties, it was predicted that the Commission would be held responsible for its work only in front of the Parliament. The Maastricht Treaty states that Parliament holds a hearing for the annual report of the Commission's performance, not later than

one month before the start of the meetings of the Assembly. Also, the Commission is responsible in front of the Parliament for EU budget expenditures. The Maastricht Treaty gave bigger rights to the Parliament in the procedure for appointing the Commission's President. Up to Maastricht, the Parliament has the right only to initiate the procedure to recall the Commission through voting distrust. By the Maastricht Treaty, the Parliament had the right to be consulted for the person that the governments of the member-countries decided to be appoint as candidate for the President of the Commission.

Further strengthening of the position and the competencies of Parliament is stipulated in the Amsterdam Treaty, the Nice Treaty, as well as in the last Lisbon Treaty. So, today the role of the Parliament is accomplished through performing **four significant functions: legislative, political, monitoring and budgetary.**

In executing the legislative functions the Parliament is the key actor in several procedures:

1. Consultation procedure (The Council of the EU can adopt an act only if it previously seeks opinion from the European Parliament). The consultation is mandatory for acts that regulate issues in the area of competition, employment policies, defining the work conditions, tax, issues connected with the third pillar, etc;

2. Cooperation procedure (for certain issues in the area of economic and monetary union, the European parliament has the right to submit amendments which the Council of the EU can reject only with unanimous decision and the adopt the act by itself);

3. Co-decision procedure (the EU Council cannot overrule the amendments of the Parliament, but the act can, through additional procedure of consolidation, it has to be adopted by the two institutions in the same text); and

4. Consent procedure (the Parliament has to give consent, for example to conclude access treaties of new EU member-countries, to conclude association treaties, for decisions to determine serious violations of basic Union principles of some member -country). The parliament has the right to give or not to give consent for accession of new member-countries to the structural and cohesion fund of the EU.

On the other hand, the political function of the European Parliament, also, is very significant. As a representative body of more than five hundred million citizens, the Parliament gets bigger importance in the European forum, on which the most significant European questions are being debated.

In accomplishing the control functions, the Parliament in its composition forms investigation commissions; votes (dis) trust the Commission, receives petitions from European citizens and from legal entities that function within the Union, seeks Court's opinion for justice in the EU for consent of some international treaty with the European Union Treaty, proposes annulment of acts of other institutions to the Court of Justice, etc.

In the part of appointing functions, the Parliament appointed the European ombudsman, approves the appointment of the President of the Commission and the Commission as a body must be consulted before the appointment of the members of the Executive Board of the European Central Bank, the Audit Court, etc.

In the internal organizational structure, the European Parliament has:

- » **Bureau composed of a president, 14 vice presidents and five quaestors**, who decide financial and organizational issues of the Parliament and its services;
- » **Conference of the presidents of Committees in which all presidents of the permanent and occasional committees partake**. Mostly, they meet once a month in Strasbourg for the plenary sessions of the Parliament;

- » **Conference of the representatives of the delegations in which are implemented the presidents of all permanent inter-parliamentarian delegations.** It refers to the political body of the Parliament that occasionally will meet and which is in charge to ease the organisation of the meetings of the inter-parliamentary delegations, as well as of the delegations of the joint parliamentarian committees;
- » **Seven political groups** formed by the affiliation to the European political parties, and not to the national affiliation of the members (European People's Party Group (Christian Democrats Group), Progressive Alliance Group of Socialists and Democrats in Parliament, Liberal Alliance Group and the Democrats for Europe, European Conservatives and Reformist Group, The Greens/ European Free Alliance, Co federal Group of European United Left Wing-Nordic Green Left Wing and Freedom and Democracy Group);
- » **20 permanent and two temporal committees** that prepare plenary sessions for the Parliament. The permanent committees are divided into 20 areas: foreign affairs, development, international trade, budget, etc., while two temporary committees solve questions in the field of financial, economical and social crisis as well as questions in the field of political challenges. Within the committees new amendments are overviewed and proposed based on the Commission's draft –acts, that are submitted to be overviewed by the EU Council. These committees, also, have the right to present their opinions to other committees. Each committee has a president, four vice presidents elected for a period of two and a half years and a secretariat,
- » **The secretariat in Luxembourg and in Brussels.**²⁷³

²⁷³ See: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/parliament/public/ststicDisplay.do?id=146&language=en>

3.1.3. Changes of the position of the European Parliament with the Lisbon Treaty

Generally, the competencies of the European Parliament were increased by the Treaty for implementing the European Constitution. That practically reflected in the Lisbon Treaty.

In accordance with the provisions of this Treaty, the European Parliament, within the execution of the legislative functions, gains more power, just like the Council of Europe. The procedure of co-decision gets transformed into a regularly legislative procedure of enacting the legislative provisions of the Union.

What the European Constitution has made in the sphere of enlarging the co- decision procedure between the Parliament and The Council of EU in almost all the spheres for which the Council decides with the qualified majority of votes, the Lisbon Treaty only reiterated.

It contains listed **more than 40 new spheres, of which 30 are permanent spheres modified by co-deciding procedure, while 13 are completely new spheres which are put in the co-decision procedure for the first time.**

New especially important listed spheres are freedom, security and justice in which normal legislative procedure is enlarged to border control, asylum, immigration, court cooperation referring the criminal issues, minimal regulations in defining the fines in the sphere of organized criminal measures for encouraging the crime prevention, Euro justice, police cooperation, Europol, and civil protection.

Also meaningful changes are made in the sphere of agricultural policy and foreign trade. But, still numerous exceptions from the co-decision rule can be noticed.

Although **it is a fact that the Lisbon Treaty quantitatively strengthened the legislative capacity of the Par-**

liament the question is whether the Parliament will succeed to answer the challenges set in the Lisbon Treaty? Whether and how the Parliament would be able to seriously reorganize and with full capacity to undertake the trust in its own hands?

According to some thoughts, the Parliament would have to immediately go through the internal consolidation procedure, reorganization and reform. The internal reforms in the functioning of the Parliament will have to be especially directed toward the work of its permanent committees, but and toward organizing several new.

Increased scope of work, on the one, and increased number of participants in the committees, on the other hand, unavoidably will initiate the decrease of its work conditions. In this sense, the question of the opportunity to open new types of organizational forms will affirm, such as, for example, sub-committees, better time organization for interventions by the participants in the committees, increased activity period in the parliamentary committees, rationalization of the period spent on plenary sessions in the Parliament, etc.

It is supposed that the parliamentary Committee for civil freedoms and justice and internal affairs functionally and organizationally will have to undertake the biggest changes, due to the fact that the enlargement of the procedure of co-decision and the qualified majority in the sphere of justice and security unavoidably will change the nature of its work.

Unfortunately, the Lisbon Treaty did not predict the right to the legislative initiative of the European Parliament. With that, the European Commission further keeps the exclusive power of the legislative initiative, which presents an important element in the institutional balance since the beginning of the Community. On the other hand, the role of the European Parliament makes a quality transformation in so called comitology procedure, although this news is not directly connected with the Lisbon Treaty.

In reality, it will be implemented the moment when the new legislative procedures, which are regulated with the Lisbon Treaty, will enter into force. The purpose of this decision is clear. It opens a whole new page in the procedure of increased institutional oversight of the Parliament, because it will be authorized to initiate regulatory procedures with the right to oversight of the Commission and its work bodies.²⁷⁴

The European Parliament will be able to implement this procedure when the Commission decides to change, to annul or to supplement insubstantial elements of some instruments adopted in accordance with the co-decision procedure.

That means, always when the Commission, in accordance with the new regulative procedure with the right to oversight, will approve measures that previously were suggested by the Commission oversight body, they will have to be forwarded to the EU Council and to the European Parliament. These institutions will have the right in the period of three months to overview and oppose the draft-measures if they consider that the draft exceeds the power that is predicted in the basic instrument, or if it does not follow the principle of subsidiarity or proportionality.

In this sense, the EU Council will be able to act with a 2/3 majority, while the Parliament with majority votes from the total number of members. If opposite opinions do not emerge, the draft-measures will be adopted by the Commission.

A similar procedure will be implemented if the Commission does not adopt the proposed measures of some work body. And in that case, the draft-measure will be submitted to the EU Council, that in the period of two months will have the right to oppose or not, and afterwards to the Parliament, which in a period of four months will be able to positively or negatively react regarding the draft.

²⁷⁴ See: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?language=EN&type=IMPRESS&reference=20090506IPR55226>

In case the opposite opinions of the Council and the Parliament do not appear, the draft-measures will be resent to the Commission with the suggestion to be adopted this time. It is obvious that it is too early to suppose all the implications from the new procedure of the comitology, but it's a fact that it will lead to significant democratization of the procedure for adopting the regulations in the Union.

On the other hand, the procedure can slow down the process of adopting decisions in the Union, as well as complicate the implementation of regulation procedure. The Parliament is authorized with the majority of votes from the total number of members to oppose a certain draft –text of regulation or measure submitted to the Commission to look like a type of veto or an obstacle in the decision –making process. But, speaking from the positive side of the process, the regular usage of the oversight procedure can lead the Parliament to constantly strive to be in good condition in the process of mastering its own activism, which is an excellent work.

When we talk about the budget power of Parliament, it in accordance with Article 268 and Article 279 b from the Reform Treaty, is completely entrusted to the Parliament in compliance with the co-decision procedure. The parliament will have the right to decide for all categories of budget expenses, which is a significant increase of its power. As a power compensation form in relation with the other institutions in the Union, the Parliament will have significantly bigger responsibility to present a multi-annual financial framework in which the amounts of the annual expenses will be presented, but also the assessment of the various expenses and categories of payments in the Union.

In compliance with Article 9 from the EU Treaty, read together with Article 9 from the Lisbon Treaty, the Parliament will elect the President of the European Commission over the

draft-proposal from the European Council, taking into consideration the results from the last elections for the European Parliament, and with previously held consultation, and will approve the Commission members previously elected by the appointed president. The Parliament and the European Council are and will be jointly responsible for the fast running of the Commission President Election process. Before the European Council adopts any decision, its representatives, together with the Parliament's representatives, will have to undertake joint consultations which have to focus on the background of the Commission presidential candidates. The mutual responsibility around the election of the Commission president does not mean complete uniformity of both institutions within this process.

The constant difference between the role of the Council (to propose a candidate) and the role of the Parliament (to elect the candidate) is clear. The new role of Parliament, in accordance with the provisions from the Lisbon Treaty, can be interpreted more as ratification of previous election.

What can be anticipated is the fact that the Parliament will definitely want to use the new Treaty provisions optimally. It will be expected that the main parties on European level appoint their Commission presidential candidates during the campaign before the next parliamentary elections. It is even considered that the person for the Commission's presidential candidate will probably be the most significant element in the European electoral and political debate.

But, this approach will have to be harmonized with the Treaty text where it is set that the European Council proposes the European Commission's presidential candidate. The contemplation will have to be in a direction of concretely locating the legal connection between the majority election results for the European Parliament and the election of the Commission President.

It is completely familiar that this dilemma is not new at all. In 2004, the Parliament considered the need of nominating the Commission's presidential candidates in compliance with the will of the majority of MPs, although this was not completely accepted by the European Council. It is considered that the present provisions from the Lisbon Treaty strengthen the hand of the Parliament vs. the Council, and in latter phase, the relation between the elected president and the Commission. Of course, in politicization of appointing Commission president that will create potential problems in the Union, because it will be a constant source of mistrust over those that are on the other side of the political spectrum.²⁷⁵

On the other hand, the problem will additionally be heated in conditions when the Council will have the majority that is party and ideologically different from that in the Parliament. This so-called dual politicization will undoubtedly lead to a real political debate that could have a negative impact over the Union's functioning.

The Lisbon Treaty increased the number of MPs in the European Parliament from 736 to 751 MPs, since the Parliamentary elections in 2009. The Treaty provides a new procedure for determining the Parliament members, or maximum 96, and minimum 6 MPs from each member-country, in accordance with the principle of decreased (digressive) proportionality.

Although, in practice, the parliamentary mandates were always allocated in accordance with the principle of decreased (digressive) proportionality, for the first time with the Treaty this principle was clearly defined within the Union.

The concept of decreased proportionality emphasizes the necessity that the distribution of the mandates should submit to the series of other principles, such as:

²⁷⁵ See: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/parliament/public/staticDisplay.do?language=EN&id=66>

1. The principle of European solidarity,
2. The principle of righteous flexibility and
3. The principle of national representation

In the future, the composition of the Parliament will be subject to additional regulation, taking into consideration the demographic changes or the question of future Union enlargement. This can lead to tough political debates between the member-countries, especially when because of the eventually new enlargements of the Union will lead to decreasing the number of mandates of the old member-countries.

In the section of the strengthened cooperation, predicted in Article 280 of the Lisbon Treaty, it is stated that any initiative for this kind of cooperation will have to be previously approved in the European Parliament (apart from the questions in the areas of mutual foreign and security policy, where the parliament should be consulted only). Issues that are not predicted in the Treaty refer to the role of the Parliament after the strengthened cooperation will be approved.²⁷⁶

In the Lisbon Treaty it is listed that the participants in the strengthened cooperation will have to function in accordance with the legal grounds of the Treaty, and in accordance with the relevant procedures that were predicted in it.

When we refer to legal procedures, they imply to the Council's intervention (limited to member-countries participants in the strengthened cooperation in accordance with Article 280e) and from the Parliament.

This state can be sufficiently unpleasant for the Parliament, especially when it would not want to be involved in creating the legislative that will not be applied only to some member-countries, on the one, or the countries that are included in the strengthened cooperation would not want their

²⁷⁶ See: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/111652.pdf.

legislative to depend on the MPs votes who are not involved, on the other hand.

In accordance with the Lisbon Treaty provisions, the European Parliament is included in the procedure for alteration of the Union Treaties. According to Article 33, the parliament can initiate a change of the Treaty in accordance with the regular procedure with organizing the convention, or its approval is necessary and then when the European council will decide not to summon the convention. The last case can easily become a big advantage if, as many believe, the governments want to avoid convention procedures in the future.

Let's conclude. The Lisbon Treaty increased the power of the European Parliament on several fronts.

First, through extended procedure for strengthened cooperation will initiate increased activity of the committees in the Parliament.

Second, through enlarged regulatory control and oversight over the activities of other institutions in the Union, the Parliament will stabilize its controlled power.

Third, through increased budget strength the Parliament will provide increased institutional influence over creating the policies in the Union.

Fourth, probably, mostly through new provisions for the strengthened role of the Parliament in the procedure for changing the provisions from Union's Treaties, Parliament for the first time in its history gets the chance to become key factor in establishing the new EU physiognomy.

The party policy, as it is realized on the national level, at the beginning was not conceived to have the main role in the European project. The purpose of the founding fathers of the European community was to prevent controversial political decisions through deciding with consensus whenever that was

possible, even for technical questions in the area of trade and competitiveness. When the political leaders meet in the European Council, or in the Ministers Council, they actually represented their national governments, much more than their party interests. The decisions were adopted with consensus by all the members of the Council that had to vote are in favor of the new policies or in benefit of the changes in them. As the power of the European Union increased, so did the need for increased democratic representation of the citizens.

Although, at the beginning the representatives of the European Parliament were elected from the line of the MPs of the national assemblies, with the first direct European elections organized in 1979 opened the opportunity for European citizens to directly and immediately elect their representatives in the European Parliament. Hence, there is a new election for the European Parliament every five years. By increasing the legislative power of the Parliament, the party policy initiated key role in the process of creating decisions in the EU. And the European Commission to strengthen the position of the parties in the Parliament through constant pressure to increase the citizen turnout in European elections. For example, as a result of the co-decision procedure that was implemented with the Maastricht Treaty in 1992, the role of party policy was extremely enforced. In 2004, the EU enacted special law that provided the European political parties to get funded from the Union's budget. The European Parliament elections in 2009 aroused changes of the rules in the composition of the European political parties. Since 2009, it is required that every European political party should have at least 25 members from seven different member-countries of the Union.

The new regulations were criticized as non-democratic because they factually rejected the small parties. In 2009, two new parties were formed European Conservatives and reformists and Party Europe for freedom and democracy, as result of exit of the British Conservative party from the Na-

tional European Party and forming the European Conservative and Reformists party, on the one, and founding the Party Europe for freedom and democracy by connecting more parties, among which, the British Independent party that was part from the former Independence/Democracy Party and Union for Europe and the Nations, on the other hand.

4. EUROPEAN POLITICAL PARTIES

Different forms of cooperation between the national political parties of the member-countries in the Union existed in rudimentary form since the beginning of the project called European integration. **However, the roots of what is called political parties at the EU level, or Euro parties, today, can be found in 1970.**

Even before the first direct elections of the European Parliament were held in June 1979, national political parties recognized the need for closer cooperation among countries in direction to reach the general preferences within the former European community,²⁷⁷ as well as coordination of the electoral activities in Europe. **At that time, the three dominant political families- Christian Democrats, Socialists and Liberal Democrats, implemented European federations or confederations of their own national members.**

Christian Democrats described their organization as “party”, known under the name European People’s Party (EPP), as a symbol of the federal ambitions and support of the European integration project, much more that they are only typical political party.

On the other hand, the political families that pleaded for support of the European integration in a more modest way called themselves Confederation of the Socialist parties in the

²⁷⁷ For the historical aspects of the development of the party scene in the EU, look in more detail at: **S. Hix, A. Kreppel & A. Noury, “The Party System in the European Parliament: Collusive or Competitive?”, *Journal of Common Market Studies* 41, 2003, (pg.309-331).**

EC, and Federation of Liberal and Democratic parties in the EC. The main target of these two families was to bridge the “gap” between the party groups in the European Parliament that appeared before holding the first direct elections for the European parliament.²⁷⁸

European parties should not be mixed with the political groups in the European Parliament. **European political parties are defined as political organs that traditionally function in Europe, but also in the Union’s institutions.** It refers to organizations that are recognized and financed by the EU. Today there are 15 recognized European parties which are formed not by individual members–MPs in the European Parliament, but by national parties that function within the member–countries in the Union.

European parties do not vote in the European Parliament for concrete regulative and policies. They express their opinions and attitudes regarding policies through their own belonging to a concrete political (parliamentarian) group. Hence, European parties are present in the European Parliament through political groups.

European parties exist with the purpose to organize European electoral campaigns in the member-countries of the Union as unions in which the national political parties of all the member-countries unite. That means that European parties set their regular and electoral priorities and policies through coordinative meetings of the national party leaders that function in the joint union. European parties have concrete influence not just in the European parliament, but also in the European Council. Through coordinative meetings with the chiefs of the countries and governments of the member countries they actually influence the decision-making process in the European Council. European Parties, also, closely cooperate with the members of the European Commission, because

²⁷⁸ See: <http://www.martenscentre.eu/sites/default/files/publication-files/eupoliticalparties.pdf>

in accordance with the Lisbon Treaty, the party that wins the majority of votes in the European elections keeps the right through the European Council to nominate their candidate for the president of the European Commission.

Otherwise, **the European political parties for the first time are defined in the Maastricht Treaty (Art.41) and with the additional Article 138a in the Rome Treaty as a "meaningful EU integration factor. They contribute to forming the European conscience and to express the political will of the Union citizens.** So, in fact, the concept of political parties on the European level was born. **Later, with the Amsterdam Treaty, the rule connected to the way of covering the expenses for the work of the European parties was established, by which the mechanism that the European parties will be compensated from the EU budget was established.** By the Nice Treaty it was planned that the Council will set the rules for activities of the political parties on the European level, as well as the rules for their financing, while in Article 251, it is provided that the European Parliament is also included through the procedure of co-deciding in defining the rules of procedure and financing of European Parties. With the regulative of EC No. 2004/2003 of the European Parliament and the Council from 4 November 2003, it is defined what actually means political party on the European level, as the financing is specified that cannot be completed through the national parties, neither directly nor indirectly. This practically means that the European money should stay in the European parties, where this provision resulted with bigger and better quality in organizing the European parties.

This regulative is later changed with the decision of the Bureau of the European Parliament, enacted on 29 March 2004, as well as with the concrete amendments enacted by the European Parliament and from the Council in 2007. They in fact limited and clarified the procedures for financing the

concept “political foundations on the European level”. This meant that European parties were finally separated financially and legally from think-tank groups. The alterations in the regulations gave the European parties exclusive responsibility to lead electoral campaigns for European elections and to use the financial means intended exclusively for that purpose.

Actually, it was found that only European parties can lead electoral campaign on the European level. Their political groups in the European parliament have a strict ban on leading a campaign. With the newest Regulative of the European parliament and the Council, enacted in 2014, the frame of the European Political Parties and of foundations has been established, in which their legal status, as well as the authorizations for registering, controlling and executing sanctions for the European political parties and for European political foundations. These authorizations are part of the EU. The part of the financing of European parties is arranged according to the previous regulative since 2004, to be applied until the 2017 budget.

Although, in accordance with the present regulations, for one party to become a European party it is necessary to be in line with the following criteria:

- » **It must have capacity of the legal entity registered in the EU member-country;**
- » **it must respect the basic principles, on which the EU is based, or the principles of freedom, democracy, of human rights and freedoms, and the rule of law;**
- » **must participate, or have the intention to participate, in the election for the European Parliament;**
- » **must be present in at least ¼ of the member-countries of EU;**
- » **or must have won at least 3% of the votes in each member-country of the last elections for the European parliament;**
- » **or must previously be presented from the mem-**

bers, regardless if it refers to members of the European Parliament from these member-countries, or for members from the national parliaments that come from these member-countries, or for members of the regional parliaments in these countries;

- » **must publicly publish their incomes and expenditures each year;**
- » must publicly publish the statement for the property that possesses, as well as the means that they annually feature;
- » must publish a list of donors, where the single donation cannot overpass 500 Euro for private entities;
- » must not receive and use anonymous donations;
- » must not accept donations over 12,000 Euro annually from donors as a legal entity;
- » must not accept donations from the budgets of the political groups in the European Parliament;
- » must not accept an amount bigger than 40% of the annual budget of some national political party;
- » must not accept a donation that comes from a company in an EU member-country where the state is the dominant stakeholder;
- » at least 15% of the party budget must come from sources different from the ones in the EU;
- » must submit an application (request) for financing their needs by 30th of September in the current year that are planned for the next year.

