

УДК: 329.05
Примљено: 14. август 2008.
Прихваћено: 16. септембар 2008.
Оригинални научни рад

Српска политичка мисао
број 3/2008.
год. 15. vol. 21.
стр. 51-64.

Zoran Krstić

Faculty of Political Sciences, Belgrade

IDEOLOGICAL, LEGAL AND STRUCTURAL PROFIL CONTEMPORARY PARTIES AND PARTY SYSTEMS

Needless to say that the question of a position and character of the parties and party in many other countries, is very complex. It can be observed and dimensionized in many ways. I will try to analyze it in a bit wider sense and operationalize it into three level or groups of problems. The first part will be referring to the more general or theoretical problem of the relationship between the ideology, law and parties. The second part will be dedicated to the positive law's designing of the position, character and activities of the parties. The third part comprises some questions concerning the effects and prospective of the law regulation of the parties. All these three levels of analyses are interconnected and to some extent interdependent.

Law and parties

As to the wider theoretical implications of the the topic: parties and law, we could say that it makes a part of a huge theoretical problem of the relationship-tension between politics and law. The old Aristotelian dilemma: the rule of law or the rule of people is reflected in the contemporary societies and political systems as a dilemma: the rule of law or the rule of the parties. In referring to the dilemma the rule of law or the rule of the parties, the majority of analysts are preferring the rule of law. But it should be kept in mind that all the question is not so simple. The main problem is, at least, connected with two kinds of facts. First is the fact of loose or anomic nature of law. In other words, the concept of law is not so clear or something that could be easily identified. What is the law whose rule we want to accept or put as a limit on the politics or parties as the most active and influential political actors? If by law is supposed the natural law, or something alike, it seems to me that it is too abstract to be an effective regulative framework for parties and political

activities and processes. If by law is supposed the positive law, then we also must say that the parties, as a narrowest part of the state structure, are deeply involved into the process of making the laws.

The other point is connected with the fact of the contradictory nature of the parties. They are the institution which, on the one hand, represents the society, agregating the various interests which come from the society and present them to the political elite or to the state, as the center of the decision-making process, and, on the other hand, a part of the state structure. The parties are taking part in converting those various group and individual interests into the general or global political demands and political decisions. Since the parties are the component of the society as well as of the state, a lot of contradictions between the state and society are presented within the parties and party system. The parties will try to overcome or handle these contradictions through their aspirations and effort to mediate, to represent, and to some extent to monopolize, the expressing of the will of the people as well as the will of the state. In the democratic political systems the will of the people should correspond to the will or decisions of the party-state. But it is very difficult to identify the existence or any measure of the above mentioned correspondance. If the state, which is to a large extent the party-state, is the law-maker, it is very difficult to expect the existence of a law which would be something quite different or something quite opposite to the will of the parties. In others words, it is unrealistic to expect that parties, as law-makers (through state), will pass the laws which will radically limit them.

The lack of an appropriate socio-economic, cultural and other prerequisites don't allow the law to go too far beyond politics and its most active agents-parties. Political and party activities are too dynamic and too "wild" to be put into the narrow limits of the law. In other words, there is an implicit or explicit tension or conflict between the parties and law which could be expressed as the contradiction or conflict between the tendency of the constitutionalization of parties and the tendency of the participation of the law. It seems to me that the tendency of participation of law, specially in "new democracy", is much stronger than the tendency of the constitutionalization of parties. Instead of a constitutional patriotism, those countries have some kind of patriotism or partyocratic politics. It prevents the law to go deeper and wider into the normative regulation of the party activities. The constitution has been more and more becoming the formal act without sufficient strength to impose some limits on the activities of the political actors specially on the parties. The fact of the predomination of the parties over the law is not the result only of the strength of the parties but also of the weakness of the law. Many of those real difficulties, contradictions and dilemmas

are reflected, more or less, in the constitutional and law's orders and documents.

