Lytvyn Vitaliy

Governments of national unity in the context of coalition majority governments: conceptualization, cases, political causes and consequences by the example of european democracies

The article presents the cases, theoretical and methodological determination, structuring and modelling of governments of national unity thorough the example of European democracies. The author implements the analysis of theoretical and practical dimensions of governments of national unity and, based on the party-dimensional and ideologically formative components, proposes the mechanism of governments of national unity formation. The researcher also defines the preconditions and determinants of governments of national unity formation and the impact and significance of governments of national unity in the political process.

Keywords: *government, grand coalition, government of national unity, coalition majority government, democracy.*

УРЯДИ НАЦІОНАЛЬНОЇ ЄДНОСТІ У КОНТЕКСТІ КОАЛІЦІЙНИХ УРЯДІВ БІЛЬШОСТІ: КОНЦЕПТУАЛІЗАЦІЯ, КЕЙСИ, ПОЛІТИЧНІ ПРИЧИНИ ТА НАСЛІДКИ НА ПРИКЛАДІ ЄВРОПЕЙСЬКИХ ДЕМОКРАТІЙ

У статті проаналізовано кейси, теоретико-методологічне дефініювання, структурування і моделювання урядів національної єдності на прикладі європейських демократій. Реалізовано аналіз теоретичних вимірів урядів національної єдності, а на підставі партійно-розмірної складової запропоновано різновиди формування урядів національної єдності. Виділено і структуровано моделі, передумови і детермінанти формування урядів національної єдності, а теж схарактеризовано вплив і значення урядів національної єдності на політичний процес.

Ключові слова: *уряд, велика коаліція, уряд національної єдності, коаліційний уряд більшості, демократія.*

Range of problems of government formations and resignations is considered to be one of the most important and controversial issues in Comparative Political Science. This is to

a lesser extent noticeable in the context of Western European consolidated democracies, but often accompanies institutional processes in "new" Central and Eastern European democracies, although developed through the patterns of their homologues in Western Europe, but not always fully echoed to them. Such situations are particularly marked and observed in the cases of critical periods of political, social and economic development, when to initiate the so-called "governments of national unity" is considered as a perspective for solving existing problems in a distributed (when there is no sufficient reason to talk about domination of a political party or coalition) political environment. Therefore, the question of conceptual outline the essence of "governments of national unity" and their functional purpose must receive independent theoretical, methodological and practical significance, especially due to the fact that these types of governments were formed in a number of Western, Central and Eastern European countries.

The separation of governments of national unity is not based on the appeal to common typologies of governments. One of the most tested is considered to be the typology, which was proposed by A. Lijphart in 1999[1]. In accordance with it, it is necessary to single out the following types of governments: single-party majority governments, single-party minority governments, minimum winning coalitions, and surplus (surplus winning) coalitions, minority coalition governments, temporary governments, grand coalitions, non-partisan governments/ governments of experts (technocratic governments) and presidential governments (which are formed without the involvement of a composition of parliament on the basis of authority of the presidents). The above-mentioned scheme is supported by the other researchers, including J. Woldendorp, H. Keman and I. Budge[2], S. Berglund, J. Ekman and F. Aarebrot[3]. However, this scheme (not including governments of national unity) to a large extent is effective and combines both party-dimensional and party-ideological vectors and demands. Following the party dimension, for example, requires the distinction of single-party and coalition majority and minority governments (and also their detailed evaluation). In return, keeping the party and ideological vector involves the distinction of party and nonparty governments and also the classification of coalition majority governments. Obviously, in terms of theoretical and methodological terms these categories are not always proportionate and mutually complementary, especially when it comes to determining the "grand" coalitions and governments of national unity (as their supposed sub-type[4]) that certainly always are coalitional majority governments.

Some authors note that grand coalitions and governments of national unity are a theoretical entity. Such researchers take into account the party-ideological component of grand coalitions' formation and argue that there are two subtypes of grand coalitions. The first one are formed

1 A. Lijphart, *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries*, Wyd. Yale University Press 1999, s. 90–115.

2 J. Woldendorp, H. Keman, J. Budge, *Party Government in 48 Democracies (1945-1998): composition, duration, personnel*, Wyd. Kluwer Academic Publishers 2000.

3 S. Berglund, J. Ekman, F. Aarebrot, *The Handbook of Political Change in Eastern Europe: [second edition]*, Wyd. Edward Elgar Publishing 2004.

4 V. Lytvyn, A. Romaniuk, *Velyki koalitsii u konteksti koalitsiinykh uriadiv bilshosti: kontseptualizatsiia, politychni prychyny ta naslidky na prykladi parlamentskykh demokratii u Yevropi*, „Naukovi zapysky Instytutu politychnykh i etnonatsionalnykh doslidzhen im. I.F. Kurasa NAN Ukrainy" 2013, vol 2, nr. 64, s. 473–504.

on the logic of governments of national unity and provide the process of integration of all (or almost all, especially the largest) major parliamentary parties into grand coalition when ideological or political party preferences do not play a practical role. The second one are formed on the logic of a simple combination of ideologically incompatible (or opposite), but also the largest parliamentary parties, provided that other parties within the parliament are opposed to government parties. However, in the second case we exceptionally see broad coalitions, where the breadth attribute provides for a combination of party and ideological incompatibility. In such a design, the limit of separation between different models of grand coalition is conditional, because every broad coalition based on various reasons may be transformed into government of national unity and vice versa. Nevertheless, we know historically that governments of national unity are mainly used in conditions where a country faces a crisis in the broad sense (political or socio-economic crisis, military situation etc.). Instead, broad coalitions are mostly formed only when the traditional formats of coalitions' formation do not work and it is necessary to search for "unnatural" political allies and to overcome their ideological differences. Accordingly, based on the theoretical and methodological comments suggested above we should consider as an option such variants of coalitions, which unite all (or almost all) parliamentary parties, i.e. so-called governments of national unity. We also have to understand two methodological conclusions: a) grand coalitions differ from governments (coalitions) of national unity and the last one also include combinations of ideologically opposite parliamentary parties but not all of them possess the coalitional potential. Besides, they have different mechanisms and motives for the formation of governments national unity; b) there are special perspective for some consensual democracies, which include formation of non-typical prototypes of coalition majority governments that are almost similar to grand coalitions and governments of national unity by their construction (this case demands special analysis, in particular, the cases of Switzerland from 1943 and Belgium from 1973).