From the inner structure aspect, European political parties resemble the national political parties in EU member-countries. Namely, in each European party, there is a **Congress of delegates as supreme party body** that creates the political program of activities, there is an **executive organ which manages the executive policies, a party leader and a party secretariat** that assists the party leader.

On the other hand, European parties look like national parties, also from the aspect of the relationship of the national

political systems of the member –countries with the EU political system. So, round ¾ from the MPs in the European Parliament come from the line of the national parties that are obligated through their membership in the European parties to join to certain political group in EP. The enlargement in 2004 changed the composition to 1/3 of the EP and managed to implement national parties from the countries of Eastern and Central Europe into the party groups whose party programs differ from those that exist in the 15 older EU member-countries.

In accordance with the data from March 2015, there are 15 recognized European parties in the EU:

Table No.13: List of recognized European parties - March 2015

European party	Ideology	Established and officially recognized
1. European People's Party	Christian Democrats, conservative	2004
2. Party of European Socialists (PES)	Social-Democratic	2004
3. Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe (ALDE), until November 2012 known as European Liberal, Democratic and Reform Party	liberalism	2004
4. Alliance of European Conservatives and Reformists (AECR)	Conservatives, economic liberalism, Euro-skepticism	2010
5. European Green party (EGP)	Green Politics	2004
6. Party of the European Left	Socialism, Communism	2004

European party	Ideology	Established and officially recognized
7. Europe of Freedom and Direct democracy (EFD) Euro –Skepticism, populism	Euro–Skepticism, populism	
8. The Movement for a Europe of Nations and Freedom	Euro-skepticism, nationalism right oriented populism	2015
9. European Free Alliance	Regionalism, independence movement	2004
10. European Democratic Party	Centrist	2004
11. European Freedom Union	Euroscepticism, nationalism right oriented populism	2011
12. European Christian Political movement	Christian Left Wing, social conservatism	2010
13. Movement for a Europe of Liberties and Democracy	Euroscepticism, national conservatism	2012
14. United Europeans for Democracy, previous EU Democrats	Ultra nationalism, euro-scepticism, ultra-right	2006
15. Union of European national movements	Ultra nationalism, euro-scepticism, ultra-right policies	2012

4.1. European People’s party –Christian Democrats

European People’s party is a party in the family of centre-right oriented parties. Established on 29 April 1976 in Brussels, as a group of twelve Christian Democrats parties

from the seven former European Union member-countries, their roots are deep in the history and the civilization of the European Continent. This party is a pioneer of the European unity project, because of the fact that the founding fathers of the European Union – Robert Schumann, Alcide De Gasperi and Konrad Adenauer set the European People’s party as a party dedicated to the development of a strong Europe based on the federalist model set on the subsidiary principle. From the beginning, this party defended the European development by applying the values that bring European citizens and people closer, based on democracy, transparency, efficient responsibility, as well as complete progress of the Union through promoting a market –oriented economy with a social context. The first program of the party was adopted in 1977, based on the pro -Europe principles, the federalist model of uniting and the idea for creating the United States of Europe.

In this period, the party focused on the questions in the field of monetary union, fast enlargement toward East, creating a new policy in competition, fight against international organized crime, as well as the further development of the European defense policy. On its 14th congress, held in 2001 in Berlin, the European People’s party set the mutual basic values on which their work and actions are set- reedom, equality, justice, solidarity, responsibility and in violation of the human dignity, values that come from the Christian perspective of humans and society.

These values are described in detail in the Party Manifest adopted at the Statutory Congress at 2012 in Bucharest. It states that the human is the centre of attention for the party. The human naturally has a dignity which makes him unique. For the European People’s Party, all people are unique, those who believe in god as a source of truth, justice, kindness and beauty, and also those who do not believe in god but respect universal values that come from other sources.

We, as it's further stated in the Manifest, recognize the Greek and Roman heritage, Judean and Christian values, and the values from Reformation and Enlightenment as roots of our civilization. Freedom is the central human right. It is only possible when it is practiced with personal responsibility. The party stands for equal rights of men and women on all levels and policies. All people must enjoy equal possibilities and that is why the party stands for providing effective implementation of equal possibilities for all, including disabled people. The party activities are based on the principles of justice and general wellbeing. It is dedicated in the further eliminating of the reasons for inequality and poverty. This is only possible in a society that functions as a socially cohesive society, in which the respect of the tradition is included, but also undertaking initiatives in which the people will live and work together.²⁷⁹

The party stands for solidarity as a joint responsibility: the stronger should help the ones that need help. In return they should try to improve their state in accordance with their competencies. The Party, in its Manifest, further commits to improve the possibilities for the following generations by defending freedom and democracy, providing good public finances and through the protection of a healthy environment. The political decisions should be adopted to be closer to the citizens; political authorities should not do the things that citizens can do themselves, regardless whether it is individual, family or within civil society organizations. Subsidiarity between these lines is the central value in our political family.

The only political system in which these values can be respected is the system of pluralistic democracy, in which the citizens accept responsibility. The best economic concept for protecting the social market –oriented economy is based on the sustainability of the environment in which competitiveness and entrepreneurship freedom are in balance with social justice. An

²⁷⁹ See: **Scully, R. (1997) "Policy Influence and Participation in the European Parliament". *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 22, No.2, (p.233-252).**

adequate frame for this concept is a strong European Union which has to provide the best answers for these challenges.

As political founder of EU, today the European People's Party includes 75 national member –parties from 40 countries. On the other hand, this party almost for four mandates composes the biggest political group in the European Parliament. It is the biggest party from which all the chief of states and governments in the European Council come from, as well as the 14th members of the European Commission, including the President.

European People's party is guided in accordance with the regulations established in 2003, in EU Regulative for the political parties on European level and regulations for financing them, as well as the alterations made in 2007, according to which it is allowed for all political parties on European level to be included in the electoral campaign for the European Parliament. As a result of this mandate, the European People's Party, in close cooperation with its national party-members, guided its first electoral European Campaign for the European Parliament in 2009 which strengthened its leader position in Parliament. In the elections in 2014, this party noted its fourth electoral victory that re-affirmed the party as a leader and guiding political force in Europe. As the biggest political party in the Union, the European People's Party at the same time, has the biggest responsibility to meet its program promises to the citizens: opening new work posts, economical stability, competitiveness, security, development.

4.2. Party of European Socialists

This party presently connects 53 socialists, social-democrats and labor parties from EU member –countries, but also from neighbouring countries. 33. of them are with complete party membership from total 28 member-countries and from Norway, 13 have associative status, while the others are with the status observers. From 1974 until 1992, this party was

known as confederation of the socialistic parties within the former European community, as a transnational political group which represents the interests of the united socialistic and social-democratic parties in Europe, especially in the European Parliament, and in other organs of the European Union.

Although the socialistic political group strengthened the cooperation between socialist parties in the former mutual assembly or the two previous communities, European Community for Coal and steel, and European Economic Community (later renamed as European community), since 1992, it was officially established in Hague, as a group of more than 30 political parties from EU member-countries and Norway.²⁸⁰

Within this party, as an observer as well as the supporting parties, also occur several socialist and social-democrat parties from the countries that are not EU members, such as Israel, Turkey, Switzerland, Iceland, the Republic of Macedonia, etc. In the European Parliament, the Party of European Socialists was presented through a political group of the progressive alliance of the socialists and democrats (known as socialist group until June 2009, when the members of the Italian Democrat party joined the group). The head of the party is in Brussels. Its roots date from the Socialist International, an association of the national socialist parties in Europe, Asia, Africa, Oceania, and from the western hemisphere.

In the first Joint Assembly of the European Community of Coal and Steel in 1952, the members voted and grouped according to ideological groups within the organizational institutions. As a result of the enlargement of the communities, and forming the European Economic Community, socialistic parties formed the Confederation of the Socialistic Parties of the European community in 1974, and since 1992, with the ratification of the Maastricht Treaty, the group adopted the name European Socialists Party. The chiefs of the govern-

²⁸⁰ See: **Raunio, T. (1997), The European Perspective: Transnational Party Groups in the 1989-1994 European Parliament, (London: Ashgate).**

ments from the socialistic parties of EU member-countries meet before each EU annual summit in order to arrange the jointly coordinated performance strategy. The group creates joint social-democratic policies for the questions important for the EU, especially in part of enlargement of the Union, economic development of the Union, as well as development of joint security and foreign policy.

The party has a purpose to include socialist and social – democratic movements in the Union and in Europe, to support the process of building a European conscience to express the political will of the citizens of the Union to define the joint EU policies, as well as to influence the decisions of the European Institutions, to get involved and to lead the electoral campaign for the European elections with joint strategy and visibility, joint Manifest, as well as a mutual presidential candidate for the European Commission, elected in an open, transparent and democratic–competitive process.

In the part of the party infrastructure, this party has a **Congress** that is held twice every five years with **the aim to determine the political orientation of the party and electing the party president and several vice-presidents**. Also, the party organ is the **Council that is elected each year and forms the party policies**.

The president leads and represents the party on a daily basis. The party statute provides the **leadership conference** in which all the leaders of the party members get together three to four times a year with the purpose to define the party strategy and to adopt joint resolutions. In the party as organ **the coordination team** meets and discusses all the preparatory and financial party activities, as well as the secretariat which leads the daily activities of the party. Also, within the party other organizational forms are established, such as the Youth European Socialists, the Women Party Forum, etc.

4.3. Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Eu

The Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe is a party that protects the liberal and democratic values in Europe. With more than 55 liberal party members from the European continent, this party stands for the interpretation of the principles for freedom in politics, the economy and in all other areas in society. Although it was established in 1976 before the organizing of the first direct European elections, this party was established as the first real transnational party in 1993. From the moment it was found until today, the party of the liberals and democrats for Europe has an aim to work in the direction to strengthen the vital connection among the citizens, on the one, and EU institutions on the other hand.

Today, this party is represented through the third in meaning political group in the European Parliament, after the one of the European People's Party and the Party of European Socialists. The political group in the European Parliament is formed by members of the Parliament that come from two different European parties, or from members of the European democratic party and from Party Union (Alliance) of the liberals and democrats for Europe. The Liberal–democrat political group has very interesting historical development.

In 1960, after the MPs from De Gaulle's party left the group, the liberal group formed within the Joint Assembly of the European Community for Coal and Steel, long and difficult period and process of changes started and inclusion of new members with reinforcing the integration process. If we analyze the history of the liberal–democratic political group, the first thing to notice is the change of the name of the group. From 1979 until 1985, within the European Parliament the liberal and democratic group composed of various parties functioned.

From 1985 until the middle of 1990s, the liberal-democratic group changed its name into Liberal and Democratic

reformist group. In this period, the parties that came from different countries (such as Portugal Social-democratic party) joined the group. In 1994 there was another change.²⁸¹

The new party of European liberal–democrats and reformists was born. Hence, the Political group in the European Parliament changed its title in 2009, when the British liberal-democratic party joined the group. In 2004, the last change happened. After the joining of the MPs from the European Democrat Party, present political group Alliance of the Liberals and Democrats for Europe was formed. The change of the name was under the influence of the various parties that are its members, and define themselves as liberal. Although the differences among them are familiar, for example, social liberalism, on the one, and the liberal conservatism, on the other hand, this title can be a joint synonym for the different parties that come from different sides of the political continuum.

For example, let's remind ourselves of the promises of former Italian Prime Minister Berlusconi to strengthen the "liberal revolution" in Italy in the period between 1990-2000, or the efforts of the Italian left-wing to input "liberal" policies in certain sectors with the purpose to forget their steps established in the so-called communist treasure.

According to Ladreh,²⁸² in the European liberal-democratic and reform party, and in the political group Liberal and Democrat Alliance for Europe, exists a larger heterogeneity than in the two strongest political groups in the European parliament. The flexibility of the word "liberal" can help us in understanding this phenomenon. It is interesting to note the extreme differences between the parties which are or were part of the liberal-democratic group (for example, the British Liberal-Democratic party, on the one, and the Basque nation-

²⁸¹ See: **Marks, G. and Wilson, C.J.(2000) "The Past in the Present: A Cleavage Theory of Party Response to European Integration", *British Journal of Political Science*, Vol.30, No.3, (p.433-459).**

²⁸² See: **Ladrech, R.J.(2006), *The European Union and Political Parties*, R.S.Katz & W.Crotty (eds) *Handbook of Party Politics*, London: Thousand Oaks, New Delhi, Sage Publications Ltd., (p.494).**

alistic party on the other hand. For example, the Italian post-Christian-democratic party, on the one, and anticlerical Italian radicals, on the other hand. Apart from these differences and transformations, MPs from the liberal-democratic political group have an influential force in the European Parliament. In the last elections, they won more than 80 mandates (with enforced support from the British Liberal-democrats and the German democrats, who won 24 mandates or around 30% from the total mandates won in this group).

Otherwise, this party stands for implementing policies that will fight against discrimination in Europe, and which will strengthen the protection of citizen's freedoms and rights, policies that will provide greener economy in order to provide healthier environment despite the climate change happening in the world. They stand for building a more efficient and stronger EU that will be more influential in the world, especially in the democratic promotion, EU budget reform and stronger support for "financial stability and development", as well as strong and clean regulation of the European financial markets, together with the implementation of the new economy governing of the European Commission.

4.4. European Green Party

The European Green Party is a political force in the EU which clearly identifies itself and profligates itself on the political stage as a party that stands for responsibility toward the environment, for individual freedom, for inclusive democracy, diversity, gender equality, global sustainable development and non-violence. The members of the European Green Party mostly come from member-countries of the Union, but also from other European counters which are not members of the Union, but are dedicated toward promoting bigger participation in Europe and bigger environmental protection.

This party was established on 22 February 2004 on the Fourth Congress of the European Federation of the Green Par-

ties in Rome, where over 1,000 delegates participated. It is composed of more than 34 Green parties from all around Europe. Historically, this party has its beginnings in 1979, when the Coordinative Alliance of European Greens and radical parties was established, as a coordinative body for the participation of the Greens and the radical parties in the elections for the European Parliament in 1979. But because of the strong differences between the Greens and the radical parties and groups, they failed to define the joint pan-European electoral platform, that resulted in a failure and this party did not enter the European Parliament with its own MPs.

In the elections in 1984, the Green Party entered in reconstructed form, as Coordination of the European Green Parties, with a secretariat provided by the Dutch Radical Party. For these elections, they published a joint declaration of the European Green Parties. In the following period the number of members that joined the party grew, so at the elections for the European Parliament in 1984, the party won 11 MPs. They formed the Green Alternative European connection with the European Parliament. The group was too small to be recognized by the Parliament to cover its expenses, because of this it joined the group "Rainbow" that united regionalists, the Danish national movement against the European community and other radicals and socialists.

The party of European Greens formed a confederate triangle structure with autonomous group in the Parliament, but also a weak group of the European Green parties as supra-national coordinative body of the party members. The position of the European Green Party was weakened also because of the implementation of the rotation principle which some of the party members (from Germany and Holland) used with their MPs through their replacement with other MPs on half of their mandates. This rotation technique was originally implemented with the German Greens to protect their members from corruption through informal negotiation systems within

the Bundestag. But it is obvious that this exact principle was a bad decision for them within the European Parliament.

On the other hand, for the Dutch parties the selection of rotation was understood as a compromise between three parties which had only two mandates in Parliament. One mandate and MP were saved for the best candidate, while the second mandate rotated between the second and the third candidate. This way, each party had representatives in the European Parliament, but the obvious difference in the opinions between the Green Parties was kept further. Especially strong was the difference between the pro-European and Euro-skeptical tendencies that weakened the position of the Greens in the Parliament. So, in the elections in 1989, the Green parties won only 26 mandates because of the political conflicts that existed between the "Rainbow" group, European Greens formed from special parliamentary group and Green groups in the European parliament. During this period, the Greens strengthened their position in the Parliament.

In June 1993, the European Federation of Green Parties was formed by members of the political group from Finland which was more organized than the others, having its own Congress, Council and Federative executive Committee. This federation strengthened its connections with the Group of Greens in the European Parliament, so, in the elections in 1994 the Green parties won a total of 20 mandates. They teamed up with the member from the Danish Socialistic People's party, and from the network, and with a single member from the Italian South-Tirol People's Party, and from the network, and formed separate group "Rainbow", with a title European Radical Alliance. At the European Elections 1999, the European Greens won 38 mandates. They formed a combined group with the European free Alliance that represented the regional parties and independent movements, that previously participated in the European Radical Alliance.

The connection between the Greens and these parties was different than before, given the fact that the Greens were stronger by number and on the political base. Since 2004, the European Green Party is registered as a political party on European level, dedicated to the ideology that defends the principles of Green policies, such as responsibility toward the environment, individual freedom, inclusive democracy and all the other previously mentioned principles.

The connection and the relation of this party toward the EU and its institutions has dramatically changed after 2004, although they are still an issue to a live discussion and debate. If we consider the fact that in the period between 1970-1980, European Greens were generally skeptical toward the European political and economical integration, today that attitude and relation is changed as a result of the social and the interests connected with the protection of the environment. In its program in 1984, the European Green Party favored creating the so-called alternative Europe, as neutral and decentralized creation. In 1989, several member-parties adopted after-parliamentary course of acting and erupted in bigger supporters of the European Integration process. The program they used to feature the elections supported the democratization process of the EU institutions. In its program for the elections in 1994, in 1999 and in 2004, the Greens rejected their principled negative attitude for European Integration and started to suggest pragmatic alternatives for the policies and EU institutions.

The Party of the Greens was especially glorified in the sphere of Internet policies of the Union, for which the parliamentarian group of Green- European free Alliance deepened its popularity between the citizens because of the suggestions for free informatics infrastructure, especially of its work, also because of the politics that prefer directive vs. software protection of the patent and of other forms of industrial property. Today, the majority in the party are the European Federal-

ists. The former leader of this party, Daniel Cohn-Bendit, was member of the Spinelli federalist group, who, together with Guy Verhofstadt, wrote a book for the goals established in the federalists manifest. In the elections that were held in 2014, the European Green Party went into coalition with the International European Movement and won 50 mandates in the European Parliament.

The European Green Party defined itself as an international association which is formed without lucrative purposes, but in the interest to protect the environment in Europe and wider. It is composed of political parties that come from EU member-countries, but also from countries which are not members of the Union, and which are usually considered to be associative, or members with monitoring status without the right to vote. The party has its own organs in its infrastructure: Council and Committee.

The Council is composed from party delegates of the member-countries based on the success achieved in the European elections or according to national electoral results. Each member-party has at least two delegates. The council is responsible to decide for the political questions between two Congresses, as well as to decide for questions of organizational nature, such as election of the committees, review of the requirements sent from the national parties for membership in the European Green Party with the status observer or with associative status, as well as for other statutory questions.

The party Committee is composed of nine members, including two spokespersons (one man and one woman), general secretary and the party treasurer. This body is responsible for running the daily political activities and issues, for executing the decisions adopted by the Council, as well as the activities connected with the services and the responsible individuals from the party.

The Party Congress summons at least once every five years and presents extended organ that decides the key issues connected with the realization of the party policies.

The European Green Parties are organized in several regional networks, near the seas, forming bio-regional structure, such as, for example, the network of the Green Islands under the leadership of the Green Parties network in Britain, Ireland and the islands, the network of the Greens from the Baltic Sea, network of the Greens of the Mediterranean, network of Greens of the Adriatic Sea, and network of Greens of the Northern Sea.

4.5. Alliance of the European Conservatives and Reformists

This European party connects the political parties that stand for and believe in personal freedom of each individual, in parliamentary democracy in the national sovereignty, the strength of the family, in low taxes, in free trade and in the rule of law. It refers to the party located in the centre-right ranked on the ideological scale, which unites the parties from the EU member-countries, but also the countries which are not members of the Union, with equal status in accordance with the internal party regulations. The Alliance is part of the political group of the European Conservatives and Reformists in the European Parliament, where think-tank groups and the New Direction also get in, the European young Conservatives and European Alliance groups that function within other international assemblies.

The Alliance works also with the allied parties from other continents which are full members of the Union of the international democrats. As the Alliance of Conservatives and Euroskeptical parties, the Alliance stands in defense of the wider conservative and economy-liberal principles. The Alliance is

composed of 22 member parties, as well as four independent members that come from twenty countries. This party has 50 MPs in the European Parliament and one Commissioner in the European Commission. It is composed of two chiefs of states, but also members that are part of the European Council. This party has its own political group in the European Parliament and was officially recognized in January 2010.

The party is led by a board of directors elected from the Council which represents all the Alliance's member-parties. The party is represented by a president assisted by four vice presidents elected from different member-parties from different countries. The party is presented through the political group of European conservatives and reformists in the European Parliament, the pan-European think-tank group New Direction and the Youth organization European Young Conservatives. Also, formally this party is associated also with the group of the European conservatives and reformists in the Region Committee, with group of the European conservatives in the Parliamentarian Assembly of the Council of Europe, and with the group of the European Conservatives and Reformists in the Congress of the Council of Europe.

At the meeting of the Party Council which was held on 21 March 2014, the Alliance adopted the **Reykjavik Declaration**, which defines the principles on which the work of the Alliance is based upon, but also the way of its acting. This declaration replaced the Prague Declaration, adopted by the Alliance in 2009. In the Reykjavik Declaration it states that the Alliance joined all the Parties which respect the above listed principles (individual freedom, national sovereignty, etc.), that the Alliance believes in a Europe of independent nations that work together for a joint profit by keeping their own identity and integrity, that the Alliance commits to respect the equality of all European Democracies, regardless of their size and regardless of which international organization

they are members of, that the Alliance favors the execution of power on the lowest level-starting from the citizens through the local to the national governments, that the Alliance understands open societies as environments based on the principles of dignity and the autonomy of the individuals, released from the various forms of state pressure.

The freedom of the individuals includes the freedom of religion, freedom of speech and free expression of thought, freedom of movement and association, freedom at work, etc. The Alliance, as stated further in the Declaration, recognizes the equality of all citizens under the law, regardless of their ethnic, sex or social affiliation. The Alliance opposes all forms of extremism, authoritarianism and racism, points to the important role of the democratic legitimacy of the state-nation. The Alliance stands for a free economy, an open contest between the economical subjects in Europe and globally. The Alliance supports the principles presented in the Prague Declaration, as well as the performance of the political group European Conservatives and reformists in the European Parliament and allied groups in the other European Parliaments.