All in all, we could say that although make a front part of the political system, the parties are until our days left insufficiently defined and insufficiently regulated by the law. There is no even a clear and deeper theoretical answer or consideration about the questions: should the party complex be more regulated by law or not; what aspects or layers of a party complex should be regulated by law and which would be extra-constitutional? It is one of the strong reason why the parties, even in the most developed countries, remained to exist as the extra-constitutional or semi-constitutional entities. There are, of course, some differences in law treating of the parties even among the most democratic western countries. The party complex, for example in Germany is much more treated by law than parties in Great Britain or in the USA.

Generally speaking, it could be argued that political parties are not sufficiently regulated by the law. Furthermore, parties go beyond even against the law in many points. It should be emphasised that it is not speciality only of political system of Serbia. It is also a distinctive feature of other "new democracy" (postcommunist countries) as well as of Western democratic countries. Political, especially democratic theory, should think and discuss much more about the discrepancies between the parties and the law. We will bring out here some of them and recommend some changes.

There are some party's places or centers of the decision-making process which are left beyond the law and wider democratic control. Among such places or points in many political systems are the governments or cabinets (which are practically party top-leadership), MPs clubs (they are formally the clubs of MPs but really they are party clubs) and so on. Shouldn't it be possible and wise to constitutionalize these bodies a bit more than is now the case; In what way should it be done?

Parties are neither sufficiently political and ideologically profiled nor deeply socially rooted. That is why it is very difficult to make classification of parties according to some social or ideological criteria. It could also be one of the reason for difficulties to identify or confirm any firmer positive correlation or correspondence between the decisions and activities of the party leadership, on the one hand, and the will or the preferences of the people, on the other hand. This more or less anomic character of parties brings about a lot of diffusion even confusion in the wider political system and situation. One of the consequences is also an easy transferring from one to another party. Paralelly with that, parties are becoming more and more dependent on the subjects which supply them with the financial sources. All these facts give us the right to raise a question: should some closer positive correlation betwe-

en the activities and decisions of the political elite, on one side, and the preferences of the people, on the other side, be in a more precise and explicit way fixed and ensured by the law. Can and should this kind of matter at all be regulated by law? As to my opinion, I would prifer the positive answer, but I am not sure could it be done and in which way it could be done.

It is well-known that the question of financing of the parties is one of the main political problems. It is in our days so important that the classifications of political parties are made according to the financial criteria. Which way of financing the parties is the most appropriate for one democratic system. What are the basic principles for distribution of the financial sources to the political parties? According to some financial criteria of classification of parties, we could characterize Serbian partises in the folowing way. The parties, on the changeable Serbian political scene, are neither "cadre parties" or "mass parties" (Duverger. 1964: 63-64) nor "catch-all" (Kirchheimer, 1966: 177-200) or "electoral-professional" (Panebianco, 1988: 264) or "cartel" parties. Katz and Mair speak of "cartel" parties as the parties that are financed by the state subvention (Katz-Mair, 1992). They are rather some kind of mixture of electoral-professional and cartel parties. The parties are mainly financed through the interest-group donations and public funds (there is membership fee but it makes smaller part of the total financial sources of the parties).

There are, probably, some additional sources of financing. It seems impossible to know the complete truth of: who gets, what, when and how. There is no anybody today, except perhaps the party leaders, who know the membership of the parties and the sources-amount of mony which are on parties dispozitions. It seems to me that democracy demands an appropriate proportion of public funds and also an appropriate balanse between the public funds, on the one hand, and other financial sources, on the other hand. There are strong reasons for defence of the public sources of financing of a good part of the party activities. Parties in Serbia have a permanet financial sources not only for elections and election campaign's expences but also for other activities. It could be an appropriate solution for the future.

Ideological aspect of parties and party siystem

The left and right concepts, in broadest communicative and etymological sense, represent a space metaphor of two extreme ideological poles in the field of politics which are both polymorph and multidimensional. The traditional understanding of the terms- left and right concepts, as well as opposite and counterpositional ideologies and movements, contains synonymies and colloquial usage of this term for

parties or coalitions of the parties of both left and right orientation. In this essay terminological units left and right are used to represent ideological position of parties and party blocks that is when ideological identity of a party or a coalition is referred to.