We should understand that the term "government of national unity" means the governments, which foresee combination of all (or all large parliamentary parties) parliamentary parties in coalition when ideological or political preferences of the parties practically do not play an important role. Such governments are usually formed of governmental parties and the total number of their mandates, hypothetically, is not lower than 90 percent. The divergent feature of governments of national unity and grand coalitions is the fact that ideological and formative confrontation of the main parties in the mentioned context is outside the process of government formation. It means, for example, that the union of the largest parliamentary parties may happen, but at the same time the coalition includes ideologically and politically opposed smaller parties. Technically, the difference of grand coalitions is the fact that there is consideration of the absolute and relative size of the government parties and their ideological status or traditional position on formative status and in the governments of national unity the attention is paid towards the view of any growth of coalition majority, especially in the context

of proportional representation. Apart from that, grand coalitions are formed when other ways of parliamentary parties' cooperation are proved to be impossible and, vice versa, the governments of national unity cannot occur when traditional models of government formation are possible. In other words, governments of national unity are immanently trying to provide as wide ideological representation as possible when grand coalitions work on it constrainedly. On this basis, governments of national unity are mainly formed in terms of economic, social or military crises (but not parliamentary, when outdated coalition partner parties cannot form the traditional construction of coalition governments that are more typical of a grand coalition). Conventionally, a grand coalition in this regard should be interpreted as a "coalition of the opposite range" and a government of national unity as a "coalition of full/maximum range". Raising the question requires a separate and more detailed consideration of government of national unity.

In practice, it has been realized many examples of governments of national unity, which will be discussed later. But it is worth noting that a governments of national unity in some countries do not fall under the traditional ways of their interpretation. This is due to the peculiarities of party and electoral systems, constitutional systems of government and democratic models sold in these countries. Therefore, we must focus on the fact that based on the specifics of the national governments of some countries we should expect possible displacement of how to interpret and classify governments of national unity, even within European countries.

Getting the analysis of the main political reasons of government of national unity, it should be emphasized that in most cases they are based on the specific political or historical background as well as on the determinants of the formation of grand coalitions. In general, it is necessary to separate the two sets of interpreters causes of government of national unity. The first set applies only to the voluntary process of creating governments of national unity. This is permissible in the cases of governments of national unity formed for the purpose in order to limit the negative impact of radical left-wing or right-wing parties that have representation in a parliament. Sometimes the formation of governments of national unity is a tradition of some political systems, which the most successful experience demonstrates Belgium and Switzerland. The second set of interpreters relates solely to the involuntary process of creating a government of national unity and this is evident in the case of failure in the process of formation of other models of single-party or coalition majority or minority governments (i.e. in situations of government crisis).

Also it is necessary to isolate scenarios of how necessary it turns a government of national unity. It developed two hypothetical cases. The first one, absolute, is relevant regarding situations, in which no forming of government of national unity serves as a technical and political basis concerning the possibility of dissolution of a parliament. In addition, the mechanism describes the practice of some countries where governments of national unity are institutionalized and self-sufficient mechanisms. The second one, relative, scenario occurs when it is possible the formation of, for example, single-party majority government, but are combined all (or almost all) parliamentary

parties. The most self-sufficient example of the second scenario, we believe, are the governmental cabinets in Western Europe during the First and Second World Wars and in some Central and Eastern European countries at the stage of their political transformation in the late 80's – early 90's of XX century. Therefore, it is necessary to distinguish (in most cases since 1944) the most famous cases of governments of national unity from among the democratic nations of Europe.

First of all, we should talk about the *United Kingdom*. It should be noted that the FPTP electoral system, which takes place in the country, maximally prevents the formation of coalition governments, but some governments of national unity and quasi-national governments were formed during the First and the Second World Wars. The first case of governments of national unity in the XX century is the coalition cabinet headed by H. H. Asquith in 1915–1916. The second and third cases are the coalition governments (quasi-national governments) headed by D. Lloyd George during the First World War and lasted until 1922: the first one in 1916–1919 and the second one in 1919–1922. During the Great Depression the coalition, which received a clear title "national government", was formed in 1931 among the Labour Party (with their Prime Minister R. MacDonald), Conservatives and Liberals. But it should be noted that the British named "national government" is an abstract concept referring to a coalition of some or all of the main (relevant) political parties. In the historical sense, such coalitions also primarily relate governments of national unity headed by S. Baldwin and N. Chamberlain, which together held the posts of prime minister in 1935–1945[5]. For methodological accuracy let examine the government of national unity headed by R. McDonald, which was formed with four parliamentary parties, i.e. National Labour Organization (as of 1957 – the National Labour Party), the Conservative and Unionist Party, the National Liberal Party and the Liberals. The government existed in the period of 05.11.1931 – 07.06.1935.

Italy, which is considered as an example of relatively unstable governments, also demonstrates an experience of governments of national unity. Chronologically, these governments are placed as follows: 1) A. De Gasperi cabinet formed with four parties of diverse ideological character: the centrist Christian Democrats (DC), the centrist Republican Party (PRI), the centre-left Italian Socialist Party (PSI)[6] and the left Communist Party (PCI). The cabinet existed in the period of 13.07.1946 – 02.02.1947[7]; 2) A. De Gasperi cabinet formed with three parties, i.e. DC + PSI + PCI, in the period of 02.02.1947 – 31.05.1947. The sample of governments of national unity for Italy is demonstrated as following:

[5] R. Bassett, *Nineteen thirty-one political crisis*, Wyd. Macmillan 1986.; D. Howell, *MacDonald's Party. Labour Identities and Crisis, 1922-1931*, Wyd. OUP 2002.; M. Pearce, G. Stewart, *British Political History 1867-2001: Democracy and Decline*, Wyd. Routledge 2002.; M. Pugh, *State and Society. A Social and Political History of Britain 1870-1997*, Wyd. Arnold/Hodder 1999.; N. Smart, *The National Government: 1931-40*, Wyd. Macmillan 1999.; A. Thorpe, *Britain in the 1930s. The Deceptive Decade*, Wyd. Blackwell 1992.; P. Williamson, *National Crisis and National Government. British Politics, the Economy and the Empire, 1926-1932*, Wyd. CUP 2003.

[6] R. Drake, *The Soviet Dimension of Italian Communism*, "Journal of Cold War Studies" 2004, vol 6, nr 3, s. 115–119.; R. Benjamin, J. Kautsky, *Communism and Economic Development*, "The American Political Science Review" 1968, vol 62, nr. 1, s. 122.

[7] W. Müller, K. Strøm, *Coalition governments in Western Europe*, Wyd. Oxford University Press 2003.

Table 1. The composition of A. De Gasperi's (DC) government of national unity in Italy (as of July 13, 1946)

Electoral parties and coalitions	The percentage of electoral votes, %	The number of parliamentary seats	The percentage of seats, %	The position on the left-right spectrum	The number of ministers
DC (Christian Democrats)	35,2	207	37,2	5,7	11
PSI (Italian Socialist Party)	20,7	115	20,7	3,8	5
PCI (Communist Party)	18,9	104	18,7	1,6	4
PRI (Republican Party)	4,1	23	4,1	5,0	1
Totally / The composition of the legislature	78,9	449 / 556	80,7	–	21 / 21

Źródło: http://www.parlgov.org/explore/ITA/cabinet/1946-07-13/ (odczyt: 01.06.2016).