4.6. Party of the European left

This party unites the democratic parties of the alternative and the progressive left wing on the European continent that fight for the consistent transformation of present social relations and connections in peaceful and socially righteous system based on the permanent diversities among the nations, but also their joint history and joint values. Established on 9 March 2004 in Rome, the Party of the European Left Wing held their first Congress on 8 October in Athens, where the Athens Declaration of the European left wing was presented. The second congress was held in Prague in 2007, while the third in Paris in 2010. The party contains 26 member-parties and 7 monitor-parties that come from almost all over Europe. Its program platform is based on the idea of transforming

Europe, through the active inclusion of social movements and unions in those processes. Several party-members and monitor-parties participate in the more radical European anti-capitalistic left wing. Before this party was established, the vast number of its present members prepared to hold an annual conference as part of the New European Forum of the left wing, which still exists.

4.7. Movement for a Europe of Liberties and Democracy

This movement is dedicated to respecting the democratic principles, freedom and cooperation between the sovereign countries with a purpose to win the processes of bureaucratization of Europe. This party opposes further enlargement of the Union and revitalizing the integration processes through contract conclusion and through implementation of policies that only increase the democratic deficit in the Union and encourage the centralist political structure in the EU.

The movement is based on the following principles: freedom between the people in the various countries, more democracy and respect for the people's will, respect for the history, tradition and cultural values in Europe, respect national differences and the freedom to vote. Established in 2011, this Movement is composed of parties that come from the political group Europe for Freedom and Democracy in the European Parliament, with the exception of the British independent party, which was not part of the movement. In its political program, the Movement emphasizes the role and the meaning of more democracy in the national and in the European system as well and respect the people's will.

Convinced that the democratic legitimacy lies in the national states, their regions and parliaments, having in mind the fact that a single European demos does not exist, the Movement resisted the further process of European integration through treaties and policies. The party is convinced that

all these new treaties or all the changes of the present treaties should be submitted to the citizens in national referendums, with the purpose to test the national opinion regarding these key EU issues. The party, also, believes that the legitimacy of any government comes from the people's will and their free and democratic right to rule. The people and nations in Europe have the right to protect their national borders, as well as to strengthen their own historical, traditional, religious and cultural values.

The party rejects xenophobia, anti-Semitism and other forms of discrimination. The party respects national diversities and interests, and especially the freedom of the voters, the freedom of the national elected representatives and members of the European Parliament to protect and practice their views, opinions and thoughts regarding various political issues that are opened and overviewed in the European parliament and other European institutions.

The movement stands for a campaign which is transparent and democratically controlled by the EU, with a smaller degree of centralism, and a larger degree of flexibility, a campaign that will be close to the citizens. Also, the movement stands for the protection of freedom of political expression of thought and association, as well as defending and strengthening the fundamental democratic principles and responsible representation.

4.8. European Democratic party

The European Democratic Party unites those parties and political representatives standing for creating a more democratic, integrated EU, closer to its citizens. In a period when Europe faces economic, social and political crises, the European nations turn their back to the idea of a united Europe. They look at the need of an enlarged and deepened EU with distrust and doubt. For those, that share European ideals, this is a big

challenge for which a decisive strategy is needed. Hence, the European Democratic party has the aim through its political actions to rebuilt the new European project and to offer the European citizens new, credible solutions, with new perspectives.

This exact challenge is considered as a base of founding the party. Initiated on 16 April 2004, the party was formally established on 9 December 2004 in Brussels, with two co-presidents. The European Democratic Party was established as an reaction to the growing influence of the Euro-skeptic parties within the democratic institutions. Soon, pro-European centrist parties joined from the biggest political group in the European Parliament, the group of the European people's party, which created the new centrist multinational block. Its co-founder, Francois Bayrou, described this party as a people's party which is not neither conservative nor socialist, as is, for example, the Democratic Party in the US.

It is interesting that the European Democratic Party followed the euro-sceptic political group Alliance for Europe of Nations, which in 2004 won 37 mandates and grew to the sixth in size parliamentary group. The Alliance for Europe of Nations is basically Euro-skeptic, established on the idea that supranational institutions of the EU based on the sovereignty of the individual European nations caused more damage than wellbeing for the European nations, and for all Europeans. Euro-skeptics mostly criticize that the EU is overburdened with bureaucracy, and slow governing, sluggish and unavailable for the citizens. Hence, euro-sceptics seek the solution for this state in reorganizing the EU or in simply taking back the authority from supranational organizations.

The European Democratic party in the sixth mandate in the European parliament from 2004 until 2009 has its own joint European parliamentary group within the Liberal Alliance and the Democrats for Europe, or with the Liberal Alliance and the Democrats for the Europe, while presently, the

mandate of the European Parliament this political group numbers 69 MPs.

With the growth of Euro-scepticism at the beginning of the 21st century, those political forces that believed in the European project and in the Union's institutions were put in a defensive position. From the beginning of the work of this party and of its member-parties centrist political coalition was established, with the political group Liberal Alliance and Democrats for Europe, as third biggest political coalition in the European Parliament. Today, the European Democratic Party numbers ten member-parties from eight EU countries. Also, in its lines there are several MPs who are members of the European Democratic Party, although none of the parties from their countries are not a member of this party.

From the beginning of the establishment of the parliamentary coalition with the European Democratic Party, the Liberal Alliance and Democrats for Europe loses its support on the field, or in 2009, the Alliance declined the number of mandates from 88 to 84, and on the elections in 2014 won only 67 mandates, as fourth biggest parliamentary group. It is interesting that although the European Democratic Party was established as direct opposition to the growing Euro-skepticism and isolation in Europe, the fact that one of the basic principles of the European Democratic Party which comes as a surprise is the protection and development of the EU and the Union's institutions. The European Democratic Party believes that the European Integration has not just been protected, but also it has to be enlarged. This party calls Europe to continue building the market economy by protecting the local or regional cultural traditions of Europe, and by providing possibilities for all Europeans to enjoy the same citizen and economy freedoms as their neighbours. Achieving this idealistic balance is one of the biggest problems that the Union faces today, which provokes big critics in the EU, based on the claims that this state can never be achieved.

4.9. European Free Alliance

The European Free Alliance is a party that is directed towards the idea "Europe to the People" to become reality. Within this party, 40 progressive nationalistic, regional and autonomous parties are united from several EU countries which present mainly the interests of the nations without countries, the regions and the traditional national minorities. The focus of the activities of this party is in promoting the right of self-determination, but also the human, citizen and political freedom and rights, democracy, internal enlargement, multi-level governing, cultural and language varieties, as well as nationalism, regionalism, autonomy and independence. The right to self-determination is the key question developed in the political program and party ideology. The European Free Alliance is an European political party recognized by the European Parliament in 2004 as a pro-European party which respects EU values, the principles of freedom, democracy, respects human fundamental freedoms and rights and the rule of law. It acts in 17 EU member-countries.

In the European Parliament elections in 2004, the European Freedom Alliance was formally recognized as an European political party with four MPs, and two associative members. After the alteration of the EU Regulative that refers to the European Political Parties in 2008, and which referred to the possibility from creating European Foundations which were affiliated toward European political parties, the European Free Alliance in 2007 officially created its think -tank foundation. In the elections in 2009, six MPs returned to the Alliance, and also, the New Flemish Alliance joined the Alliance, so, the sub-group had seven MPs. The political principles of the work and the activities of the Alliance are determined in the Brussels Declaration adopted in 2000.

In accordance with this Declaration, the European Free Alliance stands for building a "Europe of free people based on

the subsidiary principle, which believes in joint human solidarity among the people in the world". Hence, the Alliance defines itself as union of people who do not have countries, people who fight for independence, autonomy, recognizing or requiring a more adequate vote in Europe. The Alliance supports European integration based on the subsidiary principle. The Alliance also believes that Europe can and should move a step forward, forming a "Europe of regions", because the regions can and should have more power in Europe. For example, they should participate with their representatives in the EU Council's work, when the questions of their interest are being discussed in the Council. The Alliance stands for more protection of the language and cultural diversity within EU. The Alliance is considered to be on the left wing of the political spectrum, because of the fact that the Brussels declaration emphasizes the necessity for more protection of the human rights, the necessity for sustainable development, as well as the necessity for social justice.

4.10. European Alliance for Freedom

Refers to the pan-European Alliance of members of the European Parliament, who work together with national and regional MPs and parties of EU member –countries, united under the political platform which imposes the national freedom and democracy, as opposed to the centralized, supranational control. Taking into consideration the questions connected with freedom and democracy in the EU, the European Alliance for freedom does not perform in compliance with the left-right winged political paradigm, because the Alliance is composed of members who come from various parties in the political spectrum. Although founded in 2010, this party was recognized by the European Parliament in 2011. Apart from all the other pan-European parties, the Alliance members are not national political parties, but individuals. The head of the party is located in Brussels and its registered office is in Malta.

4.11. Alliance of European National Movements

This European party was formed in Budapest, on 24 October 2009 by a huge number of nationalist's parties and national movements from different countries in Europe. Since then, the Alliance for European National Movements has stayed dedicated to the political activities directed toward the protection and prevention of the varieties of indigenous cultures, traditions, languages in Europe to free, independent and equal nations, within the confederation of the sovereign national countries. In November 2009, the British National Party claimed that the Alliance counts nine parties in total, but this information was not confirmed by the president of the party in 2012.

Today, the Alliance is defined as a political group composed of patriotic parties dedicated to the protection of the European civilization, that counts parties from nine European nations, plus the two newly admitted parties in the Alliance, the Portugal Partido Nacional Renovador and the Swedish National Democrats. The Alliance is now composed by the following party-members: French National Front, Hungarian Party Jobik, Italian Flame Tricolore, British National Party, All-Ukrainian Union "Svoboda", Spanish Movement for Social Republic, Belgian National Front of Belgium and Swedish National-Democrats. In the joint declaration signed by these member-countries of the Alliance, stands the requirement to "form a Europe that will be founded on free, independent and equal nations within the confederation of sovereign national countries". The declaration further called for "rejecting each idea or attempt to form a centralist European super state".

Also, the Alliance stands for "promoting freedom, dignity and equal rights of each citizen, as opposed to all the forms of totalitarian", and at the same time calls for a "peaceful and humanely addressing of the problems connected to migrants through providing, among other things, international cooperation that will have a purpose for the development and self-

preservation of third world countries". The Alliance calls for adopting "strong policies on behalf of the families in interest to bridge the demographic deficit in Europe, and promoting the traditional values in the societies" and seeks the "protection of the diversities in Europe that is a result of the various identities, traditions, languages and cultures". The Alliance supports the direct vote of the citizens for vitally important issues in the country (direct democracy), but, and their electoral representatives in the administrative and bureaucratic organs and bodies, its stands for effective protection of Europe against new treats, such as terrorism, religious, political, economic or financial imperialism, as well as the joint struggle of the European people against social irregularities and the destructive effects of globalisation.²⁸³

4.12. European Christian Political Movement

It refers to the political movement, political association of Christian Democrat parties and organizations which are active on all different political levels in Europe. This party is represented on national, but also on European level in 10 EU member-countries. From the wider topic and issues on which the movement is focused, the most important are: marriage and human dignity, fight against human trafficking, fight against women trafficking and prostitution, sustainable economy and entrepreneurship, family priorities, freedom of belief, consciousness and expression.

4.13. EU Democrats

EU Democrats and pan-European Union the critics of the Union, and critics of enlargement of the Union and membership of new member –countries. This party opposes the further centralization of the power in Brussels, and stands for

²⁸³ See: **Brzinski, J.B. (1995) "Political Group Cohesion in the European Parliament, 1989-1994". In Rhodes, C. and Mazey, S. (eds) The State of the European Union, Vol.3, (Harlow: Longman), (p.135-158).**

transferring the power back to the national and regional parliaments and enacting decisions closer to the citizens. Also, the EU Democrats party does not stand on the position of left-right wing political issues, for which, as it is said the democratic elected national parliaments should declare themselves.²⁸⁴

Their platform of political actions is not based on racist or xenophobe views, but to the contrary, its political activities are based on the principles of transparency, responsibility, subsidiary and effective democratic control within the EU, as the main purpose of the party. The party was founded mainly from conservative parties in Europe which in the period between 1979-1992 as a subgroup of the political group of the European People's Party- European Democrats. Actually, the European Democrats group was formed in 1979 by the British Conservative Party, Danish Conservatives and from other MPs after their success in the elections in 1979. In fact, this group replaced the previous European Conservative group. In the late 1970s, the European Democrats were third in size in the European Parliament, although its force dropped off in the late 1980s, when a larger number of centre-right wing oriented members transferred into the rivalry European People's Party dominated by the German CDU and the Christian democrat ideology. In 1992, the European Democrats (mostly members of the British Conservative Party) failed, and the rest of the members were undertaken as an "associative party" toward the group of the European People's Party.

This was the key moment for the conservatives, having in mind the fact that the European People's Party was generally positively directed towards the process of European integration, as a crucial part of their ideology. The relationship of the British Conservative Party toward the European People's Party was the key question in the following years, especially for Euro-skeptic parties referring to British membership in the

²⁸⁴ See: **Kreppel, A. and Tsebelis, G. (1999) "Coalition Formation in the European Parliament", *Comparative Political Studies*, Vol.32, no.8, (p. 933-966).**

EU. The former leader of the Conservatives, William Hague, who considered that the issue should be a subject of negotiation with adopting the new treaty in 1999, through which the political group should have done its own rebranding as an European People's Party–European Democrats, by including the "European Democrats" in the nomenclature of the EPP after seven years of absence. In 2005, after the change of the leader of the Conservative party of Britain and placing David Cameron on that position, the retreatment of the Conservative party is next from the parliamentarian group of the European People's party–European Democrats.

On the other hand, Cameron's opponent, David Davis, had another attitude from the leader, according to whom the Conservative Party can stay in the group with an adequate distance from the European People's Party and providing close relations with the European Democrats, which caused a huge wave of negative reactions from current MPs. What follows is an open letter addressed by the MPs to David Cameron that makes disinformation about the relationship between the Conservative MPs from Britain, on the one, and European People's Party on the other hand, by claiming that "the conservatives are members of the European Democratic group, which is allied with the EPP". According to the attitudes stated in Davis' letter, the European Democrats do not exist because they are short of money and also short of people, and that they are practically a part of the EPP". In 2009, the founding members of the European Conservatives and reformists, as signatories of the Prague Declaration, claimed that they will leave the group of the European People's Party–European Democrats, and in that sense, the European Democrats movement. This step put an end to the 30 year existence of the European Democrats in the European Parliament.²⁸⁵

²⁸⁵ See: **Colomer, M.Joser (2001), Political Institutions in Europe Second Edition, Routledge.**

5. EUROPEAN POLITICAL (PARLIAMENTARIAN) GROUPS

5.1. History of the political groups in the European Parliament

Since the founding of the European Parliament as an institution in the former Union, and today's Union, its internal organization is set to influence Trans-national political groups. In 1958, the newly founded European Parliament that came from the previous Joint assembly of the Union for Coal and Steel, and succeeded its rights for a treatment, but also the three political groups: Christian Democrats, Socialistic and Liberal. Just to remind that the Joint Assembly was the first international assembly structured to political groups which based its work on ideological, and not on national divisions.

In June 1953, the newly adopted rules for the procedures formally recognized political groups as groups of "political conviction". In Article 33 of those first regulations, a "political group" was supposed to meet two criteria. The first criteria was at least nine delegates to form a political group, and the second criteria, that the delegates are organized in political groups according to their political convictions. These two criteria are still present in the existing procedural regulations of the European Parliament. In the alterations of the regulations in 2009, specifically Article 30 states: "the members can organize themselves in political groups in accordance with their political beliefs".

The numerous criteria undertook certain alterations, and presently states: "a political group is composed of members elected from at least $\frac{1}{4}$ from the member-countries". In accordance with Article 30, line 2 from the Rules of Procedure, the minimal number of members required to form the political group is 25. The number criteria to form a political group was constantly changed as a result of the changes of the number of members in Parliament. Regarding the criteria "political be-

lief", it is interesting to mention that at the beginning, it had a purpose to protect the Parliament from forming national groups. In the first years of European integration, there was a concept that the organization of the Joint Assembly in national groups will be basically anti-European, and the delegates in the Assembly have much more in common with their friends from the sister parties from other member-states of the Communities, rather than with their countrymen.

Although the three initially implemented political groups of the Christian Democrats, Socialists and the Liberals were established in accordance with the criteria of political beliefs, although the groups had the opportunity for free determination and to the so-called de facto expression of their beliefs on a wider base set on a wide spectrum of political cultures and traditions. In 1979, by founding the technical group for protecting the interests of the independent MPs by Italian radicals, the smaller communists parties, Danish euro-skeptics, and Belgian and Irish independent MPs, it was declared that "each member of the group protects its political platform, its right to free speech, the right to vote in the parliamentary committees, and also in the plenary sessions". The interesting case was creating the technical group of independent Mps – a mixed group in 1999, by Mps with different political commitments, starting with the Italian radicals, until Le Pen's National Front.

This specific case was considered as nonpareil in the history of the European Parliament, because for the first and the only time, the Parliament voted "for" the division of the political group. In the regulations of the Parliament, there has been listed a sort of negative definition of "political group" as a group of MPs who among themselves explicitly do not determine their political beliefs in adopting decisions to form a political group". This, practically, despite the formal precondition for explicit political belief, determined that the parliamentary regulatives are not capable of guaranteeing that the trans-

national grouping can present the coherent political cultures. Each political group individually defines its membership criteria as well as its ideological homogeneity (or heterogeneity) as a result of the political choice, much more than as a result of existing legal norms.

Although, political groups, as well as the party system in the European Parliament, are based on the parties and the party systems in the EU member –countries. It is traditionally specified that the EU party system is visible only when the huge lines of the political conflicts in Europe do not match the national borders, but match the intercepted national differences.²⁸⁶

In the early years of forming the Joint Assembly, traditional party families were “glue” for their members and their national backgrounds. In other words, they shared more mutual as socialists or as Christian Democrats, rather than as French or Germans. This is in accordance with the reading the European politics based on the new fundamental social divisions, which were “activated” and interpreted by the political actors in identical way in all of Western Europe. The social divisions, especially between farmers and workers, between the church and the country, between the centre and periphery, between industrial workers and capital owners, “produced” the competitive political parties, grouped in separate party families according to the social groups they represent and according to the basic ideological principles on which they are based.

Apart from the four basic divisions which traditionally were identified by Lipset and Rocca, the class division, together with the religious, were expressed in more general left-right wing dimension, which normally represents the interests of the parties and of the voters.²⁸⁷

²⁸⁶ See: **Thomassen, J.(2002), Parties and Voters: the Feasibility of the European System of Political Representation”, in B.Steunenberg and J. Thomassen, The European Parliament. Moving Towards Democracy in the EU, Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield.**

²⁸⁷ See: **Hix, Simon (1999), The Political System of the EU, Palgrave MacMillan.**


The political groups in the European parliament are parliamentary groups that enter the Parliamentary Composition. The European Parliament is the only type of supranational organ in which MPs join and are organized not just by party affiliation, but also according to the ideological affiliation of the group. In some cases, the political groups in the European Parliament are formal representatives of the European political parties in the Parliament, in other cases they are political coalitions of a certain number of European parties, of a certain number of national parties, as well as independent politicians.

Political groups are not political parties, but coalitions of MPs which are formed based on certain ideological affiliation and acceptance. Political groups have a strict ban to participate in the electoral campaign for the European elections, because this obligation was clearly assigned to the European Political Parties. Each political group in the European Parliament must respect the set of crucial principles on which is the EU based. Grouping into political groups in the European Parliament is mostly accomplished within the two dominant unions that lead the fact that in the EU's political system, there is a type of dual-parties, or mostly bipolar interests mainly represented through the European People's Party on the one, and the Party of European Socialists, on the other hand. But in certain exceptionally important conditions for the EU is obvious and the coalition that happens among the political groups in the centre.

5.2. Structure of European Parliament according the affiliation in the political groups

In accordance with the electoral data for the European Parliament in 2014, the turnout was 42,61% from the voters, from the total 751 mandates, the following results are elected:

Table No. 14: Electoral results in 2014 according to political groups

	Име на политичката група	Процент
	1. Group of the European People's Party (Christian Democrats)	Result: elected 221 MPs Result rate: 29,43%
	2. Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament	Result: elected 191 MPs Result rate: 25,43%
	3. European Conservatives and Reformists	Result: elected 70 MPs Result rate: 9,32%
	4. Alliance of Liberal and Democrats for Europe	Result: elected 67 MPs Result rate: 8,92%
	5. European United Left/Nordic Green Left	Result: 52 elected MPs Result rate: 6,92%
	6. The Greens/ European Free Alliance	Result: 50 elected MPs Result rate: 6,66%
	7. Europe of freedom and direct democracy	Result: 48 elected MPs Result rate: 6,39%
	8. Non-attached Members	Result: 52 elected MPs Result rate: 6,92%

In the present structure of the European Parliament eight political groups function, from which the most numerous are the Christian-Democrats, as well as the political Group of the Progressive Alliance of the Socialists and the Democrats in the European Parliament. It is clearly viewed that the MPs in the European Par-

liament, although they are elected from the line of the European Political Parties that compete in the European elections, nevertheless they function in the Parliament through political groups which formally consult and are shaped within the first constitutive session after elections.

A political group can be composed of members from only one European political party, or can decide to include a majority of MPs from one European Party, but also MPs from other parties or independent members if they accept its ideological affiliation and functioning.

The number of political groups in the European Parliament varied and changed through the years. So, after the first elected direct elections for members of the European Parliament in 1979, seven political groups were formed, in 1989, the number increased to ten, and in the elections in 1999, seven political groups were formed again. In the 2004 elections, the number of political groups increased to eight as it is today. In the eight active political groups in the European Parliament, more than 150 national political parties are members.

It can be noted that neither political group has the absolute majority in the European Parliament. Also, certain changes inside the political groups are noticed from one to another electoral cycle. The political groups in the European Parliament are mostly more or less related national political parties, as well as related European parties. The research of the electoral behaviour of the MPs that are made within the European Parliament show that the ideology has a much bigger influence over the electoral behaviour of the MPs, rather than for example, the affiliation of the MPs to a certain nationality.