“Left and right” considers Bobbio “are two opposite terms which are for more than two centuries usually used to describe contrast between ideologies and movements into which the world is divided and which are in conflict themselves by their views as well as by their political actions”(Bobbio, 1997:13). Bipolarism represents a model of Anglo-Saxon world, in which politics is, without any traces of ideology, divided into two large blocks. However, the field of politics, which is in the center, is more and more considered to be a necessary and “natural” position. Norberto Bobbio challenges these views, arguing that the fundamental political distinction between Left and Right, which has shaped the two centuries since the French Revolution, has continuing relevance today. Bobbio explores the grounds of this elusive distinction and argues that Left and Right are ultimately divided by different attitudes to equality. He carefully defines the nature of equality and inequality in relative rather than absolute terms.

Traditional meaning of the right and the left leans on the idea of bipolar strategy of preservation that is destruction of existing political order. That distinction would mostly relate to the distinction between the oppressor and the suppressed as it is well noticed by Duverger in his work “Democracy without people”. Further on, within the frame of the traditional left and right, extreme and moderate elements or flows can be clearly noticed as well as distinction between them. Left extremists are revolutionaries who proclaim radical “one-act” change of existing political order in violent manner, while moderate left consists of reformists who, again, believe that existing political regime and society can be changed in evolutionary process and by a series of reforms in succession. On the other hand, considering the traditional right can lead to noticing distinctions depending on how and in what intensity it is believed that existing order and status quo should be defended, that is preserved.

Ultraconservatives believe that the order should be defended in whole by all available means, by force if needed, while the moderate right, in other words, moderate conservatives support an opinion that while concerning small matters they should give in and that unnecessary ballast should be rejected, but the heart of the matter should be preserved. In this theoretical frame of interpretation political center includes moderate elements and currents of both sides, so that two centers can be identified: the right and the left. The very “relation “ between centers or the “union”-of right center and left center provides with coali-

tion government-barre- consisting of coagulated parties or party blocks of right-centrist and left-centrist provenience. If we, then, start from Duverger's opinion that political struggle is dominated by "the right against the left" strategy, which is today basically coalition of blocks, and if in that political antagonism the dominating ideas are those of reformists or revolutionists, in other words of ultraconservatism or moderate-conservatism, then four basic political strategies can be identified as: extreme right, moderate right, reformative left and revolutionary left. Alliances between these fundamental tendencies and strategies are not being established in every country and during every period of time in the same way. In equal distance from both counterpositional political poles is the center or center orientated alliance. When he speaks about a degree of social integration, that is disintegration and about corresponding type of political system, Duverger specially points out that total social disintegration and complete absence of basic social consensus would be similar to some form of state of revolution in which an authoritarian regime of either left or right wing would be modeled and legalized. A weak consensus and fragile political compromise lead to a pluralist democracy of lower degree which is based on centralist politics. Finally, strong national and social consensus lead to establishing of authentic pluralist democracy that allows citizens-voters to relatively freely choose the left or the right. (Duverger, 1968:220).

This brief historical and analytically descriptive turn on the projected model of traditional party-binary geography was necessary in order to get an ideological profile and to find political position of the modern left and modern right. What both traditional and modern ideological-party binom have in common is the presence of radical extremism which carries in itself strong mark of antidemocracy, anticonstitutionalism, pseudoreformatism and ultranationalism, no matter if it's coming from the left or from the right. A significant mark of every form of political radical extremism, that is neoradicalism and radical politics in general is the presence of anti-enlightenment movement, and especially of the so-called irrational or religiously vital anti-enlightenment. "Anti-democracy as a radical negation of democracy" is what both extreme right and extreme left have in common (Bobio, 1997:38).