France, starting from 1944, is endowed with the largest number of governments of national unity. They mainly took place in the period of 1944–1947. The question is about the governments, including temporary ones, who led such prime minister as: 1) Ch. de Gaulle (10.09.1944 – 21.11.1945), consisting of six parties; 2) Ch. de Gaulle (21.11.1945 – 20.01.1946), consisting of five parties; 3) F. Gouin (20.01.1946 – 12.06.1946), consisting of three major parties; 4) G. Bidault (23.06.1946 – 28.11.1946), consisting of three major parties. Those four cabinets were temporary governments that had been formed during the regime of provisional power. Among the parties that participated in the specified governments of national unity are the following: the radical left French Communist Party (PCF), the radical right Popular Republican Movement (MRP), the left Socialist Party (SIFO), the left Republican, Radical and Radical-Socialist Party (PRR/RS) and the radical right Gaullists (G). Those governments consisted of an average of 423-458 MPs, while the full composition of the legislature was 522 seats. Therefore, there is every reason to call such cabinets as the governments of national unity. For example, we offer the composition of Ch. de Gaulle's government of national unity, as of November 21, 1945:

Table 2. The composition of Ch. de Gaulle's (G) government of national unity in France (as of November 21, 1945)

Electoral parties and coalitions	The percentage of electoral votes, %	The number of parliamentary seats	The percentage of seats, %	The position on the left-right spectrum	The number of ministers
PCF (French Communist Party)	26,1	148	28,4	1,4	5
MRP (Popular Republican Movement)	24,9	141	27,0	8,2	5
SIFO (Socialist Party)	23,8	134	25,7	3,2	5
PRR/RS (Radical and Radical-Socialist Party)	11,1	35	6,7	4,0	1
G (Gaullists)	0,4	2	0,4	8,2	1
Totally / The composition of the legislature	86,3	460 / 522	88,2	–	17 / 22

Źródło: http://www.parlgov.org/explore/FRA/cabinet/1945-11-21/ (odczyt: 01.06.2016).

During the Fourth Republic in France, after 1947, there were also formed similar governments. It is, above all, the government headed by P. Ramadier (SIFO), which consisted of five parties – PCF + MRP + SIFO + Conservatives (PRL) + Rally of Republican Lefts (RGR) – which received the support of almost all members of the legislature. This cabinet was the best example of governments of national unity in France and existed in the period of 22.01.1947 – 21.10.1947. Its composition was as follows:

Table 3. The composition of P. Ramadier's (SIFO) government of national unity in France (as of January 22, 1947)

Electoral parties and coalitions	The percentage of electoral votes, %	The number of parliamentary seats	The percentage of seats, %	The position on the left-right spectrum	The number of ministers
PCF (French Communist Party)	29,0	166	30,5	1,4	5
MRP (Popular Republican Movement)	26,0	158	29,0	8,2	4
SIFO (Socialist Party)	18,0	90	16,5	3,2	9
PRL (Conservatives)	13,0	70	12,9	7,6	3
RGR (Rally of Republican Lefts)	12,0	55	10,1	7,4	2
Totally / The composition of the legislature	98,0	539 / 544	99,0	–	23 / 29

Źródło: http://www.parlgov.org/explore/FRA/cabinet/1947-01-22/ (odczyt: 01.06.2016).

There is every reason to mean P. Ramadier government of national unity as "rainbow" coalition, because it had combined different ideological interests with significant gap in party positions. But since the end of 1947, there were significant changes in inter-party relations in France. The French Communist Party had left the government and, as a result, it was ended the period on French tripartism. The formation of new coalition governments had become associated with the exception of the French Communist Party, which has radical political interests, threatening political development of France (this was a reflection of "cordon sanitaire" technique). The given situation lasted until the formation of the Fifth Republic in France (but actually till 1959). After the parliamentary elections in 1958, the position of the French Communist Party was substantially weakened, so the "cordon sanitaire" technique has lost its relevance. In addition, it was also shortened the size of the parliament. The successive governments have begun to form according to the one-ideological design with the prevalence of the parties from the right spectrum. In such a situation, there is no political space for governments of national unity and grand coalitions.

Several government of national unity were formed in *Finland*. They refer to the period during and after the Second World War. Among them we need to single out ones with the following features: 1) headed by U. Castren (21.09.1944 – 17.11.1944) and composed of five parliamentary parties: Social Democratic Party of Finland (SSDP), Agrarian Union (Maal), National Coalition Party (KOK), i.e. the party of the prime minister, Swedish People's Party (RKP-SFP) and National

Progressive Party (KE), i.e. 190 of 200 MPs; 2) headed by J. Paasikivi (17.11.1944 – 17.04.1945) and composed of four parliamentary (SSDP + Maal + KOK + KE) and one extra-parliamentary (Finnish Peoples Democratic Union, SKDL) parties, i.e. 172 of 200 MPs; 3) headed by J. Paasikivi (17.04.1945 – 09.03.1946) and composed of five parliamentary parties (SSDP + SKDL + Maal + RKP-SFP + KE), i.e. 171 of 200 MPs; 4) headed by M. Pekkala (26.03.1946 – 29.07.1948) and composed of four parliamentary parties (SSDP + SKDL + Maal + RKP-SFP), i.e. 162 of 200 MPs.

Overall, Finland is to be talked as a country with the so-called "rainbow coalitions/governments" i.e. cabinets, which involve almost all parliamentary parties, without the exception of their ideological understanding of the political process[8]. Moreover, it is mandatory to follow an extremely large difference of ideological positioning of parties that make up such coalitions/governments. However, it is clear that "rainbow coalitions" do not necessarily have to be rated as grand coalitions, because the given technique of governments' formation may also be represented with minority coalitions – for example, in the 24th Government of Ireland. However, in Finland the situation is really close to understanding the "rainbow coalition" as a model of majority coalitions. The situation is explained by the following features: 1) within the country, none of the parties have a parliamentary majority since independence of Finland (starting from 1917); 2) formation of multiparty coalitions is calculated as the norm in the process of governments' creation; 3) the practice proves that multiparty governments are the most stable one in Finland. The given fact is demonstrated the best with the example of two P. Lipponen's governments: the first one served the full parliamentary term in the period of 13.04.1995–15.04.1999 and the second one (with little changes in the composition as of May 31, 2002) served the full parliamentary term in the period of 15.04.1999 – 17.04.2003.

Table 4. The composition of P. Lipponen's (SSDP) "rainbow coalition" in Finland (as of April 13, 1995)

Electoral parties and coalitions	The percentage of electoral votes, %	The number of parliamentary seats	The percentage of seats, %	The position on the left-right spectrum	The number of ministers
SSDP (Social Democratic Party of Finland)	28,3	63	31,5	3,6	5
KOK (National Coalition Party)	17,9	39	19,5	7,2	6
VAS (Left Alliance)	11,2	22	11,0	2,2	0
RKP-SFP (Swedish People's Party)	5,1	11	5,5	6,4	1
VIHR (Green League)	6,5	9	4,5	3,6	1
Totally / The composition of the legislature	69,0	144 / 200	72,0	–	13 / 14

Źródło: http://www.parlgov.org/explore/FIN/cabinet/1995-04-13/ (odczyt: 01.06.2016).