So, according to research made by Simon Hix, Abdul Nury and Gerard Roland, MPs in the European Parliament, in around 90% of the cases, vote in accordance with the attitudes and

thinking of their political group. But, according to the data of their research regarding the issue who has more control over the MPs in the European Parliament, the national parties or political groups in the EP, the answer is very interesting. The Mps in the EP would vote less against their national parties rather than against their European political groups, or in rates, 1/3 from the electoral behavior of the MPs is determined according to his/her European political group, while 2/3 according his/her national party.

The formal acknowledgement of the political groups depends on meeting the conditions **listed in the Regulation No.29-32 from the Rules of Procedure of the European Parliament Regulative No. 31** allows or provides each MP in the European Parliament to choose whether to be a member or not to be a member in some political group. **Rule No. 29 states that** MPs in the European Parliament can form political groups in accordance with their political – ideological orientation. Parliament does not evaluate the political affiliation of the members in the political groups. But, in case when the MP rejects the political–ideological orientation of the political group, the Parliament has the right to make an evaluation (valuation) whether the political group works in line with the parliamentary regulations.

One political group can be formed in the Parliament if it is composed of MPs elected in at least 1/5 from the member –countries in EU. The minimal number of members for forming a political group in the Parliament is 20. One member cannot belong to more than one political group. The President of the European Parliament is informed that the new political group is being formed in compliance with the regulations, based on the submitted statement. In the statement, the name of the group should be listed, the number of members and the group service. The statement should be published in the EU's Official Gazette.

In **compliance with Regulative No.30**, political groups have a responsibility to complete their work engagements as part of the activities in the Union, including the tasks listed in the European Parliament Book of Rules. Political groups should be included in the parliamentary secretariat in compliance with the previously determined plan, in the parliamentary administrative services, as well as in the parliamentary budget.

The parliamentary bureau defines those regulations which refer to the provisions for implementation and oversight of these activities. In the regulations, the administrative and financial consequences have been determined in case of termination of a certain political group. In Regulation No.31 which refers to independent Mps is stated that the Bureau of the European Parliament defines their status, as well as their parliamentary rights.

The conference of the presidents of the European parliament decides the way of allocating the posts among the political groups, independent MPs and EU institutions.

Each political group appoints its president (coordinator) who decides how the group votes. Although, the MPs vote on individual or personal grounds in compliance with Article No.4(1) from the Act attached to Decision No. 76/787/EEC for direct elections in the EP. They carry and realize their mandate independently and are not tied to the political directions of the party from which they were elected, or with the directions of the political group in which they act in the Parliament. The members in the political group include bigger office space and additional services, as well as more money to organize meetings as well as to distribute information.

In November 2007, the Commission's proposal was adopted regarding the statute and the financing of the Eu-

ropean political parties and it allowed the European political parties to be financed for the electoral campaign in 2009. The financing includes creating political foundations that will provide citizen forums through organizing manifestations, public debates and training for the members of the national political movements and academic institutions. The basic purpose of this solution was to improve communication for Europe, as well as to encourage the participation in debates for Europe with the purpose to create an EU closer to the citizens.

The European parties get round 10 million euro annually through the EP, while in the budget for 2008, the EU included an additional 5 million euro for new political forms of association (new political bases). The new regulative defines that new political forms of association must formally associate toward some of the existing European party with a purpose to provide finances, as well as to get means from those funds through simply applying to the party to which they are included. The financing is directed only toward European parties, not toward political groups, while the means allocated from the EU budget cannot be used for financing other parties or for national parties and candidates.

The funds defined in the EU budget for 2009, in segment for the EP (Article 40, part 4, paragraph 1, line 402) and are controlled by the EP. These funds are allocated to the following parties:

1. European People's Party
2. Party of European Socialists
3. European Liberal, Democratic and Reform Party
4. European Federation of Green Parties
5. Party of the European Left
6. European Democratic party
7. Alliance for Europe of the Nations
8. European free Alliance
9. EU Democrats

On 31 December 2008, the Alliance of Independent Democrats in Europe was terminated, so the Bureau of the EP, in February 2009, decided to withdraw the finances. The EP, also decided to annul the previously adopted decision to pay 200,000 Euro from EU funds to the Group which was anti-Lisbon directed against the Treaty, and named themselves as Group for Freedom.

The coordinators of the political groups meet at the presidential conference to decide which issues will be solved on plenary sessions in the EP. In accordance with Regulation No.82.2, a political group can initiate a debate with the Commission and the Council before the Accession negotiations of the applicant-country are opened. The parliament is able, based on the proposal of the open committee, political group or at least 40 members, to submit a request to the Commission and to the Council to participate in the debate before they initiate negotiations with the applicant-country.

According to Rule 83, at the suggestion of the political group, the European Parliament can ask the Council not to approve of a negotiation mandate regarding some International Treaty in front of the EP, in order to present its own position for the Treaty. Rule 108 provides opportunities for a political group to submit questions to the Council or the Commission. There are other procedural advantages, for example, naming the members of the group in the management structure of the Committees, distribution of reports, duration of speeches at the plenary sessions in accordance with the proportionality principle.

According to Rule 142 from the EP Book of Rules:

1. The conference of presidents can suggest the Parliament that the time for holding the parliamentary session should refer to a certain hearing. The EP should decide for this proposal without any hearing.
2. Speech duration should be divided in accordance with the following criteria:

- a) The first part of the speech duration should be equally divided among all political groups,
- b) The rest of the time should be divided among political groups in ratio or depending on the total number of their members,
- c) Independent members of the EP will take the rest of the time remaining for the speech.

6. EU PARTY SYSTEM

For a long time in literature, especially under the Giovanni Sartori classification, political parties and party systems were classified under the criteria-number of parties that compete in the elections, as well as according to the ideological distance among them. Hence, political theoreticians mostly used certain qualitative descriptions from the type "two-and-a-half-party-system", or according to the division of the votes, or the division of mandates in Parliament, defines the weight of the parties according to their institutional meaning in the system. The key criteria according to which the final classification is done is the necessity to quantitatively present the number of parties according to their institutional meaning in the system. The key criteria according to which the last classification is done is the necessity for quantitative expression of the number of parties which have meaning in the system, or concretely, it refers to the index defined as effective number of parties as a standard measure for the size of the party system. The party system is the central part of the democratic political system that has two elements: 1. Organization-internal hierarchy party organization, and 2. Contest among the parties, much more than conflict among the party organizations. In the vast part of the countries with liberal democracy, these two elements go hand in hand, or the democracy functions, because the parties with a competitive agenda and with concrete party candidates provide this purposes. Although, if the parties do not have developed organizational structures, or are more in mutual conflict rather than on contest, then the voters choice

will not be adequately and efficiently “interpreted” in political leadership and/or in concrete political solutions and steps.²⁸⁸

For example, the appearance of “cartelized” party systems in several European states led to growing voting apathy, alienation and voters protest. Hence, it is not strange that many theoreticians that deal with the so-called democratic deficit, claim that the EU requires a “competitive party system”, as for example, it was highlighted in 1978 by David Marquand, who considered that the pan-European community would be democratic only if its basic political structure was transferred from the rule “Europe to the nations” where the politics are structured through the national identities and governments, on the rule “Europe to the parties”, where the politics are structured through the party system. As well as in all democratic societies, this party system should be based on directly elected institution-such as the example of the European Parliament.

So, effective and democratic party system in the European Parliament would mean two things. First is connected with the party groups that have to act in cohesive way, so the voting should be held under transnational party memberships, and not through national feelings. And the second thing is that the parties should compete much more for political functions (as the presidential position in the European Parliament), as well as in the political process of the EU, rather than to focus on forming “big coalitions”. Also, with a purpose to translate the electoral political preferences on the domestic stage in the political actions on European level, as well as with the purpose to build functional instead of territorial majorities, this contest, according the Hicks, should be more on party line left-right wing, rather than the line “for” or “against” European positions.²⁸⁹

288 See: **Simon Hix, Amie Kfeffel, Aedul Noury, “The Party System in the European Parliament: Collusive or Competitive?”, JCMS 2003 Volume 41, Number 2, (pp. 309-331).** <http://www.Ise-students.ac.uk/HIX/WorkingPapers/Hix-Kreppel-Noury-JCMS-2003.pdf>

289 See: **Hix, S. (1995) “Parties at the European Level and the Legitimacy of EU Socio-Economic Policy”. Journal of Common Market Studies, Vol.33, No.4, (pp.527-554), and in: Hix, S. (1999) “Dimensions and Alignments in European Union Politics: Cognitive Constraints and Partisan Responses”. European Journal of Political Research, Vol.35, No. 2, (p.69-106).**

But, as parliamentary power increases, that kind of party system simply cannot be considered as sustainable. The present dominance of the supranational party groups and their key role within the internal organization of the European Parliament, to a certain degree suppresses their only and innovative role which is set to be achieved. There is no reason why to expect from the European Parliament, as before from the Joint Assembly, to develop ideologically based internal party groups. Actually, the party groups were not formally recognized out of the Parliament until 1992, although their formation was crucial for the development of the Parliament, but also for the European Community as a whole. It is interesting to mention that the Joint Assembly for the first time was established on 10 September 1952, without ideologically based political groups. The former members of the Assembly were seated in alphabetical order, as was the case with other international assemblies, such as, for example Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe. During the constitutive session of this Assembly, there were numerous suggestions the new Assembly to be organized according to the national, much more than the ideological (or party affiliation).

The first formal recognition of the existence of ideological divisions within the European Parliament did not happen in 1953, although during the discussions and the debates regarding the last draft-version of the new Regulation for Assembly's action was suggested that the nomination of the committee members should be in compliance with the balance principle among the representatives of the member-countries, on the one, and the "various political traditions", on the other hand.

In 1953, there was a little de facto change with the support of the three bigger politically-party groupings: Christian-Democrats, Socialists and Liberals. It refers the first primary party families in continental Western Europe. This de facto division of political groups led to enacting new regulations for the parliamentary sessions in compliance that highlight the

key role of the political parties in its internal organization. In the new Regulation 33 stands that the members of the Parliament have the right to form groups in accordance with their own "political conviction", with the name of the group, and with its members. The only limitations were that the group should be based on political, not national grounds, second, to have at least nine members, and third, none of the MPs to be member to more than one group.²⁹⁰

From this moment, political groups become a factual and legal reality. In the internal organization of the former Assembly and present European Parliament, the financial support was allocated to the political groups, each group was organized and internally with its secretaries, and with business offices in Strasbourg. The thing that is noticed as an unavoidable fact is that the enlargement of the number of political groups enlarges the fragmentation in the party system. Second, increased party fragmentation disguises the trend of decreasing the relative fragmentation in Parliament (which is measured by "effective number of parties" and by the number of emerging factionalisms) and the growing consolidation of the party system in the elected parliaments (measured by combined votes for the two biggest parties). The new political groups are formed with every new electoral cycle for MPs in the Parliament.

These groups leave an impression of being relatively marginalized in relation to the two dominant political groups in Parliament. In the sense of ideological balance, in the European Parliament centre-right wing oriented groups dominate in the period when the Parliament members were named with national representatives, while the centre-left wing oriented groups were majority in most of the post-electoral periods of the Parliament. For example, in the named Assembly in the middle of the 1950s, Christian-Democrats group had won almost 50% of the mandates compared with fewer than 30% won by socialists, while in the middle of the 1970s,

²⁹⁰ See: **Resolution 13, Common Assembly Proceedings, 10 January, 1953.**

the combined total number of Christian–Democrats together with French, British, Irish and Danish conservatives won 48% compared with 40% from the mandates in the Parliament for socialists and for the communists. In the elected Parliaments, the socialists were the biggest group in the first four election structures (1979-1999), while the European People’s Party was the biggest party with the biggest group even in the fifth electoral structure of the Parliament (1999-2004). The organizational element of the party system of the European Parliament has turned into key factor for the consolidated party system. The Party system of the EU developed in a model which in theory is called “two plus several”, where the politics dominates in accordance with the principle of the biggest groups from centre-left wing and centre-right wing, and four to five smaller groups which fill the gaps that were left by the bigger.

The general perception regarding the party contest in the European Parliament is that the Party of the European Socialists and European People’s party much more prefer to take place in form of inter–party clashes, rather the in the form of competition, through forming “big coalitions” or the so-called virtual “cartels”. In the present literature for the European Parliament, four main explanations are imposed connected with the behavior of the EPP-PEC which will probably offer answers to the question about the clash.

The first explanation is that there is an ideological similarity between the EPP and PES regarding many issues that refer to the EU’s agenda. These two groups, together with the Liberals, include almost 90% of political parties in Europe. Apart from the British conservatives and open EU opponents (extreme parties, radical left wing and right wing parties), almost all other parties in Europe are mainly “pro-European” focused.²⁹¹

²⁹¹ See: **Taggart, P. (1998) “ A Touchstone of Dissent: Euroscepticism in Contemporary Western European Party Systems”. *European Journal of Political Research*, Vol 33. No.3 (p.363-388).**

This situation, of course, influences the vote in the Parliament, where, according to certain analyses of the MPs behavior, it is obvious that the members of the EPP and of PES are much closer among themselves on the line for/anti-European policies rather than the classical left-right wing dimension. For many questions on the European Parliament agenda, for example, in the part of EU institutional reforms, the majority of EPP and PES have similar positions. But for some other questions, such as, socio-economic, ecological, market economy, etc. where the party groups are divided with the left-right wing line, completely different political positions can be expected. The second explanation is that the technical regulations regarding the procedures determined in EU-legislation force the two parties to vote together.²⁹²

According to Luciano Bardi, the EU party system is in a continuous process of concentrating and in party fragmentation. This happens due to the fact that certain parties cooperate in the European Parliament, but at the same time they are the biggest competitors in the national elections. And vice versa. The parties in national elections to be coalition partners and on the European level be competitors. That is the example with angry political rivals in Britain, Conservatives and Laborites, who, on many issues, vote together in the European Parliament, and on the national field are angry political opponents. The same happens with the French Gaullists and the United French Democrats, who, with the majority support of the French Government in Paris, but in Strasbourg they vote in three different political groups. Having in mind these conditions, we can conclude that the party system in the EU is centripetal and relatively stable for permanent level of development of the EU, although at first sight, it seems that it is as traditional as a great number of national party systems.

²⁹² See: **Nugent, N. (1999), The Government and Politics of the European Union, 4th edn, (Basingstoke: Macmillan), (p.230).**



PART FIVE

INTEREST GROUPS

CHAPTER 1



INTEREST CONCEPT DEFINITION

1. INTEREST-DEFINITION

All interest groups have one thing in common, and that is their interest; the interest itself represents the essence (the foundation) of each one. Regarding the character of the interest, whether it is an economic, social or political interest, it determines the type of character of the interest group itself. In this context, unions, associations and citizen associations (such as pharmaceutical associations, law associations, youth organizations, religious organizations, women's rights organizations, sport associations, etc.) all belong to the category of "interest group".

The concept of interest itself is derived from the Latin term **interesum /interesse** which means to **participate/to be amidst something**. The interest groups of modern societies, similar to political parties, represent the most significant link among the institutions in the system, on the one hand, and the citizens, on the other. In certain contexts, interest groups have the same origin as political parties. Namely, both of them are the product / the result of a modern representative government and they appear as a result of a more complex divisions due to the growth of industrial society. Despite the previously mentioned, some interest groups existed before the representative government was formed.

While political parties are interested in winning the elections and forming the government, interest groups usually take certain positions within society and strive to achieve their concrete interests through a defined set of rules in the social order.

Interest is a category of modern political philosophy and theory. Classical and middle age philosophical and political meanings of the word were unfamiliar with the concept of interest in its modern meaning. However, it is a fact that classical philosophers would not have been able to determine the highest community welfare nor justice (as a value) without the term **usefulness**, regarded as a significant dimension in

determining the meaning of interest as a category. Namely, the element of usefulness is one of the basic segments of interest itself. In that context, for the general conceptualization of this concept it is necessary to consider the **relation between the interest and the requirements** on the one hand, as well as the **relation of interests and values**, on the other. Human need is the base of every interest. Due to that, **interest often is defined as a politically distinct or rationally established need**. However, interest is not only a political distinction of human needs. The connection between needs and interests is more complex. **Kant** concluded a dual direction in the influence, meaning that **the interest represents, and also generates the need itself**. Based on this constellation, Kant differs:

- » **First, "pathological interests of the contexts"**, what is pleasant and useful and comes from the needs on one the one, and
- » **Second, "practical interests of the mind"**, for what is considered good and arises the needs on the other hand.

Interests-values relationship analysis indicates that the **system of values** has a significant influence on the content of the interest distinctions, and also on the way they are formed and expressed. But the relation between these two categories in this case also is not unidirectional. Namely, as the values affect the content and the interest features, the interests also play a significant role in forming, maintaining or transforming the system of values.

The interest is a exceptionally complex category that, apart from the political meaning, also contains philosophical, economical, psychological, and other dimensions. Due to all these components it is impossible to give a strict definition of interest. This is clearly a phenomenon that cannot be determined easily nor definitely.

The concept of interest belongs to the group of so-called **relationship categories** that reflect a certain social relationship. This characteristic refers to all types of interest realization, regardless whether their carrier is an individual itself or the community. Even **if the interest is immediately connected with a certain individual, personal interest is determined in relationship to the interests of a specific human community, organization or social group where the individual resides**. Each personal interest is considered as a unique social value that connects the individual with the social surroundings in which the individual resides, works and functions.

In the area of politics, interest usually appears in covered or in completely unrecognizable form. It is a concept, which due to its connection with the system of values, has relatively explicit ideological content. Also, there is a significant mix of the objective state and subjective assumptions in this category. Therefore, a lot of theoreticians refer to a unsolved doctrine, a contradiction between subjective and objective dimensions, that is to say, between different types of interests.

Even **Halvencius** warned that **“the interest is a mighty wizard that in the eyes of all human beings changes the shape of every object”**. In this context, within the set of interest definitions found in modern society theory, **Habermas’s** definition has the most general characteristic. Namely, according to this author, **interests are basic interpretations which are connected with defined fundamental conditions of human reproduction and self-construction of human action and interaction, where these orientations are not directed only toward satisfying the imperial requirements but generally in solving the systematic problems.**

Interests are mostly connected with politics, while politics is completely dependent on interests.

2. INTEREST CONCEPTS IN THE PERIOD OF CLASSICAL LIBERALISM

The main features of theoretical concepts of interest in the period of classical liberalism are divided into the **four following characteristics**:

First, individualism. The only true interest in society is the interest of the individual. The community interest can be a simple amount of the individual interests of society members (nothing less and nothing more than that);

Second, political liberalism. The state is a “night watch” for the free economic competitiveness of all interests. An individual’s free initiative, led by the competitiveness of egoistic interest, provides social wealth and happiness;

Third, pragmatism. The practical interest of the individual is the only determining criteria for the truth and the standards of social behavior. What is considered to be the individual’s interest alone is in the best interest of the whole society in the end;

Fourth, utilitarianism. Profit and luck are the main criteria of moral and human behavior. The interest is the emanation of the benefit. To effectuate the interest means to achieve pleasure and benefit but, at the same time, to feel happy.

The most significant representatives of these classical liberal theories are **Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill**. Jeremy Bentham presents one of the most influential interest theories in his works “The fragment of Government”, “An introduction to the Principles of Moral and Legislation” and “Defense of Usury”. **Utility**, which base is the material interest of the individual, is the foundation of Bentham’s pragmatic-utilitarian study. In compliance with the requirements of his own era, Bentham puts the individual interest in the centre of the social system of values. The selfish interest of the individual, realized

as material benefit, presents the key point in Bentham's theory that reflects society. Even the altruistic relations with other people are viewed through the prism of egoistic interests. Namely, according to this theoretician, "completely understood interest rather than its immediate and personal benefit requires the individual to act on behalf of other people's interests". **According to Bentham, there is a harmony among the individual interests and other people's interests on the one hand, and the community as whole, on the other.** Harmony, according to this theoretician, is established completely spontaneously and naturally through the effect of laws and the market's logic, through the exchange of benefit with benefit rather than the exchange of interest with interest. Bentham says that the biggest human wish to gain and adopt material goods is the only need in compliance with its true nature. Bentham notes that "The community interest" is one of the most general expressions that can be found in moral phraseology. **"That is why it is not strange that it is often meaningless. And when it has the meaning, it is the following: the community is a fictitious body composed of individuals who as members present its integral part. So what is the community interest? It is an overall number of individual interests of the community members". Or: "Whether each individual is an equal part of society as any other human? This general interest which is personified is only abstraction. It is the overall outcome of individual interests... Individual interests are the only real interests"**.

The next significant step in developing the theory of interest in classical citizen liberalism is the contribution of **John Stuart Mill**. In his works "On liberty" and "Utilitarianism", Mill develops an **utilitarian perception of human behavior** as the highest moral criteria for benefit and human happiness. **"The utility is the last pillar of all ethical questions, but it has to be the utility in the widest sense of the word, based on the permanent human interests as**

the most advanced being", concludes the theoretician. Mill also formulated the principle that the free development of individuality is one of the main criteria for social prosperity. Mill's individualism is clearly defined in his determining of the term freedom. According to him, **"the only freedom that deserves that name is the freedom to look for our own good in our own way, whilst doing so we neither take that right from others nor do we prevent them in their efforts to reach it"**. In his opinion, a human being can only be held responsible by society for its acts that directly refer to the others. All things that refer only to him/her are rightfully treated as the absolute independence of the individuals. In this context, **"the individual is the unlimited master of himself, over his body and over his soul"**, concludes the theoretician.

3. MODERN INTEREST CONCEPTS

There are various theoretical approaches to explain interest in modern society theory. The category interest has the central part in many contemporary political theories. But there are many theoretical models and concepts crucial for interest as a problem, although the category interest within is partly used or is implicitly implied.

There are a large number of classifications of the contemporary theories of interest. However, we mostly meet the so-called **dichotomy division**:

- » **First**, objective and
- » **Second**, subjective concepts of interest.

This division is made according to the objective-subjective concept of interest, regarding whether we emphasize the objective-material or the subjective-psychological dimension. Objective concepts define interest as something that depends, regardless the subject and its facts. Despite this, subjective concepts view interest through determined states of mind,

emotions, wishes and needs that are inextricably bound to the psychological motivation of the individual. In this context, we can also divide interest into:

- » **First**, interests-goals (subjective dimension)
- » **Second**, interests-means (objective dimension)
- » Analogical to this division is also the **Fridriht** division into:
 - » **First**, "ideal" goals, rather interests, and
 - » **Second**, "material" goals, rather interests

Apart from the previously mentioned, the dichotomy division by modern theoreticians of interest is frequently used by:

- » **First**, universalists. **The universalists pre-dimension the general interest**, defining it as a general will, common good or public interest. Under these concepts, universalists imply widely accepted consensus or legitimacy among the members of society, organized under a political authority (mostly the state) that regulates or harmonizes the separate conflict interests.
- » **Second**, particulars. Opposed to the universalists, the **particulars** are not only determined by one comprehended common interest alone. What is considered as public interest by the universalists, is a result of a joint struggle of separate interests for the particulars, rather it is a result of interactions of "pressure groups".

