

## **Model of the modern political party in terms of democratic transition**

There were analyzed specifics of the evolution and function of political parties in the transforming societies. Reasons and aftermaths of “political parties’ crisis” in 70-x and 80-x years of XX century were envisaged.

It was characterized correlation of the phases of the transition to democracy and political parties’ types. Influence on the establishing of the political parties, socio-political distinctions, forms of government, electoral system was described.

There were made conclusions about the main characteristics of political parties in transitional societies.

*Keywords: political party, transitional societies, countries of Central-East Europe, socio-political distinctions, form of government, electoral system.*

## **Модель сучасної політичної партії в конструкції демократичного транзиту**

Проаналізовано специфіку еволюції функцій політичних партій в суспільствах, які трансформуються. Розглянуто підстави та чинники «кризи політичних партій» у 70-х та 80-х роках двадцятого сторіччя. Дано характеристику етапів транзиту до демократії та типів політичних партій. Простежено взаємовплив політичних партій та соціополітичних поділів, форм правління та виборчих систем. Отримано висновки щодо головних характеристик політичних партій в транзитних суспільствах.

*Ключові слова: політичні партії, транзитне суспільство, країни Центрально-Східної Європи, соціополітичний поділ, форми правління, виборчі системи.*

**Articulation of issue:** Characteristics of any phenomenon requests an understanding of its nature (essence) and sense of functioning. So we examine phenomena in context of structural-functional paradigm.

Examining political parties as institutes, there should be kept in mind: a) basic tools that are reflections of their institutional features: program, organizational structure, social base etc; b) specifics of social-cultural environment, wherein parties operate (present social-political

distinctions, transit society/entrenched democracy etc.); c) specifics of institutional environment (form of government, electoral system).

Analyzing the political party's main parameters of political party in transit society, first of all, need to describe a classic model of political party, which has been formed during XX century. The paradigm setup of the researchers of political parties was the belief, that party, as a political organization, should be examined in the relationship system «civil society – party – state», namely as transmitter between society and the state. Second, party has been considered as political institute, whose main goal of activity is power struggle, taking part in the power relationships realization. Third, party has been considered as organization that has a program (ideological profile), organizational structure (set up by a statute) and social base (fixed membership, as a rule) [10; 14; 15; 16].

In years 1970–1980 in political life of the Western countries are being conducted political processes, can be called as a crisis of parliament democracy. First of all it's about the social changes, within which the middle-class rising, women activity in political life, migration of population and some other should be emphasized. It is also important to note the crisis of traditional ideologies and formation of the post-material values system (concerned with career, cultural requests, prestige etc).

At the same time a number of researchers consider that crisis has taken over the old type of parties – mass parties – and given an impulse to the appearance of the new forms of party life – panoptic and cartel parties.

A transition to a democracy in countries of Central and East Europe also fostered appearance of the new party formations in terms of transformation of social and political structures. New political parties had been organizationally built according to the principle of panoptic parties, as a rule, and their special functioning feature was determined by the specifics of democratic transition.

**Objective** of this article is characteristics of the modern political party's model in the terms of democratic transition. For the achievement of set objective it's necessary to solve the following goals: a) to research the reason of “party crisis” in 70-x years of XX century; b) to characterize essential features of political parties in transit societies.

Problem of the institutional features of political parties in “new democracies” is being actively evolved as foreign (V. Helman [2], H. Golosov [3], G. Ishiyama [7], T. Carosers, R. Katz [17], R. Kitchelt [18], S. Lipset [8; 9], P. Mayer [17], A. Ryommele [12], G. Sartory) so the domestic specialists (V. Bun' [1], M. Karmazina, A. Kolodiy, A. Klyuckkovich, V. Lebedyuk, Y. Ostapets' [10], A. Romanyuk [11], M. Prymush).

Evolvement and activity of political parties in societies that transforming, in some measure, are determined by the process of democratic transition. It is researched special branch of comparative political science “theory of transition”, or transitology. Analyzing the transition to the democracy, the majority of transitologists places an emphasis on the number of phases. There

was popular a model of democratic transition that was proposed by American politologist D. Rustow for a long time. Comparing the transitions to democracy in Sweden (from 1890 till 1920) and Turkey (from 1940 till 1960), he has marked three phases out: preparing phase, where the conflicts between main social groups get sharpened; phase of decision's making, when the compromise on the new democratic political game's rules get reached between the political actors; phase of acclimatization, during which democratic institutes gain their role. As the main requirement of the democratic transitions he considered the national unity.