[8] A.-C. Jungar, *A Case of a Surplus Majority Government: The Finnish Rainbow Coalition*, "Scandinavian Political Studies" 2002, vol 25, nr. 1, s. 57–83.; D. Arter, *From the "rainbow coalition" back down to "red earth"? The 2003 Finnish general election*, "West European Politics" 2003, vol 26, nr. 3, s. 153–162.

The specified governments of national unity were formed with five ideologically different parties – the centre-left Social Democratic Party of Finland (SSDP), the centre-right (liberal-conservative) National Coalition Party (KOK), the right or centre-right (liberal) Swedish People's Party (RKP-SFP), eco-socialist Left Alliance (VAS) and eco-centrist Green League (VIHR). However, the importance of ideological and positional location of parties is the best demonstrated with the left wing of "rainbow coalition", particularly with VAS and VIHR. The prime minister from SSDP formed the coalition with the two abovementioned parties in order to limit their blocking capacity and to ensure that no party could claim more than allowed with its electoral strength. In turn, VAS and VIHR preferred to participate in the government because they were interested in obtaining public offices and considered the prospects of their electoral popularity growth from participating in parliamentary opposition as unlikely[9].

In general, it should be noted that this is not the only practice of such governments' formation. In its development, Finish "rainbow coalitions" underwent several stages: 1) the period of 1951–1977, when minority coalition governments as well as surplus and minimum winning majority coalitions predominantly formed, but it was difficult to classify them as exactly "rainbow" ones, because there was a slight gap in their ideological positions[10]; 2) the period of 1977–2011, when out among the eighteen governments, which formed in Finland, in 1995–2003, there were only "rainbow coalitions"[11]. In addition, several governments were formed by a similar method/technique in other periods of time. Particularly, J. Katainen's cabinet, which was formed on June 22, 2011, including 6 parties of different ideologies[12]. In this case, the minority coalition governments were not used in practice any more. At the same time, the feature of Finnish "rainbow coalitions" is a point that they are necessarily surplus winning coalitions, which consist of at least five parties, in particular, the largest parliamentary parties, but otherwise with a great "ideological gap". "Rainbow coalitions" were also (in limited circumstances) inherent in the following European countries: a) the 24th Government of Ireland (15.12.1994 – 26.06.1997) consisting of the Fine Gael, the Labour Party and the Democratic Left, led by the Prime Minister John Bruton; b) G. Verhofstadt I (12.07.1999 – 12.07.2003), E. Di Rupo I (06.12.2011 – 25.05.2014) and II (since 25.05.2014) governments in Belgium, which consisted of the following parties: VLD (Flemish Liberals and Democrats), PS (Francophone Socialist Party), PRL (Liberal Reformist Party), SP (Socialist Party), Ecolo (Francophone Ecologists), Agalev (Live Differently – Flemish-speaking Ecologists), CD&V

[9] G. Steffen, B. Thomas, *Government Status and Legislative Behaviour Partisan Veto Players in Australia, Denmark, Finland and Germany*, "Party Politics" 2006, vol 12, nr. 4, s. 521–539.

[10] Among the parties that participated in such coalitions there were the following: Maal (Agrarian Union, which since 1965 was made in an updated form as KESK (Centre Party) and continued to participate in a "rainbow coalition"), SSDP (Social Democratic Party of Finland, which in the range of 1957–1973 was called TPSL (Social Democratic League of Workers and Smallholders), RKP-SFP (Swedish People's Party), L (Liberal Party, which in 1951–1965 was known as SK (Finnish People's Party) and since 1965 is known as LKP (Liberal People's Party)), KOK (National Coalition Party).

[11] H. Nurmi, L. Nurmi, *The parliamentary election in Finland, March 2003*, "Electoral Studies" 2004, vol 23.; A.-C. Jungar, *A Case of a Surplus Majority Government: The Finnish Rainbow Coalition*, "Scandinavian Political Studies" 2002, vol 25, nr. 1, s. 57–83.

[12] Among the parties that participated in the "rainbow coalitions" in this period of time it is necessary to single out the following: SSDP, SKDL, KESK, LKP, RKP-SFP, SMP (Finnish Rural Party), SKL (Finnish Christian League), VAS and KD (updated in 2001 Finnish Christian Democrats).

(Christian Democrats & Flemish), MR (Reformist Movement), SPa (Socialist Party Different), O-VLD (Open Flemish Liberals and Democrats), CDH (Humanist Democratic Centre). However, the first one in Ireland was a "rainbow coalition minority". Moreover, it was the first time in the political history of Ireland when the former government party withdrawing from the coalition created a new coalition with the opposition parties without holding parliamentary elections.

Luxembourg was also endowed with governments of national unity, where there were created two of their samples. At the same time the country specifically use the term that describes a given category of executive power. This is the same name of "government of national unity" ("national unity government"). The first sample of the government of national unity headed by the Prime Minister V. Thorn took place in the span of 24.02.1916 – 19.06.1917. The cabinet included the members from the conservative, liberal and socialist factions in the parliament. During this period, Luxembourg was occupied by the German Empire, but it was allowed to conduct its own political relations (despite this, the presence of the Germany army was creating a dominant position over the government of Luxembourg). However, this cabinet proved the hypothesis, whereby in the conditions of grand coalitions the opposition possibilities of non-parliamentary parties significantly develop. This was the case in Luxembourg, where divergent independent candidates and MPs opposed the parliamentary parties as such, which did not reflect the national perspective. As a result, the government resigned.

The second sample of the government of national unity headed by the Prime Minister P. Dupong took place in the span of 14.11.1945 – 13.02.1947. The cabinet was composed of the members from all the parties of Chamber of Deputies, except for one non-partisan MP.

Table 5. The composition of P. Dupong's (CSV) government of national unity in Luxembourg (as of November 1, 1945)

Electoral parties and coalitions	The percentage of electoral votes, %	The number of parliamentary seats	The percentage of seats, %	The position on the left-right spectrum	The number of ministers
CSV (Christian Social People's Party)	45,0	25	49,0	6,4	3
PS (Socialist Party)	23,0	11	21,6	3,3	2
GPD (Patriotic and Democratic Group)	18,0	9	17,6	6,6	1
KPL (Communist Party of Luxembourg)	11,0	5	9,8	1,3	1
Totally / The composition of the legislature	97,0	50 / 51	98,0	-	7 / 8

Źródło: http://www.parlgov.org/explore/LUX/cabinet/1945-11-14/ (odczyt: 01.06.2016).

The government was established with the basic objective to bring the country out of the crisis after the Second World War as well as to create a welfare state. However, the biggest advantage of the state power, i.e. the unanimous support of the legislature, there was nullified and regarded as a weakness. The cabinet was formed by the parties of different ideologies: CSV and

GPD were centre-right one, PS was centre-left one and the KPL was left one[13]. An interesting situation was comprised of over the allocation of ministerial responsibilities. It is generally involved the combination of several ministries within one minister in Luxembourg. Thus, P. Dupong – the prime minister from the largest parliamentary Christian Social People's Party – represented apart from his basic position offices in finances and armed forces[14]. Therefore, every minister that was free in his deciding cases in his or her departments. As a consequence, a situation of total confusion: CSV tried to return the territories of Luxembourg annexed by Prussia during the Napoleonic Wars; LSAP was engaged exclusively with the of railways; KPL has sought to create a welfare state. As a result, there have been changes in the composition of the governmental cabinet. The government didn't last long and ceased its operations in early 1947.