Besides the previous divisions, we are familiar with the **trichotomic division** of the theory of interests into **rationalistic, idealistic and realistic**.

Here is how Glendon Schubert explains this classification:

- » **First**, rationalistic theories of interest are based on the following equation: public interests = common values. In other words, general interest is determined with the support of common values that are shared by all citizens.

- » **Second**, idealistic theories of interest reject the selfish and they consider political parties as amoral institutions. The most popular representatives of this type of theories are the American federalists who support a political system in which a strong president, independent congress, good administration and wise court will articulate all the interests.
- » **Third**, realistic theories of interest reject the idea for unified public interest, considering that politics is a process conditioned by the struggle between the various group interests which are only considered to be real in social life. The theory of interest groups and the pluralistic theory of power in local communities both express the realistic approach of interests in the best possible way.

4. OTHER INTEREST THEORIES

The publishing of Arthur Bentley's book "The Process of Government" in 1908 marks the birth of the modern theory of interest groups. It is a theory that **views politics as a struggle among the groups in accomplishing their interests**. Namely, Bentley initiates the view that the analysis of the political process, in which the interest of the group is viewed as a key code to understand the problems that are being researched, is a lot more complex than the theory that locates the crucial aspect of political life in the interest of the individual. According to him, the group and the interest are two synonymous concepts, two sides of one process.

"There is not a group without its own interest. The interest is the group equivalent. The group and the interest cannot be separated. There is only one thing rather than a certain number of people that are linked with certain activities. Sometimes we can point out the interest, and sometimes the group aspect, but if we

separate them too much we will get stuck on a desert island”. Bentley considers organized groups as a base of the political process. So, he concludes that **“when groups function in the right direction, everything functions”**.

The second important characteristic of Bentley’s conception is the connection **of the interest with the activity, with the process, rather than with behavior**. In order to avoid or at least to moderate the subjectivity in the interests approach (a common characteristic of classical liberalism and modern pluralism), Bentley states that interest overlaps with group activities. As the group exists only through group activity, the interest represents nothing else than insisting on the group to act or perform in a certain way. All this leads to the conclusion that the only direction to establish and research the interest is to observe the processes of group activities. In that way, Bentley only strengthens the pragmatic (group practice as the only criteria) and behaviorist framework (overview of group behavior) of its concept, during which it does not eliminate subjectivism that has been approached with remoteness.

Despite the fact that interests are a part of the group and not a part of the individuals (which leads to a certain level of objectivity to be necessarily implied), what remains is the characteristic that is also implied in classical liberalism. It regards **“coincidental interests”** rather than interests which structure is not dependent on the type of social organization.

Bentley’s efforts to find a **middle solution between the subjective and objective approach remained without an epilogue** due to - as was correctly notified by **Balbus** - the key question that refers to society’s conditions that form the whole group and is irrevocably excluded from his concept. **“Group acts are considered as an initial point of analysis, rather than determined, so there is no place to try putting the creation of the group into a mutual stipulation with the social or economic factors that represent its basis”** says Balbus.

Although Bentley states that the group is significant only in its relation with the other groups; then he signals that the concept of interest cannot be reduced only to economic interest, and in that context, he states **“that for the political interests as such”** there is nothing to be said further. But there is a lot to be said about the interests that exists in many forms and function in the political process.

Bentley considers the interest as a whole. The community is also fiction, as well as for Bentham, with the distinction that according to Bentley, the basis of this classification does not contain the individual interests but common interests. He strictly emphasizes that it is **“incorrect to speak about the interest as a whole (general interest)...because any change that happens inside would be the consequence from the change of the conditions, or in other words, because of the change in group interest”**. Or more precisely: **“when we are concerned with the political issues in any society that we analyze, we won’t find a group interest of the society as a whole. We will always discover that the political processes and activities of any group do not have any political appearances outside of group appearances. Namely, they have been managed against other people’s activities which appear within the groups, political or otherwise”**.

Their comprehension of society and the relation through general and individual interests, also the role of the group in that particular relation, Bentley clearly and in detail presented it in his famous definition: **“The society itself is nothing else than complex unity (complex) of the group that composes it”**. This view was presented by Bentley’s successor in a more suitable form. David Truman considered that **the idea of general or public interest is a kind of political myth and has no legitimacy of cognitive category**. According to Truman, Bentley’s theory should not be neglected and forgotten but should be reformulated. He defines the interest in context

with common group opinions by providing intermediate domination of subjective dimension in understanding the interests. In this context, Truman explains that **“an interest group is any group based on one or more group opinions, presents certain requests to other social groups and has an aim to establish, sustain or enlarge those forms of behavior which are allowed based on those views”**.

Recapitulating the results from the most significant views overview of the theories of interest groups and theories of power in local communities (that are unified under one name group pluralistic theories of interest), we can conclude the following:

- » **First**, group pluralistic theories of interest are a specific type of conflict theories of interest (because they view it as a struggle of the interest groups, the participation in solving the key disputes). It is true that this conflict of interests is clearly defined with the general ideological consensus. According to this, the multitude of interests and the conflict of interest groups does not cross the set system of borders but is a function of a so-called “middle choice”. In this context, especially in Bentley’s first phase of development of these theories, they view the state in compliance with the liberal tradition. Namely, that the state machinery is the neutral judge in group struggle of interests without their own functions.
- » **Second**, due to the group of pluralistic theories of interest, significant progress has been made in researching the appearances of political life. This model showed significant usefulness in political process analysis in northern American-type democracies and political systems. With the political approach from the aspect of struggle of different groups in reaching their own interests and redistributing political power, it is possible to view the colorful diversity of the political activities, appearances and processes in this type of political sys-

tem. In this context, based on the category "interests" and "attitudes", we come to the conclusion that "actually, the interests create the mutual attitudes".

- » **Third**, this definition of interests leads to a conclusion that people do not have them (the interests) if they are not aware of them, if they do not have mutual attitudes for them. In other words, **if the group cannot view their own interest it means that the group does not have the interest** – that leads to the really implicit possibility of misunderstanding their own interest but explicitly states that the objective dimension of the interest is not legitimate in the political life, because it simply does not exist.

This comprehension of the interest influences Truman to make a significant difference between - as he calls them - potential and organized interest groups, so-called potential and organized interests. But in his theoretical model, the central position is taken by the organized interests groups, while the potential interests groups are degraded to a level "**residual category**". Truman also does not analyze the key moment of transformation of the potential into organized interest groups. Inside the Truman concept of interest groups it is necessary to separate "**political interest groups**" that are specific because they achieve their requirements by putting pressure on the executive government. That is the reason why these groups are often called "**pressure groups**" in literature.

4.1. Theory of power in local communities

The second phase in the development of pluralistic theories of interest is the theory of power in local communities (**pluralist theory of community power**). This theory implies a connection between the interest and the power, focusing their research and analysis on the problem of power distribution in the processes of making political decisions in

local communities. This new “**pluralistic alternative**” was created at the beginning of the 1960’s and its most prominent representatives are **Robert Dale, Edward Benfield and Nelson Polsby.**

Pluralist theories of interest were created in continuance with the interest group theory on the one hand, and in discrepancy with the elitist models and approaches in researching the political processes, on the other. Modern pluralistic theories are set off with the assumption (which the title implies) that the political power in one community is divided into a multitude (plurality) of various subjects (interest groups, so-called pressure groups). This rejects the assumption of theoreticians that work on elites (such as, for example, Mills) that there is an indispensable domination of a certain group, a so-called elite, in every local community.

Unlike the elitists, pluralists categorically reject the postulate of stability of the power structure in one community. **“The pluralists point out that the power can be connected with different issues; it can be temporary or permanent. The power initiates coalitions among the concerned groups and citizens that can be momentary or semi permanent...”**. In other words, the implicit assumption of researchers – pluralists - is that no one has domination over one community in advance, that is to say, the structure of power is variable and unstable. The pluralistic theories point out the capacity of the group to protect the individual from the government and to contribute to the democratic openness of the system. In this context, the basic thesis is that **the political power is divided and that decisions are carried out with the complex process of negotiation that considers the interests and thoughts of a vast number of groups.** Therefore, the pluralists do not direct their attention to the sources of power but to its usage. Determination toward power is connected to the process of decision-making

(the power is defined as a possibility to participate in the process of decision-making), so we draw the conclusion that the structure and distribution of power can be analyzed only after **“the chain of concrete decisions is carefully examined”**.

It is obvious that modern pluralist theories avoid addressing crucial questions about the nature of social and political power. Despite these, there are other critical remarks to pluralist theories that most directly refer to the internal logics in their research model. This raises the question: **what happens with the groups and the individuals when they are not included in some decision-making process?** Namely, the conclusion presented by the pluralists can be extracted from the fact that someone does not participate in political disputes or decisions: that they don't have their interest regarding that dispute or decision.

The very common situation of “unsettling” is excluded from the pluralist model of research under the extremely difficult assumption that only the interest and individual and group wishes can determine whether they will participate in the process of significant decision-making or not. The advanced crucial remark that can be addressed to the pluralist model is that it does not present any clear criteria of how to distinguish the “important” from the “unimportant” political disputes and decisions, the so-called key and marginal political questions.

If we take Polsby's answer that “the research questions that are generally accepted to be important will be previously selected” without giving the researcher the chance to select which questions are important, than it is necessary to stress two things: to make a previous assumption that only the crucial questions appear on the political stage in each community. Or, without any discussion, to adopt what has been disputed before in order to avoid the many traps set by the normative.

It can be said that this theory completely describes the initiation of things and that it has a significant descriptive value. Also, the value of this approach is undisputed when social and political life at the micro level is being researched (interest groups and local communities). But the remark remains that the wider social condition of the interest grouping or the relations of power in local communities are often neglected or excluded from the field of theoretical and research interests.

CHAPTER 2



INTEREST GROUP DEFINITION



1. INTEREST GROUP DEFINITION

The interest group (or the pressure group) is an **organized form of uniting the citizens**. Its main purpose is to influence politics or government actions toward achieving and satisfying their interests.

Interest groups are defined as organizations separated from the government but, even so, they often have a very close cooperation with the government, whose interest is to influence the creation of public policies. This leads to defining interest groups as groups that provide institutional interaction with the government, in other words, the state and the major social spheres. The spectre of activities or policies that are achieved by interest groups is the main part of the long list of interests that are connected with them, and they include: environmental protection; the right to healthy food consumption; the protection of natural resources; defending trade policies, etc.

In a far more interesting, wider and more divergent way, interest groups initiate questions and articulate needs in the way they are presented and viewed within the political parties. **The organized interaction between the government and the vast number of interests in society is directed through interest groups;** therefore, their research has a huge meaning in understanding the relationship between the state and society.

The main problem connected with the analysis of interest groups is the question of **defining** them.

Some organizations are clearly set into the definition network of interest groups. Such organizations recruit their members with the explicit belief that they will serve concrete goals and any public interest assignments.

Although, the biggest number of organizations which are interest groups do not bring together citizens with the promise that

they will provide representation or the realization of their political views or interests. Unions, for example, are recruiting members with promises like more security, improved working conditions and increased salaries. Also, unions are included in promoting policies that can - but are not - supported by their members.

Could we conclude that every organization that influences the creation of public policy to a certain level can be considered an interest group? Obviously, the answer is no. If it is not so, then how much political activity is necessary to be fulfilled by one organization which exists for some other objectives and tasks, and when could it be considered an interest group? Many theoreticians share this mutual dilemma. Must all interest groups be organizations at the same time? Authors focusing their attention on social movements, for example, consider that also those who support the movements, as well as that part of the population that has similar characteristics with the movements, should be defined as members of interest groups. In the US, for example, it is completely natural to talk about women's organizations and about those organizations that have members with different ethnic backgrounds as well as interest groups, although the differences in their relationship and in the conditions between these two types of organizations are enormous.

Some authors from the 1950's writing about the **so-called politics of the interest groups** even broadened the concept interest group in order to reach some pseudo-groups, that is to say, groups that have not been formed yet or will be formed soon. For this purpose, **interest groups are simply defined as sections (areas) in society or in groups of people that are being brought together because of their mutual interest.** On the other hand, many authors define interest groups very narrowly because they focus only on **organizational membership.** This narrow definition of interest groups has a single purpose, namely, to exclude any huge business interests from the group's range.

Broader definitions of interest groups are also facing certain problems. Considering the fact that the bigger part of the population (for example, youths, elderly people, women, etc.) creates groups in order to achieve certain common interests which unite them and that such interests have a bigger meaning regarding other factors (such as wealth, race, etc.) that disintegrate the groups. This argument, however, has been trusted more by observers rather than it is considered to be reality.

Mostly, **interest groups influence the parties and vice versa**. Although they are out of the election process they can put strong pressure on the government, regardless which is the ruling party. Administrative agencies, committees and boards, as well as courts, are the strongest affordable forms to promote and realize the interests of the citizens. **Contrary to the parties, interest groups do not offer their own candidates for political functions**. The compromise between the different interests cannot be located without the presence of organized interest groups. Therefore, associations are considered to be representative centres of citizen's interests and can speak in their name regarding certain objectives.

Associations and organizations can be viewed as an extended political hand of the individuals through which they stress and complete their requirements. Meaning that with their help, they defend themselves from the enormous power of the state or other organized groups. Something similar refers to citizen initiatives which are commonly limited to a local level and are directed towards concrete objectives. They organize interested individuals and represent their interests in front of the political instances. Associations usually direct their requirements to the government and parliament. On the other hand, political institutions do not always feel their performance as a negative pressure but very often as direct support.

Under modern conditions today, members of associations or interest groups often represent a place where the real experts in different areas get together. Associations are very often put in a function for the government and parliament of a country. The members of the interest groups usually try to achieve their interests exactly through their influence in the institution of the system. Consequently, the individuals performing the above mentioned activities of representing and promoting the interests of one group in the institutions of the system are called lobbyists. In this connotation, the most general comprehension of the word lobbyist is used for someone who through **“the entrance hall of the parliament the lobby” tries to influence MPs through direct communication. The forms of influence today are enlarged. Members of the interest groups are often closely connected to parliamentary groups and fractions.**

2. TYPES OF INTEREST GROUPS

A widely accepted and used model for classifying interests groups is the one developed by professor Gabriel Almond, which differentiates **four basic types of interest groups**:

- » **First**, associative interest groups founded by people that have common, limited objectives. The basic characteristic of these groups as associations are their voluntary activities and common interests, wishes and attitudes. These groups have their own name, organization, professional staff, etc. The union is considered as a typical example for an associative interest group;
- » **Second**, within associative interest groups, are groups that have no name and formal structure but are reflecting bigger social, ethical, cultural or religious interests that in certain moments can

be connected to the political forces and perform a certain influence on political institutions;

- » **Third**, institutional interest groups are groups that exist within government structures (government agencies, bureau for development, committees, etc.). They are actually a part of the governmental machinery and are trying to influence the government through their positions;
- » **Fourth**, anemic interest groups that are spontaneously and casually formed as a result of bringing together citizens interested in opposing the acts of a certain policy. Student demonstrations against the war in Vietnam in the late 1960s and the beginning of the 1970s are the best historical example for this kind of interest groups.

According to Almond, certain **subtypes of interest groups** function individually within the borders of each of these groups.

For example, associative interest groups can be mutually divided into four subtypes:

- » their nature;
- » the character of the interest;
- » the type of organizational features and characteristics; and
- » the type of applied tactics and functioning strategy.

There are also **so-called custom groups** whose main characteristic is that they are ingrained in the structure of society. You belong to them since the moment of birth and without additional inclusion. Typical forms of custom groups are: the family, castes, ethnic groups, tribal communities, etc. Apart from other interest groups in which citizens decide alone whether they want to be members or not, the custom groups are based on the principles of common origin and traditional relations and respect.

According to American theory, interest groups can be divided into **two larger types**:

- » **First**, private interest groups. **Private interest groups** function out of the government and they represent almost all segments of society, economics, religious, cultural, professional, etc. Private interest groups put pressure on all spheres of the national government – legislation, the president, administrative structures and on courts. Judiciary and bureaucratic structures are especially approachable for direct influence by interest groups. For example, interest groups can initiate lawsuits for certain cases directly in court or can make a complaint directly to the bureaucratic structures.
- » **Second**, government interest groups. **Government interest groups** are formed within the borders of the political power. Agencies, ministries, parliamentary committees or government executive boards sometimes act as **public interest groups**. Finally, the constitutional system in distributing the government and the principle of “gravity and counter-gravity” is based on concrete political interests. Various interests of the three pillars of the government are guaranteed through their independence.

In the context of the previously mentioned, in theory there is a division of the interests groups into:

- » **First**, internal groups.
- » **Second**, external groups

The difference between **internal and external groups** is that one of them regularly participates in creating the policy, influencing the ministers and public administration, while the other relies on different methods to provide support for their interests such as campaigns by writing letters and organizing demonstrations. The exact combination of methods

used by the interest groups to provide influence varies from one political system to another. The institutions which the interest groups focus their attention on are one of the indicators for detecting the power of a certain political system. For example, in the US, interest groups especially persist in influencing the Congress, sometimes by creating **so-called iron triangles composed of interest groups, congress sub-committees, and bureaucratic agencies**. It is more likely that interest groups in the US, more than in any other political system, will turn toward the courts in order to achieve their political goals, which are reflecting the meaning of the Supreme Court in the American political system and the general tendency to solve disputes with the help of legal assistance.

In the **United Kingdom**, on the other hand, where power is more concentrated in the executive government, interest groups direct their attention to ministers and civil officers. In this direction, the influence of the media, especially regarding the political events, is increasing as well because that leads the interest of the interest groups towards the media to increase. The development of political structures on the international level, especially in the European Union, has initiated the development of more efficient international federations of national interest groups. The development of more liberal political systems in Eastern and Central Europe, but also the Russian Federation, the question of forming interest groups was initiated and in this region, above all, in the field of the economy.

Apart from the previously mentioned, other and more concrete efforts to categorize interest groups are exposed in theory. In this context, if we begin with the methods of activities of interest groups, we distinguish:

- » **First**, groups with special interests. **Groups with special interests (also known) as protective or functional** are formed with an objective to generally protect the material interests of their members.

These groups represent separately defined interests and are promoting those interests among accurately defined objective groups. Unions, trading companies or professional associations are a true example for this type of groups. Their peculiarity is based on the fact that they are representing separate parts of society: employees, employers, consumers, ethnic communities and so on.

- » **Second**, promotional groups. **Promotional interest groups** (also known as groups with an objective or with an attitude) were created with the interest of representing some jointly accepted values, ideals and principles. For example, typical promotional groups are those for animal protection in which there is an open membership for all citizens – animal lovers.
- » Further, abortion prevention groups, groups protecting traditional and religious values, etc. The objective of these promotional groups is to help other groups and not only their own members.
- » **Third**, insider groups. **Insider groups** have a privileged, and mostly institutionalized approach towards the government and towards state politics. Their members have regular consultations and are very often participating in activities of the governmental bodies. Governmental bodies request knowledge and data from these groups which means that there is a mutual relationship of support between them. However, the status of an insider group is not always a beneficial one for its members. The insiders, in order to achieve a better position in the system, use means that are not in the interest of the government policy. That means that insider groups can be transformed into the extended hand of the government which is not always considered good for the members of the group.
- » **Fourth**, outsider groups. **Outsider groups** do not have direct contact with the government and with

power itself. The status of outsiders in the system is often manifested with signs of weakness in the sense of the organizational power and financial resources they possess. Their influence is mostly through the media because they are being ignored by the public authorities.

In American theory and practice, interest groups are also called **pressure groups or lobby groups**. Regardless the fact that there are different types of pressure that have a broad specter of divergent interests, **all of them have more common organizational characteristics. The vast number of them includes:**

- » **Elite members**, who govern organizations and formulate policies and tactics they are using;
- » **Lobbyists**, who are working for these elites and deliver elite members' requests to other citizens or the government; and
- » **Members**, who represent the base and the reason for organizing and the existence of interest groups in the first place.

As there is an evident difference in the relationship between party leaders and regular party members, similar differences exist among the leadership and the members of pressure groups. Sometimes the leadership of the group is unable to get the support for those policies which are completely clear to be group interests.

An individual who is a member of the interest group can have an interest in participating in several other groups. Such as becoming a union member or the member of another professional organization while simultaneously participating in sports, cultural and other groups.

The objectives of different interest groups do not always coincide. Therefore, the individual should decide which interests will be given advantage to and which will be specified,

in case there is a conflict of interest between two different interest groups. For example, a doctor can simultaneously be a member of his vocation health organization and also be a member of a veterinarian administration. But, in case of a dispute between these two associations, which could be completely opposite regarding their public policy, it is the doctor's decision which organization and which interests to join.

Although lobbyists are people from different professions, the group of the most efficient lobbyists are former distinguished state officials. In that context, the techniques that these lobbyist are using are different and they depend on their individual possibilities. Regardless of who they are and how they act, **lobbyists have two main aims:**

- » **First**, to influence the legislation (legislative government); as well as
- » **Second**, to provide access to administrative agencies and services with the interest to receive as much information as possible on how government policies influence their supporters.

Probably the most significant role of a lobbyist today is to get information on questions referring to the interests of the group. In return, lobbyists provide information to government officials.

Today, the major number of pressure groups aims towards the development of an attractive and interesting public image (public occurrence) of the institutions that represent the groups, hoping that this might have an influence on the decision-making policy. Public relations techniques and public communication are the primary base, or the pillar, of an interest group. For example, the columns written by some lobbyists in newspapers, where they appeal to lowering environmental pollution, is one of the ways of making an influence. Public relations techniques and communication are very often used by pressure groups in order to provide public support for

their opinions and their concepts on questions which are in their interest.