A dual understanding of horizontal dimension of politics, that is of "left-right" couple includes existence of certain ideologies belonging to either one or another political pole. In that way, on ideal types level, right ideological spectrum includes traditionalism, conservatism and fascism in the radical right, while the left doctrine's wide range spreads from scientific socialism to the liberal anarchism. Classical liberal ideology belongs to both the left and the right depending on the context and manner of observing. In the 20th century history fascism and com-

munism represented a great antithesis between the right and the left for criteria on which a left wing party differs from a right wing party is not completely congruent with a basis of a difference between extremist and moderate wing. In political practice fascism and communism exclude one another not taking into account their common enemy-democracy, which with its rules and procedures allows the competition between the right and the left and their turn-taking in the regular election cycles. What is in common and imminent to both fascism and communism is bringing of “characteristically ideological marks to the point of extreme consequence and this is exactly what makes them irreconcilable and practically incompatible doctrines”(Bobio,1997:45).

Multi-ideological coloring of post-communist systems

Modern post-communist right and left wing in Eastern-european and Yugoslavian region are in the process if “completed” democratic transition and relatively consolidated political order. However, more and more present tendency to relieve politics from ideology, present idea of the end of history (Fukuyama, 1989) or of the end of ideologies (D.Bel, 1990) impose some unavoidable and open questions or dilemmas. Connected to this, Zane Boudriar presents some sort of a dilemma or a debate issue in his work “Perfect Crime”. Supporting a view on people’s skepticism towards politics and preservation of fictional political space, he concludes that, on “the plain of radical intellect, an analysis on left-right opposition was published back in 1968. In Boudriar’s opinion even then it was known that the right and the left are non-existing, but proper consequences never came from that notion. Politics must be, he thinks, reprogrammed on the new foundations where no difference between the right and the left exists. According to this, questions follow: if the transition is understood as continuation of the left ideas, does it necessarily include the change of ideology, that is can triumph of right ideologies in post-communism be spoken of; If the right wind, in its first democratic burst blew off old one-party and mono-ideological regimes, does that mean that the right wing achieved historical victory over the left one; can we speak about transition of the right and the left, and do they still exist. This comparative analysis is directed to explain and give prospects of ideological mosaic of “new democracies”, that is of post-communist model of ideological architecture. In the following paragraphs I will try to offer you at least some answers to the previously made questions, to give personal observations and to up to a point put some light on binary ideological system in the new democracy and Serbia especially.

In almost all “new democracies” a sharp bipolarisation of the right and the left exists, while the political center, without which there

is no stable democracy, is shifted to the margins of historical scene. Strong presidential and semi-presidential systems in post-communist countries represent some kind of substitute for non-existing political center.

If the claim that stable and efficient democratic country is based on political center, which equally attracts nationalism and liberalism, is accepted, it can be noticed that in post-communist systems a latent conflict between national and liberal exists. Parties of liberal provenience and others who carry liberal political ideas in post-communist countries are equalizing, consciously or not, nationalism and totalitarianism and vice versa, which results in division of political space on the right and the left, to the detriment of political center.

Liberalism as political doctrinaire ideology, movement and practice achieved a historical victory worldwide because in it's teachings it anticipated "the end of history of all utopias and the beginning of history without normative ideas". Having noticed that behind the division on the left and the right the struggle between two utopias with different ideological connotations is hidden, post communist intellectual elite consistently abstains from active political participation. The reason and the motif of such passive behavior should be searched for in the fact that coherent and strong political center which would be relatively acceptable political option with it's balance between national and liberal does not exist. In the extreme case, the left or the right center is acceptable but never classical right or left. Therefore, one of the important pre-conditions for resuming stable and in real sense liberal democracy, in other words pluralistic order in post-communist countries is achieving consensus of liberal political powers on the issue that national interest includes social progress in general, prosperity of economy, autonomy of political decisions and culturally-traditional originality. Only after fulfillment of these conditions will every danger of eventual post-communist totalitarianism appearing be eliminated, including the danger in the form of super-presidential and semi-presidential systems of government. Certainly, the path towards overcoming these authoritarian and non-democratic tendencies and occurrences, *volens nolens*, starts at the stable political center.