The governments of national unity also took place in *Greece*. In this country they have their own specific name, i.e. "ecumenical governments", although represented with only three cabinets. The first was formed in 1926 and was headed by the Prime Minister A. Zaimis which re-elected as a prime minister for five times. But during 1926–1928, it was formed the coalition of national unity consisting of the most influential parties, i.e. moderate conservatives and "venizelists" (representatives of a powerful political movement in Greece in the period of 1900–1970's, the main ideological considerations of which were the opposition to the monarchical form of government, the support for "Big idea" about an aggressive manner of including all the Greek lands, including Crete, into a unified Greece, a positive attitude to the coalition of Western European countries during the Second World War, protectionism).

However, we are more interested in the cases of the governments of national unity that took place in the period of 23.11.1989 – 13.02.1990 and 11.11.2011 – 10.02.2012. They were provisional governments headed by K. Zolotas and formed by the three parliamentary parties, i.e. ND (New Democracy), PASOK (Panhellenic Socialist Movement) and SAP (Coalition of the Left and Progress), and headed by L. Papademos and formed by three parliamentary parties, i.e. PASOK, ND and LAOS (Popular Orthodox Rally).

The K. Zolotas's cabinet didn't include only the representatives of the two parliamentary parties, but each of them was represented by the only one or two mandates. These parties were OE (Alternative Ecologists) and Independent Muslim Lists. The L. Papademos's cabinet didn't include only the representatives of KKE (Communist Party of Greece) and SYRIZA (Coalition of the Radical Left), but they had a small number of MPs. These cabinets were formed as primary or secondary results of the early 1989 and 2009 parliamentary elections. However, in the first case none of the parties failed to get unanimous majority and in the second case the absolute majority of seats was concentrated in PASOK. In accordance, in the first case in order not to be included in the political (governmental)

[13] G. Thewes, *Les gouvernements du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg depuis 1848*, Wyd. Service Information et Presse 2007.

[14] All other departments were also combined. This includes the following areas of the economy such as: 1) foreign affairs and viticulture; 2) employment, social security and the coal industry; 3) education, religion, art, science and agriculture; 4) justice, transportation and public works; 5) nutrition and economic issues; 6) social assistance and health care. The only position that has not been replaced by different departmental structures related to the matters of interior and military losses.

crisis, the two largest parliamentary parties went the other way: they offered the post of Prime Minister to non-party K. Zolotas. However, they viewed the cabinet as a non-party administration, but actually the government consisted of the ministers from the two major parties. As a result, Greece has not slipped to the wave of political controversy and came out of the situation as a result of early elections, which took place on April 8, 1990. In the second case, PASOK decided to form a government of national unity and not a single-party majority cabinet. The most interesting was the fact that the position of prime minister was given to non- party L. Papademos.

Table 6. The composition of K. Zolotas's government of national unity in Greece (as of November 23, 1989)

Electoral parties and coalitions	The percentage of electoral votes, %	The number of parliamentary seats	The percentage of seats, %	The position on the left-right spectrum
ND (New Democracy)	46,0	148	49,3	6,7
PASOK (Panhellenic Socialist Movement)	41,0	128	42,7	4,5
SAP (Coalition of the Left and Progress)	11,0	21	7,0	2,8
Totally / The composition of the legislature	98,0	297 / 300	99,0	-

Źródło: http://www.parlgov.org/explore/GRC/cabinet/1989-11-23/ (odczyt: 01.06.2016).

Table 7. The composition of L. Papademos's government of national unity in Greece (as of November 11, 2011)

Electoral parties and coalitions	The percentage of electoral votes, %	The number of parliamentary seats	The percentage of seats, %	The position on the left-right spectrum	The number of ministers
PASOK (Panhellenic Socialist Movement)	43,9	160	53,3	4,5	12
ND (New Democracy)	33,5	91	30,3	6,7	3
LAOS (Popular Orthodox Rally)	5,6	15	5,0	9,1	0
Totally / The composition of the legislature	83,0	266 / 300	88,6	-	15 / 19

Źródło: http://www.parlgov.org/explore/GRC/cabinet/2011-11-11/ (odczyt: 01.06.2016).

Austria is traditionally represented by grand coalitions. However, once the country was represented by the government of national unity. This was L. Figl's I government (04.12.1945 – 20.11.1947), which was created by all parties of the legislature, i.e. the centre-right OVP (Austrian People's Party), the centre-left SPO (Socialist Party of Austria) and the left KPO (Communist Party of Austria). On November 20, 1947 KPO left the ruling coalition about the confusion regarding economic issues. Thereafter, Austria began to be mainly characterized by the formation of grand and minimum winning coalitions. As a result, we can say that Austria is an example of "consistent democracy" political culture.

Table 8. The composition of L. Figl's government of national unity in Austria (as of December 20, 1945)

Electoral parties and coalitions	The percentage of electoral votes, %	The number of parliamentary seats	The percentage of seats, %	The position on the left-right spectrum	The number of ministers
OVP (Austrian People's Party)	49,8	85	51,5	6,5	8
SPO (Socialist Party of Austria)	44,6	76	46,1	3,7	5
KPO (Communist Party of Austria)	5,4	4	2,4	0,5	1
Totally / The composition of the legislature	99,8	165 / 165	100	-	14 / 14

Źródło: http://www.parlgov.org/explore/AUT/cabinet/1945-12-04/ (odczyt: 01.06.2016).

Another aspect of the governments of national unity is the practice of the first governments in some countries of East-Central Europe, which are now fully integrated into the European Union. First of all we are talking about *Poland*, where there was formed the government of national unity headed by T. Mazowiecki, which occurred in the period of 12.08.1989 – 12.01.1991 Formally we are talking about the cabinet that was formed by the first multiparty (constituent) elections. On the other hand, the creation of the given (Table 9) composition of the cabinet allowed it to overcome the most enormous challenges faced by the country during the collapse of the Communist regime. The government was formed by the following parties of different ideological families: the left and centre-left PZPR (Polish United Workers' Party); centrist S (Solidarity), ZSL (United People's Party) and SD (Democratic Party). The deputies, who were not included in the coalition government, were positioned as non-partisan. Therefore, the cabinet should be singled out as a coalition of all parliamentary parties.

Table 9. The composition of T. Mazowiecki's government of national unity in Poland (as of September 12, 1989)

Electoral parties and coalitions	The number of parliamentary seats	The percentage of seats, %	The position on the left-right spectrum	The number of ministers
PZPR (Polish United Workers' Party)	173	37,6	1,3	0
S (Solidarity)	161	35,0	3,3	16
ZSL (United People's Party)	76	16,5	5,3	3
SD (Democratic Party)	27	5,9	1,3	3
Totally / The composition of the legislature	437 / 460	95,0	-	22 / 24

Źródło: https://pl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rz%C4%85d_Tadeusza_Mazowieckiego (odczyt: 01.06.2016).; http://www.parlgov.org/explore/POL/cabinet/1989-08-24/ (odczyt: 01.06.2016).