Some similar model of transition to the democracy is proposed by the American politologists F. Schmitter and G. O'Donnel. They marked such phases of the transition out: of liberalization, of democratization, resocialization. Phase of liberalization begins at the crisis of authoritarian or totalitarian regimes and crisis of elite's identity that ends with their divide. Phase of democratization differs itself by the institutional changes in the political system. On this phase there are appearing such political institutes as political parties, electoral system, that give a possibility to form authorities in a democratic way. During the resocialization acquirement and adoption of the democratic values and game rules by citizens and step-to-step inclusion of them to the new political system takes place – there forms a democratic society.

Other authors call this phase a phase of consolidation. So, the logic of party systems establishing is subordinated to the already mentioned logic of political transition. Such an evolution ends with a consolidation of party system. On the every of these phases party system has their configuration and corresponding factors make an influence on its establishing. On the phase of liberalization takes place a political split on the leftists and rightists, governing and opposing parties. Then splitting takes place within the governing party and opposition [13].

An essential influence on the evolution of political parties in the terms of transformation, on thought of Y. Ostapet's makes an objective process of the development of party structures in the modern world. Such regularity exists and has been described by the scientists. The question is historical phases of institutionalization of political parties. In political science next phases are marked out: 1) aristocratic groups; 2) political clubs; 3) mass political parties; 4) panoptic political parties; 5) cartel political parties. Therefore, political parties that establish in new democracies shall act and are acting on the panoptic and cartel parties' functioning principles [10, p. 8].

Universal parties (electoral-professional parties or "get-them-all"-parties) don't claim the intellectual and moral domination anymore, aiming at the success on the elections. These «interclass» organizations consider their widening but trying to consolidate the maximal number of electors of different social, ethnic and other belonging for the solving of the main questions of the moment. Such parties are forming around the pragmatic leader (or leaders) of a common-national scale, as a rule, that offers to society the ideas of harmony, compromise, balance of interests.

Process of transforming of ideological parties in universal is being conducted in the direction of strengthening their direct connection with state and also connections between the

parties. It appears a type of “cartel parties” on this ground. This kind of parties becomes a mechanism of state offices’ sharing between professional groups of politicians. Such a mechanism is based, first of all, on the unmediated ties of politician and elector without any help of party organization. Moreover, it is based on the wide coalition basis and shortening the distance between electors and political leaders [17].

Sure, one can speak on the specific way of party system establishing in the post-communist countries. First of all, there should be emphasized that in difference with Western Europe countries, whose party building process has begun from below are distinguished in Central-Europe countries, where all was conversely – from above to below. That means the institutional forming of the elites (groups and interests) taken place first and then terms for appearance and institutionalization of political parties being created. Hereout comes the affirmation of the low-level political participation in the «third wave» democracies by the researchers.

V. Merkel marks 5 factors out that make an influence on the party system configuration in the post-communist countries: 1) character of transformational conflict; 2) presence of «historical» parties; 3) influence of political institutes; 4) presence of the clientalist traditions; 5) influence of social-political division [10, p. 9].

Lviv scientist A. Romanyuk considers that evolvement of modern party systems in Central-Eastern Europe is determined by the turning points of post-authoritarian and democratic history of parties. The first is forced by collapses of authoritarian regimes in the region (party pluralism has appeared as a consequence), the second – by the consequences of the first/constituent elections in the certain countries of the region (inasmuch the ideological parties have begun to appear or restore), the third – by the specifics and consequences of the eurointegrative processes in the region (political parties became more structured). Every single turning point in the political parties’ evolvement has been added by a qualitative change of the social-group structuring of the different countries and transformation of their party systems [11, c. 285–288].

Other researcher of the party systems’ evolution in the CEE countries G. Kitchelt has constructed three (perfect) types of parties in the period of the transition to the consolidated democracy:

1. Program parties – the parties which are bounded with existing conflict lines and which have ideological or worldview basis. As a rule, they represent the interests of the certain population swath. The mobilize groups of electors on the basis of their program documents.
2. Charismatic parties are the parties, whose identity is determined by a charismatic leader and isn’t tied with contensive constituent of their policy.
3. Clientalist parties also impede the consolidation of democracy. Through such parties promise general goods but in fact, they care first of all about supplying of their clientele in a way of different resources sharing: subventions, tax reliefs, social goods [18, p. 76].