The influence of electoral system on the process of forming ideological profiles of political parties

Debates that are held today about advantages and disadvantages of by majority controlled, that is proportional electoral system and their influence on party relief and ideological mosaic are current as well as open to new pros and cons arguments. Comparatively historic and analytical examinations of elections and electoral systems can be, qu-

ite simplifyingly, reduced to a maxim that “while proportional electoral systems produce paralysis, majority controlled system produces catalysis.” Actually, majority controlled electoral system favors large political blocks and party coalitions and encourages creation of a bipolar party scene, that is, produces two-party system or the system with two ideologies. Majority controlled system leads not only to establishing more stable and productive party system, but also to functioning of ideologically more flexible, democratic and transparent parties. On the other hand, proportional electoral system encourages not only fragmentation of the party system and devolution of larger parties, but also a greater ideologism, “mysticism” and bureaucracy in party system. Majority controlled democracy mean a relatively stable and efficient government whose term depends on the length of representatives’ term. On the other hand, majority controlled electoral system provides with pretty easier forming, aggregation and articulation of political strategies and ideological landmark, in other words it significantly influences party-ideological bipolarization. Bifurcation of ideas of party landscape is making easier for the voters to choose between one and the other political strategy, that is one or the other party-formed politics. Majority controlled system in two electoral rounds is an efficient way to distill party scene. In France, for example, thanks to such a system LePen’s NationalFront is traditionally insignificant power in parliament. In Italy preserving a proportional quota enables neoreformed communists to maintain in the role of “the third disruptive party”.

Coexistence of a proportional electoral system and semi-presidentialism, as it is the case in Serbia, produces contradictory influence on “political environment” and constitutional order in general. Semi-presidential system encourages grouping of parties into coalitions or two parties which strengthens the tendency for two party system, while proportional electoral system secures existence of more than two parties. Efficiency of these two institutions-semi-presidentialism and proportional system- which is noticed in achieving a basic consensus is also contradictory: presidentialism immanently encourages extreme polarization for it creates absolute losers and absolute winners on presidential elections, while proportional system secures assumptions for compromise between all relevant political forces.

Proportional electoral system gives the truest picture of expressed voters will by distribution of representatives’ mandates in proportion with the number of votes that are won. By producing a fragmented party and parliamentary system, proportion as method reproduces an extremely party heterogeneous and unstable coalition government whose term, that is survival is decided upon on the level of ephemeral political negotiations in which most often small representatives’ groups

and “couch” parties have the leading role. In European left wing proportional electoral system was always judged as synonym for regularity and democracy, supposedly because it gave the real picture of the voters expressed will in parliament. At the beginning of this century the left especially favored proportional electoral system for it enabled the left, which was a growing political power, to enter parliament and win representatives’ mandates. Fighting against majority controlled system from the start, the left considered that system to be basically reactionary and elitist because it disabled the party that represented a coherent program and politics to be chosen. In that system individuals are chosen to represent local interests of their electoral unit, and not interests of the whole society. Time and practice, however, proved something else. Gabriel Almond thinks that majority system can not exist in every society because that system is an expression and proof of well-developed society. Contrary to an assumption that majority system creates bipolar society, what actually happens is that already bipolarized society creates majority system. Divisions on the right and the left, which existed, were not formed by electoral system (Almond, 1974:145).

The left and the right in Serbia

Previously mentioned theoretical observations enable a relatively valid empirical analysis of ideological political parties’ platform in Serbia to be performed. Relevant parties which are dominating and actively participate in Serbia political scene can not be clearly ideologically identified nor classified as parties of the right or parties of the left. Insufficient ideological profile of the parties is due to a nonexistent yet necessary correspondence between party and social structure, in other word insufficient sedimentation of the parties’ landscape in social and class basis of society. I will talk more about that later. Political parties in their programs and practical activities contain elements of both left and right political option so that ideological hybrid at great extent complicates party scene internally and externally. Taking into an account that party topography in Serbia still does not have democratic structure and is not socially established in social and political system, hardly any strict classification of parties can be produced, in the sense that one party represents one and another party another ideological orientation or political strategy. In one single party both left and right ideas can be found, and it’s not a rare thing to see right wing and left fraction acting together. The degree of achieved convergence and coexistence of two currents or ideological fractions is determent by a degree of party’s internal stability and cohesion. For classification of parties along the left-right line we need to focus on certain permanent points or dilemmas such as, for example, social issues, question of the form of government- republic or

monarchy, national issue, the question of state or private property, or parties' relation towards UN.