On the similar principles it was formed a government of national unity in *the Czech Republic* in 1990, when the state formally that did not exist and was part of Czechoslovakia. The government headed by P. Pithart was formed of four parties with three of them positioned as parliamentary. These were the following parties and movements: OF (Civic Forum), HSD-SMS

(Movement for Self-Governing Democracy – Society for Moravia and Silesia), KDU-CSL (Christian Democratic Union – People's Party) and KDS (Christian Democratic Party). In total, they were given 168 mandates of all 200 of the National Council of Czechia. Only the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia (KSCS) was non-governmental/oppositional. Moreover, the technique of "cordon sanitaire" was used against this party and the government was formed as a way to achieve consensus about the future of the Czech Republic.

Table 10. The composition of P. Pithart's government of national unity in Czechia (as of June 29, 1990)

Electoral parties and coalitions	The percentage of electoral votes, %	The number of parliamentary seats	The percentage of seats, %	The position on the left-right spectrum	The number of ministers
OF (Civic Forum)	49,5	127	63,5	6,0	12
HSD/SMS (Movement for Self-Governing Democracy – Society for Moravia and Silesia)	10,0	22	11,0	-	1
KDU/CSL (Christian Democratic Union – People's Party)	8,4	19	9,5	5,8	2
KDS (Christian Democratic Party)	0	0	0	8,1	2
Totally / The composition of the legislature	67,9	168 / 200	84,0	-	17 / 22

Źródło: http://www.parlgov.org/explore/CZE/cabinet/1990-06-29/ (odczyt: 01.06.2016).

There were formed two practical options for governments of national unity, which were endowed with its own characteristics, in *Latvia*. In particular, there were historically notable efforts of Latvian parties to withdraw from governments any pro-Russian political parties. This, in particular, was emphasized by such scholars as H. Smith-Siversten[15]. Nevertheless, it is only about "semi-party" governments, as the positions of prime ministers were not formed by quota of any parliamentary parties. It is about two consecutive cabinets headed by A. Skele. For example, let consider historically the first of them, which existed in the period of 21.12.1995 – 13.02.1997.

The government of national unity was formed by eight parties (see detailed Table 11), mainly of centre-right ideological spectrum[16]. In return, the cabinet excluded all parties of socialist and pro-Russian direction. Primarily we are talking about the parties, for which the procedure of "cordon sanitaire" is or was relevant, i.e. TKL-ZP (People's Movement for Latvia – Siegerist Party), TSP (National Harmony Party), LSP (Socialist Party of Latvia), but which are represented in the Latvian parliament. This is an inherent feature of practically all Latvian governments.

[15] H. Smith-Siversten, *Latvia*, [w:] S. Berglund, J. Ekman, F. Aarebrot (eds.), *The Handbook of Political Change in Eastern Europe: [second edition]*, Wyd. Edward Elgar Publishing 2004, s. 107.

[16] I. Mednis, *Partiju laiki Latvijā (1988-2002)*, Wyd. Drukātava 2007, s. 262–270.

Table 11. The composition of A. Skele's government of national unity in Latvia (as of December 21, 1995)

Electoral parties and coalitions	The percentage of electoral votes, %	The number of parliamentary seats	The percentage of seats, %	The position on the left-right spectrum	The number of ministers
DPS (Democratic Party Saimnieks)	15,2	18	18,0	6,0	7
LC (Latvian Way)	14,7	17	17,0	6,1	6
TB (For Fatherland and Freedom)	11,9	14	14,0	8,7	6
LVP (Latvian Unity Party)	7,2	8	8,0	1,3	1
KDS (Christian Democratic Union)	-	5	5,0	6,2	-
LNNK (Latvian National Independence Movement)	-	4	4,0	8,4	2
LZP (Latvian Green Party)	-	4	4,0	4,7	3
LZS (Farmers Union of Latvia)	1,4	3	3,0	4,4	2
Totally / The composition of the legislature	50,4	73 / 100	71,0	-	27 / 29

Źródło: https://lv.wikipedia.org/wiki/%C5%A0%C4%B7%C4%93les_1._Ministru_kabinets (odczyt: 01.06.2016).; C. Conrad, S. Golder, Measuring government duration and stability in Central Eastern European democracies, "European Journal of Political Research" 2010, vol 49, nr. 1, s. 119–150.

Governments of national unity were also subject to Bulgaria and Romania. This applies, above all, the coalition of national unity headed by D. Popov (07.12.1990 – 08.11.1991) in *Bulgaria*, which was formed with three political parties: BSP (Bulgarian Socialist Party), SDS (Union of Democratic Forces) and BZnS (Bulgarian Agrarian People's Union). In total, the coalition in parliament composed of 371 MPs (in a given period of time a nominal composition of the parliament was 400 deputies), but the post of prime minister was non-partisan. In *Romania*, the model of such a government of national unity appears the cabinet headed by T. Stolojan (16.10.1991 – 18.11.1992). It was the coalition of four parties, i.e. FSN (National Salvation Front), PNL (National Liberal Party), MER (Romanian Ecological Movement) and PDAR (Democratic Agrarian Party of Romania). It consisted of 313 MPs (from 341 at all), but the post of the prime minister was also non-partisan. Therefore, in general, it is evident that governments of national unity in their pure understanding in East-Central Europe were inherent in the early 90's of the XX century, when it occurred fundamental political and socio-economic change in direction on liberalism and democracy, and subsequently the countries were at critical stages of their development, for which it was necessary a unity of political elites.

All cases of governments of national unity discussed above are distinctive and random, because they are not permanent phenomena of institutional order. However, in some countries, governments of national unity are formed more frequently, so they are institutionalised. This largely tend to some consensual democracies, were the formation of some non-typical prototypes of majority coalition governments is similar by their construction to governments/coalitions of national unity. This case demands special analysis and attention, in particular,

on the example of *Switzerland* from 1943. According to the Swiss Constitution, the Federal Council composed of 7 members, who from 1959 (on so-called "magic formula" or "Zauberformel") are represented by four main party, exercises the executive power in the country. The head of the Federal Council is the President of the Switzerland, which together with the Vice President is annually elected by the Parliament from the determined seven members of the Federal Council (this means that the President is considered to be the head of government). The base for the choice has a formal nature as the candidate who has the most experience in government dominates. The President also serves as the head of the ministry assigned to him.