K. Janda marked next type of parties in CEE countries out:

1. Parties of mass democratic movements («Solidarity» in Poland, «Civil Forum» in Czechia, «Sajūdis» in Lithuania, «Union of Democratic Forces» in Bulgaria, «National Salvation Front» in Romania etc.).
2. Parties – rudiments of communist parties.
3. Restored pre-war parties (liberal, conservative, rural).
4. Ethnic parties (hungarian parties in Romania, Slovakia).
5. Religious parties.
6. Parties of western political values (feminist, environment protection etc.).
7. “Exotic” parties (parties of beer fans) [6, p. 132].

So, party development of the new democracy countries is characterized by tendency of forming of parties with an unstable electoral base, wherein party leadership performs the main role, inasmuch the party system isn't established yet.

This process is concerned with several circumstances. First, parties have to appeal to the wide circle of electors foremost, because they cannot rely on the support of the electorate with established political vocation, because there was any under the authoritarianism. Second, parties don't seek to widen their members' number, because their financial resources don't depend from the number of members, and with lower number of members, the chance of the potential challenge within party reduces. Third, depoliticized citizens of post-communist countries don't expose an inclination to the ideological and party symbols identification – they prefer powerful personalities. Therefore the highest chances in post-communist politics has universal parties, where party leadership plays the dominate role and the party structure – secondary.

The essential influence on the party system evolution makes social-political stratification. Founders of the social-political stratification theory S. Lipset and S. Roccan have considered the establishment and evolvement of Western party systems in close ties with revolutionary transformations and contradictions that have been appeared between center and periphery, between state and the Church, between city and countryside, between owners and workers [8, p. 204–235].

This approach presents party systems as reflection of societal conflicts or political competition's structure that has been forged between different groups of population.

The structure of social-political division in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe has its own specifics. Divisions that come from the socialist past and reflex, first of all, in the mental characteristics of the electors – authoritarian values of the powerful state and powerful leader, although they losing significance, they still determine the existence of the “divide” between those, who gained benefits from the “old” regime and those, who won in a result of “transitional” period.

A high mobilization level of population in a communist regime, negative take of communist past by electors explain in a great measure the fact that individuals in Central and Eastern Europe don't qualify themselves with political parties, are unstable in their party-political preferences, passive, inclined to the positive reaction of populist and nationalist parties.

It must be noted that according to the O. Donova, the characteristic of the post-communist electorate as unstructured and «atomized» had a momentum in the beginning period of transformation. The situation has changed with the lapse of time – definition of the main ideological blocks and structuring of the party of the party-political space reduces the level of the disorientation of electors. Electors that had won are inclined to the support of liberal-free market programs and parties. And, vice versa, the disaffection for the economic situation can enforce to vote for the parties that stay on antidemocratic and anti-market positions. It points onto the presence of social-political division on the social-political ground in post-communist countries [4].

In general, it's noteworthy that specifics of social-political divisions in Central and Eastern Europe countries are determined by the regional historical development specifics, authoritarian regime experience, specifics of the democratic transition first of all. On the other hand, communist regime has weakened the historical structure of the division to the point, where they stopped to be the ground of electoral proclivity and party competition. So, social-political divisions of societies that transforming bearing the imprint of the social conflicts' structure, that has been existed even before the entrenchment of the authoritarian regimes.

A. Ryommele has defined such four mandatory distinctions in political divisions in Central and Eastern Europe, different from the Western Europe.

First, it's a path and difficulty of the transition. Post-communist Europe really experiences “triple” transition that foresees not just a democratization but also massive transition to the market economy and state building.

Second stays the difference of the electorates. In party systems that had been formed in the West is being preserved the incline to the inheritance and inertance. In Eastern and Central Europe electorate is much more opened and responsive to the influence.

Third, there are differences in the type of the party. New parties in countries of Central-Eastern Europe are more charismatic and clientelist than program. Fourth – the role of media. In the countries of Central and Eastern Europe media were to be strictly censored and controlled under the communist regimes. They played a role of an ruling elite's tool, with the help of which state policy and ruling ideology has been popularized [12, p. 30–45].