Inner-party bifurcation of interests and choices, that is coexistence of both right and left elements has significant influence on the contents of the party program, political platform and parties' activity. Wide-range insufficiency of democratic potential in a society and political order, ideological dualism, in a way even eclecticism produce in a great degree charismatically clientistic and individually authoritarian parties. The reproduction of special "cazaropopistic" parties in our political environment is backed up by a subject to authority type of political culture and Serbian mentality of the inferior. The existing ideological confusion suits the political climate in whole and party leaders who are compiling different ideas and political options skillfully manipulating with party members as well as with voters. However, to steer the party across the stormy seas of politics carries in itself the latent danger of creating the swampy "dungeon" caves at touching the surface. The "dungeon" caves can stand the party's "cargo", yet it is not rare to see how invisible rocks under the surface take the party with it's ideological luggage down to the muddy political bottom.

Observing the present Serbian political scene it is possible to identify few political options in the right ideological wing: neoliberalism or the moderate right, the extreme right or the right radicalism and the traditionally conservative right, whereas the left ideological spectrum includes the moderate left and the extreme left of the "newcomposed" business. According to the claims of the members of the local left wing, that very left wing at the elections should be composed from those who carry "patriotic, democratic and progressive views". From this state an ideological syncretism, inconsistency and even confusion of ideas in the left political pole can clearly be noticed. The analysis of up to now gathered election results of the parties gravitating towards the middle, between the left and the right ideological and program option, show that the center parties won 10% of voters. The struggle for political center and winning or taking the larger seat the better is yet to come.

In the civilian poverty situation of wide range when a great number of citizens depend on the state, every neoliberal right program sends clear message to the pensioners, the unemployed and other socially troubled categories what they may expect in the case the right wins the elections. The ultimate modalities of the left-egality and of the right-liberalism suffered a relative failure on our political scene. If political center is strengthening the poles are getting weaker which does not necessarily mean that in near future an ideological pendulum can not again "swing" a little bit too much to the left or to the right.

Parties that till yesterday were promising quick changes, today are giving up on that radical and proclaimed enterprises which is a sure sign of voters turning towards the parties of socialdemocratic orientation. In recent period in the statements of extremely national, maybe even nationalist party leaders, one can hear that those parties are parties of the moderate right and the right center. A contemporary party landscape more and more shows the characteristics of and tendencies to dichotomous composition of political universe. The existence and activity of two large, more or less, united block coalition or alliance is an expression of not only a need for ideological unity but also a consequence of relatively aggregated yet not clearly enough articulated social structure of interest. A certain deballans of a party architecture to come is possible and desirable, which is indicated by certain signals and impulses, located between the left and the right block. Political center block (barre) would incorporate in itself the center of center parties as well as the parties of the left or the right center. In such a way a triad party-block scene would gain dynamics, attractiveness and uncertainty, but on the other hand it would surely attribute to a reduction of present extreme polarization which presents a constant threat of potential conflict. After all, voters' mood, influenced by whole-scale social crisis and more and more bigger social differences, as well as insufficiently modeled ideas on the party scene, indicates that in time to come political pendulum will more and more oscillate from the right to the left center and vice versa, but not from the right to the left wing, that is from one to another extreme pole. Social and economic swings in society and inconsistency of the main characters on political scene lead to a creation of political amalgam which would include the moderate left and the moderate right, but at the same time tend to making a certain ballans of small amplitudes inside the political center.

If we take under consideration a broader horizon of ideas or political philosophy, almost all-political parties suffer from chronicle insufficiency of getting into a profile in the field of ideas. Opinion about bipolar political scene in Serbia is based on assumption that the moderate left exists next to the right center. On the other hand, in the time of post-pluralistic shock when the dynamic, rational and modern political strategies of development should have been expected, many of oppositional parties are of too much traditional and monarchy-nationalistic orientation. In the time of mass impoverment and more and more greater social chasm, a large portion of oppositional parties seem to still be the proclaimer of idealized neoliberalist variant, in other words neoconservatism, which does not exist in such a form and is not even functioning in the countries with parliamentary democracy.