Pressure groups can very often be included in the election process. There is a **third method of a group's influence of the pressure group over the public or the individual to accept government politics**. Lobbying is the function of a group with a private interest, although the administrative agencies and services themselves are performing similar functions within the government. Administrative agencies, for example, are a typical example of interest groups that have defined public objectives they want to achieve. Considering that government agencies are included in so-called lobby activities can arouse astonishment in many people but those agencies actually are usually the biggest spokespersons in finalizing certain special policies.

As experts in certain areas, the agencies themselves are summoned in front of congress committees and are consulted in various ways. It is interesting that their thoughts in the US are more accepted by congress members than those given by lobbyists of private interest groups. In this direction, due to their more comfortable approach towards the congress, administrative agencies also have internal influence in the process of preparing legal texts because it is required of them to express their attitude regarding legal questions which are the object of regulation.

The fact that conflicts appear a lot more between pressure groups referring to various questions and objectives indicates that none of the interest groups can completely overtake the primate in creating policies. However, it is a fact that interest groups are consolidating more and more into unions, their mutual work leading to increased power and strength. In each government area-defense, transport, agriculture, security, labor, health system, etc. there are extremely powerful coalitions of interest groups.

On the other hand, **the character of the country** plays a major role in creating interest groups behavior. The state that is distinguished as concentrated, with unitary system, mostly encourages interest groups to put their grounds on so-called technocratic forms of lobbying. The centralized, powerful state encourages interest groups to accept the technocratic model of lobbying and to persuade those that make decisions with the assistance of technocratic arguments rather than by mobilizing political forces.

In countries that have manifestly fragmented political systems, such as the US, interest groups risk losing less if they are politically identified closer to any other party.

3. POLITICAL PARTIES AND INTEREST GROUPS

Interest groups and political parties are being referred to as opponents. The two forms of connection provide political participation of citizens and effective influence methods on the public politics. But, the parties and the interest groups view themselves not only as competitive in certain political sources, but also as antipathetic, hostile towards their own power. In theory, there is an opinion that points out that when the parties are strong, the interest groups weaken and vice versa, when the interest groups are strong, the parties weaken their power.

This assumption is especially accepted among American political theoreticians. Although the same is not based on the explanation of the integrative character of the political parties, which, as they say, join the vast number of different groups with an aim on the elections, apart the disintegrative role of the interest groups that are concentrated always toward precisely determined interests in certain areas within society. If the parties succeed to lower their integrative role, then they strengthen their own role within the system, becoming powerful, during which process, on the opposite, it appears on the

stage disintegrative power of the interest groups. Not even one party is able to get the majority of votes if it is identified only with one interest, or as Schattschneider wrote: **“The idea that the parties keep the separate interest groups to act together in one endless process of negotiation and agreeing is unreal... It underestimates the fact that we (it refers to the US) get two party systems. The parties compete among themselves; they do not compete in the pressure groups”.**

Interest groups and parties can play very similar or very different roles in the system, and that can influence their relationship and cooperation. There is no unique pattern of cooperation between the interest groups and the parties. The initial cooperation that has to be resolved in their mutual relationship is to determine whether there is or there isn't a difference between these two forms of merger. Although, to get a good answer to this question it is necessary to analyze the moments that consolidate their activities.

One form of cooperation between interest groups and parties is their close connection. The most obvious example of such a connected relation can be seen in the cooperation between the social democratic or labor parties, as well as party organizations and unions as interest groups. In this context, although the congress of the British Union, for example, is not a part of the Great Britain Labor party, although it accepts the Labor policy in great deal. The union is especially significant on the local level for the Great Britain Labor Party. Also the union “sponsors” the Labor Party candidates for MPs.

The obvious contrast of connection of the parties with the interest groups is the model of **so-called apolitical interest groups**. In this case, the interest groups reject any kind of connection with the parties. Party support is even considered to be absolutely unacceptable because it is incompatible with the professional status of the group and it represents a

danger for the authority and credibility of its members. Between these two extreme comprehensions there is **one middle type of connection, according to which the interest groups can be political, but not party groups.**

Although, interest groups very often do not support only one, but two and even more party politics. For example, the biggest part of the interest groups in the US today are involved in supporting both democratic and republican candidates for the election in Congress through various forms on the assistance given by their political action committees.

It is considered that with the character of the relationship between parties and interest groups the weakness has its influence, or in other words, the strong role of the parties within the system. Namely in countries with strong political parties, party discipline easily rejects the interest group pressure, especially in the part of the legislation. On the other hand, the absence of strong, competitive parties creates politics in which fractions, individuals and individual interests dominate. Consideration that the existence of strong parties and strong interest groups is incompatible, is deeply incorporated in the American political science, even though the theoreticians of the European Continent disagree with it.

Parties and interest groups are the two main types of organizations that undertake the possibilities and the functions of transfer of the citizen's interest within the institutional structures responsible for making decisions and creating the political will.

Interest groups organize and articulate social interest of certain citizens, social groups and other social units (enterprises, associations, etc.) and **by the rule can be distinguished from political parties in three basic segments:**

- » **First**, interest groups do not participate in the race to win parliamentary or other types of mandates. In-

terest groups occasionally can participate in the elections as a tactics to have influence over the political parties, but mostly their methods are directed toward leading campaigns and toward lobbying to the current government politics. Therefore, for example, the agrarian parties enter the election race with the objective to form a government or to enter in coalition with the other parties, while the agrarian associations indirectly support the agrarian parties and use other means of influence – demonstrations, private consultations with ministers, and function to finalize their objectives although individually they are not interested to win the power.

» **Second**, the context of existing, the objective of creating and the program of performance of the interest group are different and specified according to the social requirements (due to the functional spheres and social groups), while the political parties require a more general creative function and representation, as well as the integration of various social groups. In this context, the associations direct their objectives toward four functional gravity centers:

- **Self-assistance and self-regulation of their own membership,**
- **Horizontal conflict relations with counter-associations.**
- **Political influence toward the institutions, and**
- **Their own production of services on behalf of certain clients** (that can overlap their members).

These gravity centers can be connected with certain organizational logics of finalization (membership logics, conflict logics, and negotiations, influence logics, manufacturing logics).

- » **Third**, interest groups are strongly connected with specific social context of the citizens, meaning that from an organizational aspect are narrowly connected with social structure and social activities, as well as with permanent relations of conflict and cooperation with other associations.
- » **Fourth**, interest groups are not homogeneous organizations. They have a wide spectrum of interests and objectives, they have various degrees of generality and specificity that, depending on the objective and the interests they represent, they have a different organizational structure, a different level of power, influential potential, action strategies, etc.

4. INTEREST REPRESENTATION

The frames of functioning and the political influence of associations within the system are determined by state institutions: the parliament, the government, the administration, and the courts. In this sphere of functioning, at the same time as central actors, political parties are integrated, where in the struggle for power and as "owners" of public facilities have significantly stronger political influence in the process of enacting the political decisions. But lately, interest groups play a more important role in the processes of decision-making in all democratic political systems, where the private organizations represent "the civil society" opposite state interests. The question how private and public interests are presented in the decision-making process, the answer is that kind of representation is different and varies in reliance on how the system is placed. There are three major models of so-called interest intermediation (interest mediation):

- » **First**, model of pluralism (pluralist model),
- » **Second**, corporative model and
- » **Third**, co-social model.

Table no.15: Types of interest mediation

	PLURALISM	CORPORATISM	CO - SOCIALISATIONALISM
Society divisions	cross -cutting	class	cultural
Interests	Private vs. public	Capital vs. Labor	French vs. German vs. British, etc.
Character	competitive	consensual	consensual
Political network	open	closed	closed
State role	neutral	proactive	neutral

The simplest explanation of the role of the interest groups and the political parties in the system is offered by the **pluralist model**, according to which the huge number (to some extent competitive) organized interests try to make an influence to concrete parties for the benefit of the certain requirements.

Pluralism is the classic model of interest group politics in democratic systems. The central idea of this model is that **the organization of competitive social interests creates “gravity and counter-gravity” against strong state government or special interest groups.** The assumption on which this model is based is that any group in the system has the possibility through various forms of debates, open tribunes, etc., to oppose the other interest groups’ attitude. In terms of exchange and competitiveness of various opinions and attitudes regarding the same question, none of the interests can be isolated, unique, or monopolized.

Or, in other words, there is always “a weight that over weights on one or on the other side”, but always with a certain dose which is not the maximum. **The central mark** of the pluralistic model of interest mediation is that the different interests **have equal approaches in the political process.** For example, environmental protection groups, according to

this model, have equal influence on governmental officials as well as the industrial lobby. If this is the case, then the governmental officials should serve as “judges” in the dispute between the interest groups and industrial lobbyists directing the dispute in the interest of the public. The problem with this model is the lack of the ideal pluralism.

- » **First**, in many states one type of community division always has the objective to impose itself over all the others, so the side, that by definition is financial, economical, and political more powerful will succeed to impose itself in the political process.
- » **Second**, even in those systems where there is cross-cutting of the state divisions, the opposition groups very rarely have the opportunity for an equal approach to power. This is a result of so-called “collective action logics” where there is interest for inclusion in the group that offers profit only for its members (“private interests”), and there isn’t any interest for inclusion with the groups that require profit for all in society (“public interests”).

Apart from pluralism, corporatism is a model of interest mediation which is completely opposite from the pluralist model. While the pluralists talk about a society that is divided into many social divisions, the representatives of the corporative model suppose that **the class is the dominant factor of the social gap, that society is divided on two contradictory types of interests: capitalists – capital and workers – labor. Corporativism** assumes that if pluralism is set as dominant, business interests undoubtedly will be set as priorities. The solution for the state is to recognize, to approve and support representative monopolies on both sides of the divided classes - “Social partners”. Instead of open policy network, the leaders of the business community and the union movement should participate in closed “three party” meetings with government officials.

Although, the problem is in the fact that post-industrial society cannot be further divided into capital and labor.

- » **First**, the class is more and more determined as a huge determinant of individual political, economical and social interests and values. Even when excluded from the cooperative agreements, the individuals with "post-material values" orientations are joining modern "social movements", such as human rights movements, ecological movements, anti-nuclear and peace protests, women's movements, gay-rights movements, lobbyists of consumers, pensioner unions, etc. As a result of this, the social consensus in post-industrial society cannot be guaranteed simply by providing the industry and the workers to participate in the process of creating politics.
- » **Second**, whether the consent by both sides in the industry is necessary for all bigger politics in the country or not, corporativism can protect the involvement in politics. As in the pluralist model, the capital and the workers interests firstly want to protect their interest, and then, in the long-term also the interests of the others in society. The result is the creation of indestructible political process and political stagnation.

The co-social model is a similar model to corporativism, by which one **concrete type of social group has certain privileges despite the others and equal status in the political process as means of protection from inevitable domination of the concrete group.**

As corporativism privileges the class divisions (business - workers), the co-social model is a system of interest mediation in deeply divided societies ("segmented") round some cultural questions, such as language, ethnicity, religion or nationality. Also, instead of the state official negotiating with private interests, the political process is governed in compliance with the institutional rules that guarantee the political consensus.

The majority of competencies in politics are decentralized in each segment; only the elites of the segments participate in the central process of enacting decisions; each group is proportionally presented in state bureaucracy and in the process of enacting decisions and has proportional participation and access to public finances (proportionality); each group has a right to veto on any decision which threatens the vital interests or the identity of their own segment. For example, we are dealing with a dominant model of interest mediation that is applied in Holland, Belgium and Switzerland.

Same as corporativism, the co-social model produces interterm. Whether the consent (consensus) among all groups presents the pre-condition to step forward in politics, the results will be inevitably with the "lowest general denominator". Or in other words, the existence of multiple "veto-players" leads to political immobility and suboptimal solutions. To all of this we can add the fact that the co-social model is inherently undemocratic. Like corporativism, it is based on closed "elite cartels"; it excludes better members from the main social groups and consciously creates force that underestimates the existence of social interests and loyalty that crosses over the privilege gap. If some cross-cutting interests appear, such as class and post material values, the legitimacy of co-social agreements is always decreased or devalued. This leads to two questions:

- » **First**, which model of interest mediation dominates in Europe?
- » **Second**, what are the implications of this models' influence over the performance and over the EU's legitimacy?

5. INTEREST GROUPS IN THE EUROPEAN UNION

The necessity of direct or indirect influence over the process of decision-making in the EU by private individuals and groups has dramatically increased by the end of the 1980s,

it is possible to identify between 400 and 500 interest groups with seats in Brussels, and this number was tripled by the middle of the 1990s. As can be noticed from the vast number of analysis, the biggest number of interest groups on European level are individual enterprises and companies that mostly have their own offices in Brussels.

Second in size are those interest groups that represent the associations such as the European Business Federation, the unions, sector industries or professions, etc. Also, there are more than 300 private "lobbyist" firms, such as political consulting houses, public relations companies, specialized firms on European law and similar groups in Brussels. Business interests are also represented in Brussels, through multiple national, European and sector chambers of commerce. The representation of these diffuse interests in the decision-making process happens much more through the national and European interest associations – such as European Association of National Consumers Groups. Some of these groups employ private consultants. And in the end, a huge number of European regions, a huge number of state organs from the countries that are not members of the EU and international organizations also have their own offices in the capital of the Union.

5.1. Business interests in the EU

Lobbying of private firms in the political process of the EU was pro-actively initiated by the end of the 1970s and the 1980s, at the moment when governments started to set standards in the sphere of trade economy through the inclusion of new forms of economic and social regulations. Today, by organizing the single European market these standards are actually European due to which business interests are naturally determined as key factors in the new political centre. Business interests are not just responses to the appearance

of the regulatory competences in Brussels. Namely, they actually promote their development. Even when the concrete European industries oppose the global free market, a larger number of sectors in the European economy favor the removal of the barriers in free movement of products, services and capital among the European countries. This type of consideration was the core thinking in the non-functional theories of European integration in the 1950s.

Research in 1996 on more than 200 business groups set in Brussels shows that most of these groups employ less than five people, and even so, they show a total profit of more than 100 000 Eur annually. A vast number of these groups are national associations, individual enterprises services, or specific European sector associations such as, for example, the Committee of Agriculture Organization in the European Union, National Farm Associations, etc. Although, despite the previously mentioned, there are other powerful cross-cutting sectors in European associations.

5.2. Trade unions, public interests and social movements in the EU

Interest groups that often dramatically confronted the owners of business companies until the 1990s are not sufficiently well-represented in Brussels. The representatives of various social interests are formally represented in the **Economic and Social Committee** since it was initially founded (the Rome Treaty), as a first attempt to include the element of corporativism in the process of creating EU policies. Nevertheless, the basic status of this committee is strictly consultative.

The broad spectrum of various interests, such as unions, ecological or consumer, naturally become interesting for the processes in Brussels as a result of the newly transferred

EU competencies in the areas of health care, work protection, policies in environmental protection, consumers policy and social policy by enacting the Single European Act and the Maastricht Treaty.

The European Union Confederation (EUC) was formed in 1972. The EUC represents an "umbrella-organization" whose members are federations of unions of 22 member states and countries that are not members of the EU. These federations have over 45 million individual members of the unions, 1/5 are members of British and German union federations. The size and the diversity of the members of the EUC undermine the possibility of creating a real coherent union strategy set on the European level. The EUC is not an organization that is connected in the network of related public interest groups. But members of the EUC have limited funds, sources and possibilities to search for alternative lobby – strategies. Although, the EUC strengthens its role in the negotiation process as a legitimate "social partner" together with the UNICE and the European Centre for Public Enterprises that represents the national industries. In 1984, the president of the European Commission announced that none of the new initiatives in the sphere of social politics could be processed in the EU without previous consent on both sides in the industry, the representatives from both sides in the industry, represented by UNICE and EUC. In the first years of this "social dialogue", very small progress had been made in the relations between these two organizations because of the insistence of UNICE members not to be bound by any of the agreements that they would conclude with the EUC. Although, the constant sympathy of the Commission over the EUC shows security that the social dialogue will not be annulled. In this context, the President of the European Commission launched a strategy of European social politics that resulted in enacting of the European Social Charter, which was signed in 1989 by all the EU member countries, except the UK.

The support in favor of the EUC is additionally strengthened by the Maastricht Treaty which institutionalizes the social dialogue in the sphere of social politics. The Maastricht "Social Treaty" broadens the EU's competencies in the sphere of social politics for all member states, except the UK.

In compliance with the regulations declared in the social treaty, the Committee legally binds itself to consult both sides – business and labor, before it submits any kind of proposals in the area of legislation and social politics. Also, member states can require both sides to reach agreement to implement the directives adopted with the social dialogue. And, most importantly, if both sides reach collective consent for concrete political questions, it can serve as a direct replacement of some European law. In other words, **we talk about accepting the classical model of corporativism in the central sphere of social – economic policy of the EU.**

Similar development is felt by other diffuse interests, such as ecological and those of the consumer interest groups. Only few interest groups had the right to express their own opinion in Brussels in the late 1980s, and that is the reason why at the beginning of the 1990s, public interest played a central role in many debates on the EU political stage.

5.3. Territorial (regional) interests in the EU

Another amount of non-economic interests that play a significant role in the process of creating EU politics are the **so-called sub-national regions**. This applies to a huge number of services of sub-state authorities that have their seats in Brussels. They include the state authority's offices, regional councils and other state organs of decentralized unitary countries of Italy, France and Spain; organs of local self-governments in the united countries of Great Britain, Ireland, Denmark, Holland, Sweden, Greece, Portugal and Finland, as well as a great number of other intermediary organizations

of local governments, municipalities, regions, cities, and sub-national units.

Some of these sub-national groups have been present in Brussels since the beginning of the 1970s, but a vast number of them started to mobilize by the end of the 1980s after the reform of the EU regional policies. With the reform in the structural funds that happened in 1988, the "inclusion" was consciously allowed by the national authorities of the Commission and of the regions. On the one hand, the Commission consciously pushed regional interests into the initiative, by accepting and the implementation of the regional politics. On the other hand, regional interests explore a vast number of their own possibilities to connect themselves with the national governments, while many of them were governed by the parties from the opposing political camp or were rejected from the budget of their own regional authorities.

"The cooperation" between the Commission and the authorities on the regional level becomes a central leading principle in this political area. The regional bodies are summoned to deliver their proposals directly to the Commission. But, regional bodies are also responsible for the realization of their "special framework programs" under direct control of the Commission services. The formal role of the regions in the process of creating decisions in the EU is further institutionalized through the **establishing of the Regional Committee by the Maastricht Treaty**. This Committee replaces the Consultative Council of the Regional and Local Authorities which was established by the Commission in 1988 as part of the regime of new regional politics. The members of this council are appointed by two European subnational associations: The Parliament of the European Regions and the Council of the European Municipalities and Regions. In the new Committee, these transnational associations are replaced with direct representatives of regional and local authorities of all member states in the EU. Some of them are appointed by the central

governments, such as Great Britain, but in some cases they are independently appointed by subnational bodies, such as French regional assemblies and regional assemblies of German states. The Maastricht Treaty states that the Regional Committee has the right to be consulted not just to adopt and to realize regional policies in EU, but also for all the other areas that have implications on the European "social and economic cohesion".

The existence of EU competencies in the sphere of regional politics and the promoting of regional interests by the Commission are not the only explanations for various levels of regional mobility. Another very significant factor is whether the state – member from the certain region as a member has tradition to respect the private – pluralistic or state financial-corporative model of interest representation. The regions always insist on establishing their own services in Brussels, not just due to the EU's competencies, but more because their own competences apart those of national governments. As a result of these findings, sub-national governments in the wider spectrum of political competence, such as in Belgium and in Germany, have their offices in Brussels. Also, there is a reversed process of influence on their sub-national governments that insists to be formally included in structure of German and Belgian delegation in the European Council when the questions listed in the agenda tease in so-called sub-national competences.

Many consider that the result of this is the existence of a so-called "System of multilevel governing", where politics are created in accordance with the interactivity between authorities on the regional, national and European level. Due to the role of regional governments in functioning of the structural funds, the system of multilevel governing is additionally elaborated in the materials that treat the regional policy. Due to the fact that regional interests are included in other EU policies,

as well as the fact that the European policies of allocation and implementation include a large number of participants on the regional and local level, the concept of multilevel governing is built as a general model on which additionally the process of decision-making in the EU is upgraded. Although, in EU theory, some weaknesses that have been noticed in the structure of interest mediation in the sphere of politics. For example, the regions play a small role compared to the EUC in the sphere of social politics. As an answer to this, the leading structures that accept the model of multilevel governing think that the concept refers to the appearance of multilevel degrees of negotiations out of national government domination, but not to that simple conception that the EU is a three-level system.

5.4. National interests and co-social agreement

Informal and quasi-formal systems of transnational interest introduction are competing within the political process of the EU as a highly institutionalized system of national interest representation.

The EU is a multinational political system and the structure of the political process in it is placed in order to settle down most - if not all - national values, cultures, traditions and ideas that exist on the European continent. We do not refer only to the regular acceptance of EU law, where national governments are the formal participants in the central legislation and in executive organs (The Council and the European Council), but refer to initiating, or creating an agenda and accepting all levels of EU politics.

On the level of determining the agenda, the Commission has a formal monopoly over the legal initiative in most areas of social and economic politics. Even though, in practice, the Commission almost always develops political suggestions and cooperates with national administrations. On the formal level,

this cooperation functions through the **work groups network** composed from national public officials delegated from authorized Commission personnel. On the informal level, the commission is insufficient of personnel which leads it to lean itself on the activities of the national officials and representatives from national assemblies – such as national associations of business and professional groups – in interest to provide knowledge and information about current national politics of the system and their interests. The Commission itself is a multinational bureaucracy, with officials that are connected by specific national interest groups. The result of this type of connection is the permanent process of negotiation between the Commission and the representatives of the state and non-state national interests. On this level, the Commission's objective is to establish those political ideas that will satisfy a large number of national requirements with the hope that the excluded interests will be included in some higher phase, in the formal legislative negotiating process in the Committee of permanent representatives and in the Council.

The political process in the EU has all the classical aspects of the co-social model of interest mediation. EU societies primary are divided by cultural lines, not by socio-economic lines: on different national states in Western Europe.