In 1959, the mandates in the Federal Council were distributed among the representatives of the following parties: FDP (Free Democratic Party – The Liberals, which represents classical liberalism and radicalism, and which political position is defined as the centre-right one[17]); CVP (Christian Democratic Peoples Party, which under the name represents the ideology of Christian Democracy and is positioned as a centrist); SP (Social Democratic Party of Switzerland, which is defined as Social Democratic one and is positioned as a centre-left); BGB (Farmers, Traders and Citizens Party and since 1971 it is called SVP (Swiss People's Party), which represents conservatism and national conservatism and is positioned as right one. Three parties (FDP + CVP + SP) each received two ministerial seats, and the last one (BGB / SVP) the only one ministerial seat. It should be noted that the "magic formula" is not an official law, but only the agreement among four parties about the fact that there have to form governments of national unity[18]. In the given design the formula existed until 2003 when it was held its partial reinterpretation. The essence of the changes is that the CVP gained two CVP one seat in the government. This was caused by the election results of the parties, when the first party won a relative majority of votes and the second got the last place among the four coalition partners[19].

Furthermore, we must stress that from 1947 to 1955 two governments of national unity were formed in Switzerland without the existence of so-called "magic formula". On the other hand, among all the cabinets, which were formed in Switzerland in 1947–2011, except two, were governments of national unity. The only exceptions were the coalition (minimum winning) cabinets in the period of 15.12.1955 – 17.12.1959 and 12.12.2007 – 10.12.2008. The rest of the cabinets – in a total of 17 in the period of 1947–2016 – were represented by governments of national unity. Moreover, it is necessary to single out a few basic points: 1) all governments of national unity were formed by the same parliamentary parties of Switzerland with only minor modifications of hierarchical structuring of these parties (i.e. representation and allocation of seats within them); 2) the exclusion of at least one party causes the formation of minimum winning and not surplus

[17] Since 2009, there is another party, i.e. FDP-LPS, which emerged on the basis of combining the two classical liberal parties – actually FDP and LPS (Liberal Party of Switzerland).

[18] C. Church, *The Politics and Government of Switzerland*, Wyd. Palgrave Macmillan 2004.; U. Altermatt, *Conseil Fédéral: Dictionnaire biographique des cent premiers conseillers fédéraux*, Wyd. Cabédita 1993.

[19] R. Rose, *The End of Consensus in Austria and Switzerland*, "Journal of Democracy" 2000, vol 11, nr. 2, s. 26–40.

coalition. For representative sample of governments of national unity in the country we offer the composition of one of them, namely the cabinet that took place in the period of 2003-2007.

Table 12. The composition of 2003–2007 government of national unity in Switzerland (as of December 10, 2003)

Electoral parties and coalitions	The percentage of electoral votes, %	The number of parliamentary seats	The percentage of seats, %	The position on the left-right spectrum	The number of ministers
SVP-UDC (Swiss Peoples Party)	27,0	55	27,5	7,4	2
SP-PS (Social Democratic Party of Switzerland)	23,0	52	26,0	1,8	2
FDP-PRD (Radical Democratic Party)	17,0	36	18,0	6,3	2
CVP-PDC (Christian Democratic Peoples Party)	14,0	28	14,0	4,7	1
Totally / The composition of the legislature	81,0	171 / 200	85,5	-	7 / 7

Źródło: http://www.parlgov.org/explore/che/cabinet/2003-12-10/ (odczyt: 01.06.2016).

An interesting situation occurred in 2007 when there was a change of governmental coalition from national unity one inti minimum winning one. Two representatives of the SVP (E. Widmer-Schlumpf and S. Schmid) for various reasons left the ministerial posts and formed a new party, i.e. Conservative Democratic Party of Switzerland (BDP), which got two seats in the government. However, this situation was corrected in 2008 in favour of another and finally the widest format of government of national unity. S. Schmid refused the post of Minister of Defence and as the result of by-election, which took place on December 10, 2008, the post was returned to SVP. Consequently, it was formed the following composition of government of national unity in Switzerland (see detailed Table 13).

Table 13. The composition of 2008–2011 government of national unity in Switzerland (as of December 10, 2008)

Electoral parties and coalitions	The percentage of electoral votes, %	The number of parliamentary seats	The percentage of seats, %	The position on the left-right spectrum	The number of ministers
SVP-UDC (Swiss Peoples Party)	28,9	58	29,0	7,4	1
SP-PS (Social Democratic Party of Switzerland)	19,5	43	21,5	1,8	2
FDP-PRD (Radical Democratic Party)	15,8	31	15,5	6,3	2
CVP-PDC (Christian Democratic Peoples Party)	14,5	31	15,5	4,7	1
BDP (Conservative Democratic Party of Switzerland)	-	4	2,0	7,4	1
Totally / The composition of the legislature	78,7	167 / 200	83,5	-	7 / 7

Źródło: http://www.parlgov.org/explore/che/cabinet/2008-12-10/ (odczyt: 01.06.2016).

Some scientists stress that the current specific practices regarding the formation of governments of national unity in Switzerland should be named (interpreted) as a technology of creation "oversized coalition cabinets", i.e. cabinets that include much more coalition partners than it is necessary for winning a majority in parliament. Switzerland is the only case of political system in Europe where the government formed by the parliament cannot be early reduced in its authority. Cabinet's members are elected individually for the complete duration of the term of parliament (four years). As a result, the governmental cabinet in Switzerland, at least formally, is not designated as accountable to parliament. However, in its activity any cabinet is based solely on the acts of the legislature. The oversized feature of Swiss governments is also demonstrated via the point that in a given country all members of the governmental cabinet (ministers) are identical in their power, and formally there is no the position of a prime minister. Instead, there is only a rotational process that takes place every year and is done on the principles of "seigniorage".

In addition, the proportional electoral system, combined with the agreement on the formation of governments of national unity, also provides a design of a broad "inclusive policy". Of course, a government of national unity in Switzerland is not positioned as a symbol of "authoritative" and "decisive" governmental offices and may entail high potential of production the blocking type of the political process. This is especially peculiar, as emphasizes by J. Tsebelis[20], when coalition partners are represented as ideologically different and distanced. But this is not necessarily the case in practice. If political actors have common areas of cooperation and strong incentives to find understanding, then such blocking situation may not be, as emphasizes by A. Heritier[21], A. Bachtiger and D. Hangartner[22], relevant. And Switzerland is generally considered a model in this respect. As a result of induction of uncertainty of the legislative process, direct democracy and referendum, cooperation and coordinated style of policy the actors provide themselves with significant incentives to seek common solutions. Therefore, governments of national unity in Switzerland are "coalitions as arrangements", but not target-oriented coalitions that characterise parliamentary regimes and "centripetal" management[23]. Thus, by Lijphart[24] definition, Switzerland is familiarly seen as a way of "consensus model" with such a key attribute as governments of national unity or grand coalition. Moreover, J. Colomer and G. Negretto[25] note that the formation of governments of national unity in Switzerland helps her in the process of "parliamentarisation" of presidential system. Nevertheless, Swiss scientists propose some doubts about how it is advisable to consider Swiss

[20] G. Tsebelis, *Veto players: how political institutions work*, Wyd. Princeton University Press 2002.

[21] A. Heritier, *Policy-Making and Diversity in Europe. Escape from Deadlock*, Wyd. Cambridge University Press 1999.