Summarizing different original approaches it could be laid an emphasis onto seven problematic dimensions that correlate with conflict lines of S. Lipset and S. Roccan and which are typical for the post-communist societies. These are next dimensions: cultural-ethnic, religious, social-economic, of foreign policy, post-material, dimension “city-countryside” and dimension of the “regime support”.

**Conclusions.** In societies that are being in the state of transformation a lot of parties are registering. It's sure that only a part of them takes a part In the political life of the society, so not any of them could be considered as a party system. According to our point of view as a part of party system should be considered the parties that: a) express the essential interests of society and being supported by the citizens; b) bidding political and law principles that are regulating party competition; c) reaching a representation in the state authorities.

The main factors that are making influence on the forming of political parties and political systems in transitional societies are the next: a) objective terms that are defining the specifics of functioning of the party systems in the modern world; b) logic of the transformational process in one or another country; c) choice of the government form; d) election system; e) social-political divisions.

After characterized the specifics of functioning of political parties in transitional societies, such a «perfect types» of parties can be marked out: a) charismatic parties; b) clientist parties; c) program parties; d) quasipolitical parties.

## Література

1. Бунь В. Соціополітичні поділи як детермінанти електорального вибору: суть та основні теорії. *Науковий вісник Ужгородського університету. Серія: Політологія, Соціологія, Філософія*. 2009. Вип. 12. С. 79–83.
2. Гельман В. «Учредительные выборы» в контексте российской трансформации. *Общественные науки и современность*. 1996. № 6. С. 46–64.
3. Голосов Г. Форматы партийных систем в новых демократиях: институциональные факторы неустойчивости и фрагментации. *Политические исследования*. 1998. №1. С.106–130.
4. Деттербек К. Картельные партии в Западной Европе. *Политическая наука: Политические партии и партийные системы в современном мире*. М.: ИНИОН РАН, 2006. С. 45–54.
5. Донова О. Социально-политические размежевания и их трансляция в политическую систему стран Центральной и Восточной Европы. *Политическая наука: Социально-политические размежевания и консолидация партийных систем*. 2004. № 4. С. 101–125.
6. Елисеев С. Социальные и политические размежевания, институциональные предпосылки и условия консолидации партийных систем в демократическом транзите. *Политическая наука: Социально-политические размежевания и консолидация партийных систем*. 2004. № 4. С. 64–89.
7. Ишияма Дж. Партии-преемницы коммунистических и организационное развитие партий в посткоммунистической политике. *Политические исследования*. 1999. № 4. С. 14–27.
8. Липсет С. Структуры размежеваний, партийные системы и предпочтения избирателей. Предварительные замечания. *Политическая наука: Социально-политические размежевания и консолидация партийных систем*. 2004. № 4. С. 204–235.
9. Липсет С. Неизбывность политических партий. *Политическая наука: Политические партии и партийные системы в современном мире*. 2006. № 1. С. 14–27.

10. Остапеч Ю., Шестак Н., Дудінська І. Еволюція партійної системи України в умовах трансформації соціальних і політичних структур. Ужгород: ЗІППО, 2016. 252 с.
11. Романюк А., Литвин В., Панчак-Бялоблоцька Н. Політичні інститути країн Центрально-Східної Європи: порівняльний аналіз. Львів: ЛНУ імені Івана Франка, 2014. 462 с.
12. Рёммеле А. Структура размежевания и партийные системы в Восточной и Центральной Европе. *Политическая наука: Социально-политические размежевания и консолидация партийных систем*. 2004. № 4. С.30–51.
13. Хомин І. Методологічні засади дослідження міжпартійних взаємодій у суспільствах, що трансформуються. *Вісник НТУУ «КПІ». Серія Політологія. Соціологія. Право*. Випуск 2. 2012. С.38–43.
14. Шведа Ю. Партії та вибори: енциклопедичний словник. Львів: Видавничий центр ЛНУ імені Івана Франка, 2010. 750 с.
15. Herbut R. Teoria i praktyka funkcjonowania partii politycznych. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 2002. 224 s.
16. Janda K.. Political Parties: A Cross-National Survey. New York: The Free Press, 1980. 178 p.
17. Katz R., Mair P. Changing Models of Party Organization and Party Democracy. The Emergence of the Cartel Party. *Party Politics*. 1995. Vol. 1, № 1. P. 18–34.
18. Kitschelt H. European Party Systems: Continuity and Change. *Developments in West European Politics*. London: MacMillan Press., 1997. 363 p.