The elites of these national "segments"- national governments, national public administrations and the representatives from national interest groups are the main participants in the process of creating EU politics. In this context, the national administrations in EU, that incorporate the views and the attitudes of different national interest groups before they get to the negotiating table in the EU, represent the functional equivalent of ethnical, linguistic and religious political parties in the Dutch, the Belgian and the Swiss co-social system. These elites are capable to represent and defend their "national interests" as interests above all other political conflicts

that appear on the European level. The necessity to provide support from so called cross-cutting class interests on national elections always means that national authorities will defend the interests of all their citizens as priority interests above the interests of other member countries which are even ideologically closer. For example, the French socialistic government will defend French business interests against the interests of the workers in some other member country. This results in creating a political process in the EU whose primary objective is to satisfy all national interests, rather than completing all transnational interests.

This co-social model of national-segmental interest mediation is different from the classical inner state model of negotiating in international organizations. In international organizations, national governments negotiate only if the final results contain the so-called "zero-sum" effect (referring to the sharing of the cake) and always will be able to exit the organization if the expenditures from the defeat are enormous.

In the EU, there is a high level of mutual interests between the elites in national groups that consequently accept the political process as gathering positive effects from their own engagement. The exit from the co-sensual pattern of enacting decisions has a high price for all national groups if they cannot follow the same level of social and economic development out of the EU system. The result is a "symbolic" connection between national groups, where they have an interest in promoting the role of the EU and the EU itself, which, on the other hand, has an interest to preserve the survival of autonomy of the national groups.

In the end, the role of national executives in the political process of the EU is similar to a sub-state executive government in "cooperative federal systems"; in these systems, sub-state executives directly participate in the implementation of the legislation in the central government. **Although, some**

differences must be stated between “national” co- sociativism and cooperative federalism. In cooperative federal systems, sub-state executives are represented because they are formal state organs on a lower level; they do not have specific legitimacy for this role of cultural interest representatives.

Contrary to this, in the EU, national governments are not just sub-state executives in the EU system; as representatives of the collective interest of their countries, governments are also interest groups within the European national states. Due to this, national administrations play the key role on every level of the political process in the EU – they are objects for legitimating the EU system.

In this context, co-sociativism has the same logics as corporativism – if all sides of the dominant social division can be incorporated in the collective process of enacting decisions, in which case the result will be acceptable for all.

The system of interest representation on the European level is very complex and contradictory. Business interests, with greater financial and political power and sources of performing than public interest are especially capable to manage this complex system. The practical result of this system performance is probably more different “primitive pluralism” with the fact that there is a counter-gravity power to block manipulations in the political process by the owners of the capital. Without cohesive European political parties capable to promote their interest trough formal channels of representing, public interest will always be endangered by the much more organized and financially more powerful business lobby groups.

5.5. Interest groups and democracy

Although regular citizens (that believe that politics has to be set above their personal interests) often react with the reflex aversion toward the concept of “special interests”, inter-

est groups are endemically connected with democracy. There are at least **three reasons for this**:

- » **First**, constitutional governments protect the individual freedoms of the citizens, including the freedom of speech, thought and freedom of corporation. Interest groups are concerned to be a crucial part and necessary consequence of a free society. Or as James Madison wrote in his work "The Federalist", "freedom of the interest groups is the same as air is to fire". Interest groups can be suppressed but never freedom".
- » **The second reason** why interest groups are a natural part of constitutionalism is the fact that democratic societies want to be politically and economically more complex than non-democratic ones. In democratic systems it is not just the individual freedoms that express and act in compliance with their opinions and interests, but the interests themselves are "multiplied" thanks to political freedom. **Because of this, a democracy is more generally characterized as a system that generates political, economic and social interests.**
- » **And the third reason** why interest groups have success in constitutional democracies is the fact that governments in these democracies regularly benefit from them.

Critics addressing interest groups state that their development and their acceptance, especially in the US and in Europe, created difficulties in vast parts of society. Those segments that offer less financial means and interest groups have less influence and power. On the other hand, highly organized and financially powerful interest groups are also ready to fight with the political factors in the state. All of this makes a difference in the strength and in the power of interest, so from the only category by value, the interest has become a different measure category that is dependent only on the groups that promote it.

SUMMARY



SUMMARY



РЕЗИМЕ

ПОЛИТИЧКИ ПАРТИИ И ИНТЕРЕСОВНИ ГРУПИ

Првото издание на универзитетскиот учебник „Политички партии и интересовни групи“, на авторите проф. д-р Саво Климовски и проф. д-р Тања Каракамишева, беше издадено во 2007 година. Девет години подоцна, во април 2016 година, се објавува изменето и дополнето издание на овој труд, во авторство на проф. д-р Саво Климовски, проф. д-р Тања Каракамишева и доц. д-р Александар Спасеновски.

Овој труд првенствено е наменет за студентите на политичките науки на Правниот факултет „Јустинијан Први“ во Скопје, како и за останатите студенти од другите универзитети во државата кои во рамките на нивните курсеви ја проучуваат оваа исклучително значајна проблематика. Освен тоа, овој учебник кореспондира и со наставните програми и на факултетите за правни науки, за новинарство, за јавна администрација, за односи со јавноста, како и останатите сродни академски области. Секако, со оглед на целите на секој високошколски учебник, веруваме дека ова дело ќе им биде корисно и на сите практичари надвор од универзитетите кои се занимаваат или се интересираат за проблематиката поврзана со политичките партии и интересовните групи.

Учебникот „Политички партии и интересовни групи“ е составен од пет дела.

Првиот дел со наслов: „Политички партии и партиски системи“ е составен од шест глави, при што во првата се изложени согледувања за основните прашања кои се однесуваат на политичките партии како форма на организирање на луѓето во демократските општества. Во втората глава, пак, на темелот на информациите од првата глава, дополнително се разјаснува оваа проблематика преку из-

ложениот осврт кој се однесува на прашањето на развојот на политичките партии во четири референтни држави, односно Обединетото Кралство, Соединетите Американски Држави, Франција и Сојузна Република Германија. Понатаму, во третата и во четвртата глава од првиот дел, дополнително се разјаснува оваа област преку изложените согледувања кои се однесуваат на темата „партиски лидер и теории за лидерството“, како и на темата „внатрепартиски судири и фракции“. Конечно, сознанијата од овој, прв воведен дел, се заокружуваат во двете последни глави кои се однесуваат на прашањето на видовите политички партии и партиски системи, како и на прашањето на финансирање на политичките партии.

Вториот дел од учебникот со наслов: „Политичките партии во Република Македонија“ е составен од три глави, при што во првата се разработува проблематиката на партиското организирање пред создавањето на Социјалистичка Република Македонија, во втората се разработува партискиот систем на Социјалистичка Република Македонија, додека во третата глава се разработува партискиот систем на денешна Република Македонија.

Третиот дел од учебникот со наслов: „Избори и изборни системи“ е составен од четири глави, при што во првата се разработува прашањето на суверенитетот на граѓаните, во втората се разработени облиците на посредна демократија, додека во третата глава се изложени согледувања поврзани со изборниот систем како дел од вкупниот уставен и политички систем на државите. На темелот на изнесеното во овој дел, но и во претходните делови, во последната глава се разработени релациите помеѓу изборниот и партискиот систем.

Во четвртиот дел од учебникот со наслов: „Европските партии и партискиот систем на Европската унија“ дополнително се разјаснува проблематиката преку примерот на

еден важен политички ентитет, особено референтен за Република Македонија, но и за демократскиот свет генерално.

Конечно, на самиот крај од учебникот, во неговиот последен петти дел со наслов „интересовни групи“, се изложени согледувања поврзани со карактерот на оваа форма на организирање на луѓето, како и со релациите што се развиваат помеѓу овие групи и државните институции, односно помеѓу овие групи и политичките партии.

При пишувањето на учебникот „Политички партии и интересовни групи“ е консултирана соодветна стручна и научна литература во која влегуваат и понови сознанија на референтни автори и научни авторитети. Секако, со оглед на фактот дека станува збор за тема која е предмет на уставно и законско регулирање на државите, консултирани се и поголем број уставни и законски текстови на покарактеристични држави, како и на нашата земја, Република Македонија.

Авторите искрено веруваат дека со овој учебник дополнително ќе се разјасни и натамошно ќе се доближи оваа сложена и повеќеслојна проблематика до сите заинтересирани личности. Секако, наспроти систематичноста во пристапот и соодветната исцрпност во објаснувањата за секоја од темите, останува констатацијата дека овој сложен и бескраен простор и во иднина ќе се истражува, при што дополнително ќе се збогатува и облагородува овој труд во изданијата што ќе следуваат.

REYZME

PARTITË POLITIKE DHE GRUPET E INTERESIT

Edicioni i parë i tekstit mësimor universitar „Partitë politike dhe grupet e interesit“ të autorëve Prof. Dr. Savo Klimovski dhe Prof. Dr. Tanja Karakamisheva, u botua në vitin 2007. Nëntë vjet më vonë, në muajin prill të vitit 2016, botohet edicioni i ndryshuar dhe i plotësuar i këtij punimi, me autorët Prof. Dr. Savo Klimovski, Prof. Dr. Tanja Karakamisheva dhe Doc. Dr. Aleksandar Spasenovski.

Ky punim fillimisht u dedikohet studentëve të shkencave politike pranë Fakultetit Juridik „Justiniani i Parë“ Shkup, si dhe studentëve të universiteteve të tjera në shtet të cilët, në kuadër të kurseve të tyre, e studiojnë këtë çështje e cila është jashtëzakonisht e rëndësishme. Veç kësaj, ky tekst mësimor universitar korrespondon edhe me programet mësimore të fakulteteve të shkencave juridike, gazetarisë, administratës publike, marrëdhënieve me publikun, si dhe me fusha tjera të ngjashme akademike. Së këtejmi, duke i pasur parasysh synimet e çdo teksti mësimor të arsimit të lartë, besojmë se kjo vepër do t’u shërbejë edhe të gjithë praktikentëve jashtë universiteteve të cilët merren ose janë të interesuar për problematikën që ka të bëjë me partitë politike dhe grupet e interesit.

Teksti mësimor „Partitë politike dhe grupet e interesit“ përbëhet nga pesë pjesë.

Pjesa e parë me titullin: „Partitë politike dhe sistemet partiake“ përbëhet nga gjashtë kapituj, me çrast në të parin janë prezantuar pikëpamjet lidhur me çështjet themelore që kanë të bëjnë me partitë politike, si formë e organizimit të njerëzve në shoqëritë demokratike. Ndërkaq, në kapitullin e dytë, mbi themelin e informatave të kapitullit të parë, në mënyrë plotësuese shpjegohet kjo problematikë përmes vështrimit të prezantuar lidhur me çështjen e zhvillimit të partive politike në katër shtete referente, përkatësisht Mbretëria

e Bashkuar, Shtetet e Bashkuara të Amerikës, Franca dhe Republika Federale të Gjermanisë. Pastaj në kapitullin e tretë dhe të katërt të pjesës së parë, në mënyrë plotësuese trajtohet kjo fushë përmes pikëpamjeve të prezantuara që kanë të bëjnë me temën: „Lideri partiak dhe teoritë e liderizmit“, si dhe me temën: „Përplasjet dhe fraksionet brenda-partiake“. Përfundimisht, informatat e pjesës së parë hyrëse, rrumbullakohen në dy kapitujt e fundit që kanë të bëjnë me çështjen e llojeve të partive politike dhe sistemeve partiake, si dhe me çështjen e financimit të partive politike.

Pjesa e dytë e tekstit mësimor me titullin: „Partitë politike në Republikën e Maqedonisë“ përbëhet nga tre kapituj, me çrast në të parin trajtohet problematika e organizimit partiak para krijimit të Republikës Socialiste të Maqedonisë, në të dytin trajtohet sistemi partiak i Republikës Socialiste të Maqedonisë, ndërkaq në kapitullin e tretë trajtohet sistemi partiak i Republikës aktuale të Maqedonisë.

Pjesa e tretë e tekstit mësimor me titullin „Zgjedhjet dhe sistemet zgjedhore“ përbëhet nga katër kapituj, me çrast në të parin trajtohet çështja e sovranitetit të qytetarëve, në të dytin trajtohen format e demokracisë së tërthortë, ndërsa në kapitullin e tretë janë prezantuar pikëpamjet lidhur me sistemin zgjedhor, si pjesë e sistemit të përgjithshëm kushtetues dhe politik të shtetit. Mbi themelin e asaj që është prezantuar në këtë pjesë, por edhe në pjesët paraprake, në kapitullin e fundit trajtohen relacionet midis sistemit zgjedhor dhe partiak.

Në pjesën e katërt të tekstit mësimor me titullin: „Partitë Evropiane dhe Sistemi partiak i Bashkimit Evropian“ në mënyrë plotësuese trajtohet problematika përmes shembullit të një entiteti të rëndësishëm politik, veçanërisht referent për Republikën e Maqedonisë por edhe për botën demokratike në përgjithësi.

Përfundimisht, në fund të tekstit mësimor, në pjesën e pestë dhe të fundit të tij me titullin: „Grupet e interesit“ janë

prezantuar pikëpamje që kanë të bëjnë me karakterin e kësaj forme të organizimit të njerëzve, si dhe me relacionet që zhvillohen midis këtyre grupeve dhe institucioneve të shtetit, përkatësisht midis këtyre grupeve dhe partive politike.

Gjatë hartimit të tekstit mësimor „Partitë politike dhe grupet e interesit“ është konsultuar literaturë përkatëse profesionale dhe shkencore ku bëjnë pjesë edhe studimet më të reja të autorëve referent dhe autoriteteve shkencore. Megjithatë, meqë bëhet fjalë për temë e cila është objekt i rregullimit kushtetues dhe ligjor të shteteve, janë konsultuar një sërë tekstesh kushtetuese dhe ligjore të shteteve më karakteristike, si dhe të shtetit tonë, Republikës së Maqedonisë.

Autorët sinqerisht besojnë se përmes këtij teksti mësimor në mënyrë plotësuese do të sqarohet dhe në vazhdimësi, kjo problematikë komplekse dhe multidimensionale, do të përafrohet deri te të gjithë personat e interesuar. Së këtejmi, kundrejt qasjes sistematike dhe trajtimit përkatës e gjithëpërfshirës të temave të shtjelluara, mbetet konstatimi se kjo hapësirë komplekse dhe e pafundme do studiohet edhe në të ardhmen, me çka në edicionet e ardhshme në mënyrë plotësuese do të pasurohet dhe fisnikërohet ky punim.

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

POLITISCHE PARTEIEN UND INTERESSENGRUPPEN

Die erste Ausgabe des Lehrbuchs „Politische Parteien und Interessengruppen“ der Autoren Prof. Savo Klomovski (PhD) und Prof. Tanja Karakamiseva (PhD) wurde 2007 veröffentlicht. Neun Jahre später, im April 2016, veröffentlichten die Autoren Prof. Savo Klomovski (PhD), Prof. Tanja Karakamiseva (PhD) zusammen mit dem Dozenten Aleksandar Spasenovski (PhD) diese überarbeitete und erweiterte Ausgabe.

Das Werk ist vorrangig gedacht für Studierende der Politikwissenschaften an der rechtswissenschaftlichen Fakultät der Iustinianus Primus in Skopje, sowie für Studierende anderer Universitäten des Landes, welche sich dieser exquisiten und bedeutenden Thematik im Rahmen ihres Studiums widmen. Darüber hinaus entspricht das Lehrbuch den Lehrplänen der rechtswissenschaftlichen Fakultät, journalistischen Fakultät, öffentlichen Verwaltung, Öffentlichkeitsarbeit und anderer verwandter akademischer Gebiete. In Anbetracht der Ziele eines jeden universitären Lehrbuches sind wir der Überzeugung, dass diese Ausgabe allen Spezialisten außerhalb der Universitäten, die sich mit Themen in Zusammenhang mit politischen Parteien und Interessengruppen beschäftigen oder sich dafür interessieren, von Nutzen sein wird.

Das Lehrbuch „Politische Parteien und Interessengruppen“ besteht aus fünf Teilen.

Der erste Teil trägt den Titel „Politische Parteien und Parteiensysteme“ und umfasst sechs Kapitel. Das erste Kapitel stellt Ansichten zu grundlegenden Themen zu politischen Parteien als eine Form der Organisation von Menschen in demokratischen Gesellschaften dar. Basierend auf den Informationen des ersten Kapitels verdeutlicht das zweite Kapitel die Problematik weiter anhand eines Vergleichs der Entwicklung politischer Parteien in vier Ländern: Vereinigtes Köni-

greich, Vereinigte Staaten von Amerika, Frankreich und der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Das dritte und vierte Kapitel des ersten Teils vertiefen das Thema anhand von Ansichten zu dem Themen „Parteiführer und Theorien zur Führung“ und „innerparteiliche Konflikte und Fraktionen“. Schließlich werden die Erkenntnisse des einführenden Teils in den letzten beiden Kapiteln, welche politische Parteien, Parteiensysteme sowie Parteifinanzierung umfassen, weiter behandelt.

Der zweite Teil des Lehrbuchs, „Politische Parteien in der Republik Mazedonien“ umfasst drei Kapitel. Das erste behandelt Probleme der Parteiorganisation vor der Gründung der sozialistischen Republik Mazedonien. Das zweite exponiert das Parteiensystem der sozialistischen Republik Mazedonien, das dritte Kapitel erläutert das Parteiensystem der heutigen Republik Mazedonien.

Der dritte Teil des Lehrbuchs, „Wahlen und Wahlsysteme“ umfasst vier Kapitel. Das erste behandelt das Thema der Souveränität der Bürger, das zweite exponiert Formen der repräsentativen Demokratie. Das dritte Kapitel erläutert Ansichten im Zusammenhang mit dem Wahlsystem als Teil des gesamten konstitutionellen und politischen Systems des Staates. Das vierte Kapitel erläutert das Verhältnis zwischen Wahl- und Parteiensystem anhand von Informationen dieses Kapitels sowie der vorherigen.

Der vierte Teil des Lehrbuchs „Europäische Parteien und das Parteiensystem der EU“ verdeutlicht das Thema weiter anhand des Beispiels einer sehr bedeutenden politischen Figur und mit besonderer Referenz zur Republik Mazedonien, aber auch der demokratischen Welt im allgemeinen.

Der letzte, fünfte Teil trägt den Titel „Interessengruppen“ und verdeutlicht die Ansichten in Zusammenhang mit dem Charakter dieser Form der Organisation von Menschen sowie die Beziehungen, die sich zwischen diesen Gruppen und

staatlichen Institutionen bzw. zwischen diesen Gruppen und den politischen Parteien bilden.

Während der Erstellung des Lehrbuchs „Politische Parteien und Interessengruppen“ wurde entsprechende wissenschaftliche und Fachliteratur herangezogen, welche die neuesten Erkenntnisse namhafter Autoren und Wissenschaftler umfasst. Da dieses Thema den legislativen und verfassungsrechtlichen Bestimmungen des Staates unterliegt, wurden wesentliche legislative und verfassungsrechtliche Werke der repräsentativeren Staaten herangezogen, inklusive jene der Republik Mazedonien.

Die Autoren sind der festen Überzeugung, dass dieses Lehrbuch zusätzliche Erläuterungen bietet und dieses komplexe und vielschichtige Thema allen Interessierten näher bringen wird. Natürlich besteht trotz der systematischen Herangehensweise und der großen Sorgfalt die Möglichkeit dieses komplexe und unendliche Thema weiter zu erforschen, was nur zur Bereicherung und Veredelung dieses Werks in den kommenden Ausgaben beitragen wird.

SUMMARY

POLITICAL PARTIES AND INTEREST GROUPS

The first edition of the university textbook „Political Parties and Interest Groups“ by the authors Prof. Savo Klomovski (PhD) and Prof. Tanja Karakamiseva (PhD) was published in 2007. Nine years later, in April 2016, a reformed and supplemented edition of this work has been published by the authors Prof. Savo Klimovski (PhD), Prof. Tanja Karakamiseva (PhD), and lecturer Aleksandar Spasenovski (PhD).

This work is primarily intended for the students of Political Science at the Law Faculty Iustinianus Primus in Skopje, as well as for other students from other universities in the country who study this exquisitely significant issue as part of their courses. Besides that, this textbook corresponds to the curricula of the faculties of law, journalism, public administration, public relations, as well as other similar academic areas. Of course, considering the aims of each high education textbook, we trust this edition will be of use to all professionals outside the universities who deal with, or are interested in, issues related to political parties and interest groups.

The textbook „Political Parties and Interest Groups“ consists of five parts.

The first part is titled „Political Parties and Party Systems“ and consists of six chapters. The first chapter exposes views on basic issues related to political parties as a form of organizing people in democratic societies. Based on the information from the first chapter, the second chapter clarifies these problems via the presented review related to the issue of the development of political parties in four respective countries, i.e. the United Kingdom, the United States of America, France and the Federal Republic of Germany. In addition, the third and fourth chapters from the first part clarify this area further via the presented views related to the topic “party leaders and

leadership theories”, as well as the topic “intra-party conflicts and factions”. Finally, the insights from the first introductory part are unfolded within the two final chapters related to the issue of the types of political parties and party systems, as well as the issue of political party financing.

The second part from the textbook titled „Political Parties in the Republic of Macedonia” comprises of three chapters. The first tackles the problems of party organization prior to the establishment of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, the second exposes the party system of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, and the third chapter elaborates on the party system of the contemporary Republic of Macedonia.

The third part of the textbook titled „Elections and Electoral Systems” comprises of four chapters. The first elaborates on the issue of citizens’ sovereignty, the second expands on the shapes of representative democracy, and the third chapter exposes the views related to the electoral system as a segment of the overall constitutional and political system of the state. The last chapter elaborates on the relation between the electoral and party systems, based upon the information presented within this chapter and the previous ones.

The fourth part of the textbook titled „The European Parties and the Party System of the EU” clarifies the topic further, through the example of a very important political entity and with particular reference to the Republic of Macedonia and the democratic world in general.

The final fifth part titled „Interest Groups” exposes the views related to the character of this form of organizing people, as well as the relations that develop between these groups and state institutions, i.e. between these groups and the political parties.

While drafting the textbook „Political Parties and Interest Groups”, appropriate professional and scientific literature was

consulted, encompassing the latest insights of eminent authors and scientific authorities. Of course, considering the fact that this topic is the subject of the constitutional and legislative regulations of the state, a major corpus of constitutional and legislative texts of the more representative states were consulted, including of our country, the Republic of Macedonia.

The authors truly believe that this textbook will provide additional clarifications and will bring this complex and multi-layered topic closer to all concerned individuals. Of course, despite the systematic approach and the proper diligence in exposing each of the topics there is an opportunity for this complex and infinite area to be explored further, which will only enrich and ennoble this work in the editions to come.