In accordance with more and more present socially economic and political bipolarisation of society, which becomes more and more anemic and potentially quite implosive, some anachronist and politically retrograde ideas and tendencies are appearing. They carry the mark of ever-lasting political apo-kastasis and meaningless worshipping of an individual. Finally, it can be concluded that we are witnessing a process of pseudo-pluralization or quasi-pluralistic social democratization which leads to over-expressed demagogic or manipulative ideologization of political life. In other words, fictional ideas about the left, the right or the center are becoming crystal clear if the real nature of political system is perceived, that is if the essence is realized as well as the way the political institutions and the country functions in general.

The non-existence of ideological profile and party system's sediment results in insufficiently respectable and far from influential parliament, which unavoidably leads to the strengthening of executive vis-à-vis legislation and transforming parliamentary or semi-parliamentary systems into presidential or super-presidential systems. The essential issue, which almost all post-communist countries are facing, is how to design horizontal plain's optimal model of power organization and of realistically acceptable party configuration. Dilemmas that the post-communist countries now deal with are: whether to opt between two or three or multi-party systems and which form of government organization to choose. In other words which institutional arrangement to accept-classical parliamentary or semi-presidential or presidential arrangement. The time, that proved more than once to be the best judge and interpreter of history, will provide with answers to these dilemmas.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alan Ware: *Political Parties and Party Systems*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- A. Panebianco, *Political Parties: Organization and Power*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Giovanni Sartori: *Parties and Party Systems*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- O.Kirchheimer, "The Transformation of Western Party Systems", in J. LaPalombara-M.
- Weiner eds., *Political Parties and Political Development*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966.
- Maurice Duverger: *Political Parties*, 1964.
- Norberto Bobbio: *The Left and Right: The Significance of a Political Distinction*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997.
- Norberto Bobio: *Democracy and Dictatorship*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989.
- Katz, S.R. - P.Mair, (eds.), *Party Organizations: A Data Handbook*, London, 1992.

Summary

The most of “new democracy” (postcommunist countries) is characterized by insufficiently diversified and ideologically non-established party system. The presence of different ideological orientations, often artificial and contradictory yet scientifically party amalgams, points out social non-differentiation of post-communist societies and fluidity, which is actually inconsistency of party’s voters. Post-communist ideological spectrum includes a great number of variants or models of both the left and the right option. Certain ideological confusion, largely stimulated by party elite or oligarchies themselves, is producing unstable and disfunctional political system, and this is making conditions for the latent yet disturbing crisis of the country and it’s order. The strengthening of political center is weakening the extreme left and the extreme right, in other words it de-radicalizes politics and voters. On the other hand, creation of a centrist alliance leads to relative stability and greater democracy of the system, that is it leads to acceptance of the basic postulate for minimal or procedure democracy.

Зоран Крстић

Факултет политичких наука, Београд

Резиме

За већину „новодемократских“ (посткомунистичких) држава карактеристичан је политички систем који није успостављен нити довољно разграничен по идеолошким основама. Различите идеолошке оријентације, често мешавина уметних и контрадикторних, а ипак научно дефинисаних партијских коалиција, указују на друштвену неиздиференцираност и несталност у тим пост-комунистичким државама, што се у стварности одражава у недоследности у гласању за политичке партије. Посткомунистички идеолошки спектрум садржи велики број варијанти или модела и леве и десне опције. Извесна идеолошка конфузија, коју углавном условљавају сама партијска елита и олигарси, производи нестабилан и дисфункционалан политички систем, и то ствара услове за латентну и узнемиравајућу кризу државе и њеног поретка. Јачање политичког центра слаби екстремну левицу и екстремну десницу, другим речима оно дерадикализује политику и гласаче. С друге стране, стварање централистичке коалиције води ка релативној стабилности и већој демократичности система, односно води ка прихваћању основних постулата минималне или процедуралне демократије.