REFERENCES



REFERENCES



REFERENCES

1. FOREIGN AUTHORS

- » Adam Przeworski, Susan C. Stokes & Bernard Manin (1999), *Democracy, Accountability, and Representation*, Cambridge Studies in the Theory of Democracy, Cambridge University Press
- » Adams, James, Samuel Merrill, and Bernard Grofman (2005), *A Unified Theory of Party Competition*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- » Almond, G.A.(1956), „Comparing Political Systems“, *Journal of Politics*, vol. 18, no. 2
- » Andre Blais (1988), "The Classification of Electoral Systems", *European Journal of Political Research*, No. 16
- » Andrew Reeve and Alan Ware (1992), *Electoral Systems, A comparative and theoretical introduction*, Routledge, London and New York
- » Arend Lijphart (1994), *Electoral Systems and Party Systems: A Study of Twenty-Seven Democracies, 1945-1990*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- » Bartłomiej Kaminski (1991), *The Collapse Of State Socialism*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey
- » Bass, B. M. (1990) *Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research and Managerial Applications 3rd Edition*, New York: The Free Press.
- » Bernard Manin (1997), *The Principles of Representative Government*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- » Birch, A.H. (1964), *Representative and Responsible Government*, London: Allen & Unwin
- » Birnbaum, P, and Badie, P. (1983), *The Sociology of the State*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- » Black, D. (1963), *The Theory of Committee and Elections*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- » Blondel, J., *Party Systems and Patterns of Government in Western Democracies*, *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 1. June

- » Bobio, N. (1997), *Desnica i levica*, CID, Podgorica
- » Bone, H.A. (1955), *American Politics and the Party System*, New York
- » Bowden, A. O. (1926) "A study of the personality of student leaders in the United States," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, vol. 21
- » Brunner, G. (1979), *Vergleichende Regierungslehre*, Padernborn
- » Butler, D. and Stokes, D. (1974), *Political Change in Britain*, London.
- » Campbell P. (1958), *French Electoral Systems and Elections, 1789-1957*, Faber & Faber, London
- » Caporaso, J. (1998), „Regional Integration Theory: Understanding Our Past and Anticipating Our Future“, *Journal of European Public Policy* 5
- » Caramani, Daniele (2014), *Comparative Politics*, Third Edition, Oxford University Press
- » Carole Rogel (2004), *The Breakup of Yugoslavia and its Aftermath*, Greenwood Press
- » Colomer, M. Joser (2001), *Political Institutions in Europe*, Second Edition, Routledge
- » Daadler, H. (1966), *Parties, Elites and Political Development*, *Political Parties and Political Development*, Eds. La Palombara, M. Weiner, Princeton University Press, Princeton
- » Daglas Rae (1971), *The Political Consequences of Electoral Laws*, Revised Edition, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press
- » David M. Farrell (1997), *Comparing Electoral Systems*, *Contemporary Political Studies Series*, Prentice Hall/Harvester Wheatsheaf
- » Dinan, D. (2000), „Ever Closer Union: An Introduction to European Integration“, Boulder/London : Lynne Rienner
- » Downs, Anthony (1957), *An Economic Theory of Democracy*, New York: Harper and Row
- » Duverger, Maurice (1951), *Political Parties: Their Organization and Activity in the Modern State*, New York: Wiley

- » E.S. Staveley (1972), *Greek and Roman Voting*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press
- » Easton, D. (1957), „An Approach to the Study of Political Systems“, *World Politics*, vol. 9, no. 5
- » Elgie, R. and Griggs, S. (2000), *French Politics: Debates and Controversies*, London: Routledge
- » Elliot John (1888), *The Debates in the Several State Conventions on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution as recommended by the General Convention at Philadelphia*, New York: Burt Franklin, New York
- » Emile Noel (1994), „A New Institutional Balance?“, in Renaud Dehousse (ed), „Europe After Maastricht-An Ever Closer Union?“, *Law Books in Europe*, Munchen
- » Fiedler, F. E. (1967a) *A theory of leadership effectiveness*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- » Freedon, M. (2001), *Reassessing Political Ideologies: The Durability of Dissent*, London and New York: Routledge, како и во: *Ideologies and Political Theory: A Conceptual Approach*, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press
- » Fukuyama, F. (1989), *The End of History, National Interest*.
- » Gamble, A. (1979), „The Conservative Party“, Drucker, M.H. ed., *Multy-Party Britain*, MacMilan.
- » Garner, R.&Kelly, R. (1993), *British Political Parties Today*, Manchester University Press, Manchester.
- » Gary W. Cox (1997), *Making Votes Count, Strategic Coordination in the Worlds Electoral Systems*, Cambridge University Press
- » Gary,W.Cox (1997), *Making Votes Count, Strategic Coordination in the Worlds Electoral Systems*, Cambridge University Press
- » Geoffrey Brennan & Loren Lomasky (1993), *Democracy & Decision, The Pure Theory of Electoral Preference*, Cambridge University Press

- » Goati, Vladimir (1990), *Savremene političke partije*, Komparativna analiza, Drugo dopunjeno izdanje, štampa "16 maj", Stara Pazova.
- » Gordon Smith (1993), "Dimensions of Change in the German Party System", in: Stephen Padgett (eds.), *Parties and Party Systems in the New Germany*, Aldershot u.a.: Dartmouth.
- » Gray, John (2000), *Two Faces of Liberalism*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- » Grint, K. (1997) 'Leadership: A contested Construct', in Grint, K. (ed.) *Leadership: Classical, Contemporary, and Critical Approaches*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- » Grint, Keith (2005), *Leadership: Limits and Possibilities*, New York: Macmillan, како и во: Grint, Keith, (2000), *The Arts of Leadership*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- » Hancock, M.D., Conradt, D.P, Peters, B.G., Safran, W., White, S. Zariski, R. (2003), *Politics in Europe*, Chatham, New York
- » Hayek, F.A. von (1960), *The Constitution of Liberty*, London: Routledge&Kegan Paul.
- » Heifetz, Ronald (2010). *Leadership without easy answers*. Cambridge: Harvard Business Press
- » Hejvud, Endru (2004), *Politika*, Clio
- » Hejvud, Endru (2005), *Političke ideologije*, Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, Beograd
- » Helen Wallace, William Wallace and Mark A. Pollack (2005), *Policy-Making in the European Union*, Fifth Edition, Oxford University Press
- » Henry H. Perritt (2010), *The road to independence for Kosovo: a chronicle of the Ahtisaari plan*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- » Hermann Scheer (1979), *Parteien kontra Bürger? Die Zukunft der Parteiendemokratie*, München/Zürich: Piper
- » Hix, S. (1995) 'Parties at the European Level and the Legitimacy of EU Socio-Economic Policy'. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 33, No. 4.

- » Hix, S. (1999) 'Dimensions and Alignments in European Union Politics: Cognitive Constraints and Partisan Responses'. *European Journal of Political Research*, Vol. 35, No. 2.
- » Hix, S. (1999), *The Political System of the European Union*, London: Palgrave Macmillan
- » Hix, Simon (1999), *The Political System of the EU*”, Palgrave MacMillan.
- » Hobsbawm, E.J. (1977), *Revolution un Revolte*, Frankfurt am Main.
- » Hoffmann, S. (1966), „Obstinate or Obsolete? The Fate of the Nation-State and the Case of Western Europe”, *Deadalus*, 95/3
- » Huntington, S. (1993), "The Clash of Civilizations", *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 72, No. 3.
- » J. Meynaud (1965), *Les parties politiques en Grande Bretagne*, Press Universitaires de France (PUF), Paris
- » J.R.Pole (1966), *Political Representation in England and the Origins of the American Republic*, Berkeley: University of California Press
- » Janos Simon (1997), *Electoral Systems and Democracy in Central Europe, 1990-1994*, vo: *International Political Science Review*, Vol. 18, No. 4
- » John Peterson and Elizabeth Bomberg (1999), *Decision-Making in the European Union*, Palgrave
- » Jorge Juan Fernández Garcia, Jess E. Clayton and Christopher Hobley (2004), *The Student's Guide to European Integration*, Polity Press
- » Jürgen Dittberner and Rudolf Ebbinghausen (eds.), (1973), *Parteiensystem in der Legitimationskrise*, (Op-laden: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- » Kathleen Bawn Department of Political Science UCLA&Frances Rosenbluth Department of Political Scienc Yale University (2003), *Coalition Parties versus Coalitions of Parties: How Electoral Agency Shapes the Political Logic of Costs and Benefits*.

- » Katz, R.S. and Mair, P. (1995), "Changing Models of Party Organization and Party Democracy: The Emergence of the Cartel Party", *Party Politics*.
- » Keman, H. (1993), „Comparative Politics: A Distinctive Approach to Political Science?", Keman H.(ed), *Comparative Politics: New Directions in Theory and Method*, Amsterdam: VU University Press
- » Key Jr, O. V., (1967), *Politics, Parties and Pressure Groups*, New York
- » Kreppel, A. and Tsebelis, G. (1999) 'Coalition Formation in the European Parliament', *Comparative Political Studies*, Vol. 32, No. 8
- » Kuhn, T. (1962), *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.
- » Kurt, Ümit (2009), „Europe of Monnet, Schumann, and Mitrany: A Historical Glance to the EU from the Functionalist Perspective", *European Journal of Economic and Political Studies*, EJEPS 2, (2)
- » L. Sandy Maisel & Jeffrey M. Berry (2012), *The Oxford Handbook of American Political Parties and Interest Groups*, Oxford University Press, New York
- » Ladrech, R.J. (2006), *The European Union and Political Parties*, R.S.Katz&W.Crotty (eds) *Handbook of Party Politics*, London: Thousand Oaks, New Delhi, Sage Publications
- » Larry Diamond (1990), *Three Paradoxes of Democracy*, *Journal of Democracy*, 1, Summer
- » Lawrence LeDuc, Richard G. Niemi & Pippa Norris (1996), *Comparing Democracies, Elections and Voting in Global Perspective*, SAGE Publications, International Educational and Professional Publisher, USA
- » Lijphart, Arend & Grofman B. (1984), *Choosing and Electoral System*, ed. Praeger, New York
- » Lipset, Seymour Martin & Rokkan, Stein (eds) (1967), *Party Systems and Voter Alignments*, New York: Collier Macmillan

- » MacIntyre, H. (1981), *After Virtue*, London: Duckworth.
- » Marks, G. and Wilson, C.J. (2000) 'The Past in the Present: A Cleavage Theory of Party Response to European Integration', *British Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 30, No. 3.
- » Marks, K.-Engels, F. (1974), *Dela*, Tom 6, Prosveta, Beograd.
- » Maurice Duverge (1963), *Political Parties*, Wiley, New York, 1963
- » McKenzie, R. (1963), *Britain's Political Parties*, London.
- » McLean Iain (1991), *Forms of Representation and Systems of Voting*, во делото на: David Held, *Political Theory Today*, Cambridge Polity Press
- » Michels, Robert (1959), *Political Parties*, New York, Dover
- » Mills, C.W. (1956), *The Power Elite*, New York
- » Nash, J. B. (1929) "Leadership," *Phi Delta Kappa*, vol. 12.
- » Neuman, S. ed. (1956) *Modern Political Parties*, The University of Chicago, Chicago
- » Neumann, S. (1955), *Modern Political Parties*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- » Nohlen, Dieter (1989), *Wahlrecht und Parteiensystem*, Opladen: Leske&Budrich
- » Nugent, N. (1999), *The Government and Politics of the European Union*, 4th edn, (Basingstoke: Macmillan)
- » Nye, Joseph S., „Comparing Common Markets: A Revised Neofunctionalist Model“, во публикацијата на: Lindberg, L.N. and Scheingold S.A. (1970), *Europe's Would-Be Polity*, Englewood Cliffs: NJ: Prentice Hall
- » Oppenheim, F.E. (1961), *Dimensions of Freedoms: An Analysis*, New York.
- » Ostrogorski, Michael (1902), *Democracy and the Organization of Political Parties*, The Mackmillan Company: New York
- » Otto Kirchheimer (1966), "TheTransformation of the Western European Party System", in: Joseph LaPalombara and Myron Weiner (eds.), *Political Parties and Political Development*, Princenton, N.J.: Princenton University Press.

- » Panebianco, A. (1988), *Political Parties: Organization and Power*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- » Papeke, S. (1985), *Machtfragen*, "Marksizam u svetu", 1/85
- » Parton, J. (1960), *The Life of Andrew Jackson*, Third Volume, New York
- » Petar Radan (2001), *Break-up of Yugoslavia and International Law*, Routledge
- » Pierson, P. (1996), „The Path to European Integration: A Historical Institutionalist Analysis“, *Comparative Political Studies*, vol. 29, no. 2
- » Proudhon, P.J (1970), *What is Property?*, translated by Tucker B.R., New York: Dover.
- » R. Dahl (1971), *Polyarchy, Participation and Opposition*, New Haven, Yale University Press
- » R.J.S. Hoffmann & P. Levack (eds) (1949), *Burke's Politics, Selected Writings and Speeches*, New York, A.A. Knopf
- » Ratković, Radoslav (1983), *Ideologija i politika*, Institut za političke studije, Beograd.
- » Raunio, T. (1997), *The European Perspective: Transnational Party Groups in the 1989–1994 European Parliament*, (London: Ashgate).
- » *Reshaping the Broken Image of Political Parties, Internal Party Democracy in South Eastern Europe*, Georgi Karasimeonov (2007), Bulgarian School of Politics, GorrexPress, Sofia
- » Rosamond, B. (2000), *Theories of European Integration*, London: MacMillan Press
- » S. Hix, A. Kreppel & A. Noury (2003), "The Party System in the European Parliament: Collusive or Competitive?", *Journal of Common Market Studies* 41
- » Sajmon Hicks (2007), *Politički sistem Evropske unije*, Službeni glasnik, Beograd
- » Sandholtz, W. (1993), „Choosing Union: Monetary Politics and Maastricht“, *International Organization*, 47
- » Sartori, G (1976). *Parties and Party Systems: A Framework for Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

- » Sartori, Giovanni (1976), *Parties and Party Systems, A Framework for Analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- » Sartory, G., *The Theory of Democracy Revisited*, Chatman N.J., Chatman House, Vol. I.
- » Schattschneider, E.E. (1942), *Party Government*, Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- » Schlager, N. and Weisblatt, J. Editors, (2006) *World Encyclopedia of Political Systems and Parties*, Fourth Edition, Facts on File, USA.
- » Schumpeter, J.A. (1943), *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*, New York: Harper&Row.
- » Scully, R. (1997) 'Policy Influence and Participation in the European Parliament'. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 22, No. 2.
- » Seymour Martin Lipset & Stein Rokkan (eds) (1967), *Party Systems and Voter Alignments*, New York: Collier Macmillan
- » Shefter, M. (1994), *Political Parties and the State, The American Historical Experience*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.
- » Shugart Matthew S. (1993), *Of President and Parliaments*, *East European Constitutional Review*, No. 2
- » Simeunović, Dragan (1994), *Osnovi političkih nauka-praktikum*, Izdavačko predizeće "Ferko", Beograd.
- » Simeunović, Dragan (1994), *Osnovi političkih nauka-praktikum*, Izdavačko predizeće "Ferko", Beograd.
- » Simon Hix, Amie Kfeffel, Aedul Noury (2003), "The Party System in the European Parliament: Collusive or Competitive?", *JCMS*, Volume 41, Number 2.
- » Simon Hix (1999), *The Political System of the European Union*, Palgrave
- » Slaviša Orlović (2002), *Političke partije i moć*, Agora, Beograd
- » Steiner, J. (1998), *European Democracies*, Longman, New York

- » Taggart, P. (1998) 'A Touchstone of Dissent: Euroscepticism in Contemporary Western European Party Systems'. *European Journal of Political Research*, Vol. 33, No. 3.
- » Thomas Poguntke (1993), *Alternative Politics. The German Green Party*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press
- » Thomassen, J. (2002), 'Parties and Voters: the Feasibility of a European System of Political Representation', in B. Steunenberg and J. Thomassen, *The European Parliament. Moving Towards Democracy in the EU*, Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield.
- » Toni Bler, "Moj treći put", *Corriere della sera*, September, 1998, *Politika*, 6. oktobar.
- » Towney, R. (1964), *The Radical Tradition*, London.
- » Tuftes, E.R. (1973), *The Relationship Between Seats and Votes in Two-Party Systems*, vo: *American Political Science Review*, no. 67
- » Vasović, Vučina (2006), *Savremene demokratije*, Tom 1, JP Službeni glasnik, Beograd.
- » Vučina Vasović i Vladimir Goati (1993), *Izbori i izborni sistemi*, NIP Radnička štampa, Beograd
- » Vučina Vasović (2006), *Savremene demokratije*, Edicija Sintezes, JP Službeni glasnik, Beograd
- » Weber's Rationalism and Modern Society, edited and translated by Tony Waters and Dagmar Waters, Palgrave MacMillan, „Politics as Vocation“.
- » Wildavsky, A.B., Maurice Duverger (1969), *Les parties politiques. Eine methodologische Kritik*, Zieburas, G.(Hrsg)
- » Wolf-Dieter, Narr (1977), *Auf dem Weg zum Einparteiensstaat*, Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag

2. MACEDONIAN AUTHORS/DOCUMENTS:

- » Nadežda Cvetkovska, *Gragjanskite partii vo vardarskiot del na Makedonija (1935-1941)*, Institut za nacionalna istorija, Skopje, 1996

- » Cane Mojanoski, Letopis na makedonskata demokracija, Pakung, Skopje, 2000
- » Aneta Jovevska, "Izborite fokus na političkiot život", Di-jalog br.6, Skopje, 1994
- » Slavko Milosavlevski, "Istočna Evropa pomegju egalitazmot i demokratijata", Ljuboten, Skopje, 1993
- » Law Amending and Supplementing the Law on Social Organisations and Civic Associations, Official Gazette of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, year XLVI, No. 12, Skopje, 13.4.1990
- » A decision to declare the Amendments LVII – LXXXI to the Constitution of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, Amendments to the Constitution of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, Official Gazette of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, year: XLVI, No. 28, Skopje, 21.9.1990
- » Law on Election and Recall of MPs and Councilors, Official Gazette of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, year XLVI, No. 28, Skopje, 21.9.1990
- » Law on Social Organisations and Civic Associations, Official Gazette of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, year XXXIX, No.32, Skopje, 11.11.1983
- » Law on Social Organisations and Civic Associations (re-fined text), Official Gazette of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, year XLVI, No.13, Skopje, 13.4.1990
- » Constitution of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, Official Gazette of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, year XXX, No. 7, Skopje, 25.2.1974
- » Law on Constituencies for the Election of MPs in the Socialist Republic of Macedonia's Assembly, Official Gazette of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, year XLVI, No. 28
- » Vlado Timovski, Sveto Stefanovski, Političkite partii vo Makedonija, 1990
- » Declaration on Sovereignty of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, the Assembly of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, No. 08-220-1

- » Decision on Declaring the Amendments LXXXII - LXXXV to the Constitution of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia, year XLVII, No. 27, Skopje, 11.6.1991
- » Declaration on the Plebiscite Expression of the Citizens' will for a Sovereign and Independent State of Macedonia, the Republic of Macedonia's Assembly, No. 08-3786, 17.9.1991
- » Declaration on international recognition of the Republic of Macedonia, the Republic of Macedonia's Assembly, No. 08-5099, 19.12.1991
- » Law on Political Parties, Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia, year L, No. 41, Skopje, 5.8.1994
- » Law on Political Parties, Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia, year LX, No. 76, Skopje, 27.10.2004
- » Law Amending and Supplementing the Law on Political Parties, Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia, year LXIII, No. 5, Skopje, 16.1.2007
- » Correction to the Law Amending and Supplementing the Law on Political Parties, Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia, year LXIII, No. 8, Skopje, 24.1.2007
- » Law Supplementing the Law on Political Parties, Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia, year LXIX, No. 23, Skopje, 14.2.2008
- » Law on Party Research and Analytic Centres, Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia, year LXIX, No. 23, Skopje, 14.2.2013

CIP - Каталогизација во публикација

Национална и универзитетска библиотека „Св. Климент Охридски“, Скопје

329

KLIMOVSKI, Savo

Political parties and interest groups / Savo Klimovski, Tanja

Karakamisheva-Jovanovska, Aleksandar Spasenovski. - Skopje : Fondacija

Konrad Adenauer, 2017. - 636 стр. ; 24 см

Фусноти кон текстот. - Резиме ; Reyzme ; Zusammenfassung. -

Библиографија: стр. 621-632

ISBN 978-608-4648-27-7

1. Karakamiseva-Jovanovska, Tanja [автор] 2. Spasenovski,

Aleksandar [автор]

а) Политички систем - Партии

COBISS.MK-ID 103113994

EXTRACTS FROM THE REVIEWS

... An excellent and comprehensive textbook, from both the aspect of the contents and the structural organisation of the materials. The extraordinary approach in studying the most important issues related to the development of political parties and party systems, the development and functioning of elections and electoral systems, but also issues related to the development and the essence of the functioning of interest groups in national systems, as well as in the EU, all attach a special significance to this textbook, as well as serving a special role in the system of educational papers.

PROFESSOR SLAVIŠA KOVAČEVIĆ, PHD

The textbook is organized in an excellent manner, incorporating numerous opinions of world renowned authors, professors, and analysts of political parties and interest groups from the past and present. At the same time, this textbook contains highly relevant scientific, expert analyses and opinions on issues directly related to the contemporary challenges of political parties in Europe and abroad. This textbook gains even more importance due to the extraordinary connection the authors make between party systems and electoral systems, parties and elections.

PROFESSOR IRENA PEJIĆ, PHD

Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung in the Republic of Macedonia

Since July 2000, when the first representative office of the Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung was established in Skopje, there have been a significant amount of activities realized in order to contribute towards improving the general conditions in the Republic of Macedonia. In this regard, the cooperation with the academic community is an imperative and a challenge for us, implying the support provided for the publishing of this textbook is another logical step in this direction. We truly hope that this textbook will enrich the knowledge not only of students at the Law Faculty Iustinianus Primus in Skopje, but also of academics from other higher educational institutions in the state. At the same time, we believe that this paper will be a challenge for all concerned with the issues elaborated in it, within their professional interests.