[22] A. Bachtiger, D. Hangartner, *When Political Philosophy Meets Political Science. Theoretical and Methodological Challenges in the Study of a Philosophical Ideal*, Paper presented at the 3rd ECPR General Conference, Budapest, 8-10 September 2005.

[23] A. Bachtiger, D. Schwarz, G. Lutz, *Parliamentary Practices in Presidentialism? A Swiss Perspective on Governance in a Separation of Powers Framework*, Paper prepared for the Joint Sessions of the ECPR, 25-30 April, 2006, Nicosia, Cyprus, 29 s.

[24] A. Lijphart, *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries*, Wyd. Yale University Press 1999.

[25] J. Colomer, G. Negretto, *Can Presidentialism Work Like Parliamentarism?*, "Government and Opposition" 2005, vol 40, nr. 1, s. 60–89.

cabinets as a type of governments of national unity[26]. The fact is that there are no official and binding agreements regarding the existence of coalitions of parties in Swiss Parliament[27].

In addition, governments of national unity in Switzerland are contested in terms of the ideological content of the party system. Despite fairly significant level of fragmentation of the party system, the latter is characterized as a tripolar (left parties, moderate right parties and new populist right parties) structure, which is traditional for continental Europe[28]. Therefore, in the usual structure of the Swiss governmental cabinet, formed by four parties (within the "magic formula"), which represent three poles of the party system, even the governmental party may be in opposition to the cabinet about the specific issues. In some cases, four coalition parties support parliamentary proposals, and the impetus for the split of the coalition is the challenge of any party, for example, on the protection of minorities. In this case, the government coalition usually breaks up and the left or new populist right parties are opposed to any integrated governmental coalition[29]. In other words, the government coalition is usually formed in the composition of moderate right and new populist right parties (centre-right coalition) or in the composition of moderate right-wing and left-wing parties (centre-left coalition). All this is based on inter-party conflict generated by the effects of direct democracy in Switzerland[30].

Overall, the study demonstrated that the separation of governments of national unity is not based on the appeal to common typologies of governments. The author argued that governments of national unity are such variants of coalitions, which unite all (or almost all) parliamentary parties, when their ideological or political preferences practically do not play an important role. Thereupon, governments (coalitions) of national unity differ from grand coalitions and the first one also include combinations of ideologically opposite parliamentary parties, but not all of them possess the coalitional potential. In other words, governments of national unity are immanently trying to provide as wide ideological representation as possible when grand coalitions work on it constrainedly. Conventionally, a grand coalition in this regard should be interpreted as a "coalition of the opposite range" and a government of national unity as a "coalition of full/maximum range". Governments of national unity are mainly formed in terms of economic, social or military crises (but not parliamentary, when outdated coalition partner parties cannot form the traditional construction of coalition governments that are more typical of a grand coalition). The study also observed that there are special perspective for some consensual democracies, which include formation of non-typical prototypes of coalition majority governments that are almost similar to governments of national unity

[26] Y. Papadopoulos, S. Kobi, I. Moroni, *Les processus de decision federaux en Suisse*, Wyd. L'Harmattan 1997.

[27] W. Linder, *Schweizerische Demokratie: Institutionen, Prozesse, Perspektiven*, Wyd. Haupt 2005.; H. Kriesi, *The Federal Parliament: The Limits of Institutional Reform*, "West European Politics" 2001, vol 24, nr. 1, s. 59–76.

[28] H. Kriesi, E. Grande, R. Lachat, M. Dolezal, S. Bornschier, T. Frey, *West European Politics in the Age of Globalization*, Wyd. Cambridge University Press 2008.

[29] H. Kriesi, *Direct Democratic Choice: The Swiss Experience*, Wyd. Lexington 2005, s. 26–34.

[30] A. Ladner, M. Brandle, *Does Direct Democracy Matter for Political Parties? An Empirical test in the Swiss Cantons*, "Party Politics" 1999, vol 5, nr. 3, s. 283–302.

by their construction. Based on the specifics of the national governments of some countries it's possible displacement of how to interpret and classify governments of national unity, even within European countries. In most countries where we meet governments of national unity, they are random ones. The exception is Switzerland, where governments of national unity are permanent and represent the essence of the consensus model of democracy.

References:

1. Altermatt U., *Conseil Fédéral: Dictionnaire biographique des cent premiers conseillers fédéraux*, Wyd. Cabédita 1993.
2. Arter D., *From the "rainbow coalition" back down to "red earth"? The 2003 Finnish general election*, "West European Politics" 2003, vol 26, nr. 3, s. 153–162.
3. Bachtiger A., Hangartner D., *When Political Philosophy Meets Political Science. Theoretical and Methodological Challenges in the Study of a Philosophical Ideal*, Paper presented at the 3rd ECPR General Conference, Budapest, 8-10 September 2005.
4. Bachtiger A., Schwarz D., Lutz G., *Parliamentary Practices in Presidentialism? A Swiss Perspective on Governance in a Separation of Powers Framework*, Paper prepared for the Joint Sessions of the ECPR, 25-30 April, 2006, Nicosia, Cyprus, 29 s.
5. Bassett R., *Nineteen thirty-one political crisis*, Wyd. Macmillan 1986.
6. Benjamin R., Kautsky J., *Communism and Economic Development*, "The American Political Science Review" 1968, vol 62, nr. 1, s. 122.
7. Berglund S., Ekman J., Aarebrot F., *The Handbook of Political Change in Eastern Europe: [second edition]*, Wyd. Edward Elgar Publishing 2004.
8. Church C., *The Politics and Government of Switzerland*, Wyd. Palgrave Macmillan 2004.
9. Colomer J., Negretto G., *Can Presidentialism Work Like Parliamentarism?*, "Government and Opposition" 2005, vol 40, nr. 1, s. 60–89.
10. Conrad C., Golder S., *Measuring government duration and stability in Central Eastern European democracies*, "European Journal of Political Research" 2010, vol 49, nr. 1, s. 119–150.
11. Drake R., *The Soviet Dimension of Italian Communism*, "Journal of Cold War Studies" 2004, vol 6, nr 3, s. 115–119.
12. Heritier A., *Policy-Making and Diversity in Europe. Escape from Deadlock*, Wyd. Cambridge University Press 1999.
13. Howell D., *MacDonald's Party. Labour Identities and Crisis, 1922-1931*, Wyd. OUP 2002.
14. Jungar A.-C., *A Case of a Surplus Majority Government: The Finnish Rainbow Coalition*, "Scandinavian Political Studies" 2002, vol 25, nr. 1, s. 57–83.
15. Kriesi H., *Direct Democratic Choice: The Swiss Experience*, Wyd. Lexington 2005.
16. Kriesi H., *The Federal Parliament: The Limits of Institutional Reform*, "West European Politics" 2001, vol 24, nr. 1, s. 59–76.

17. Kriesi H., Grande E., Lachat R., Dolezal M., Bornschier S., Frey T., *West European Politics in the Age of Globalization*, Wyd. Cambridge University Press 2008.
18. Ladner A., Brandle M., *Does Direct Democracy Matter for Political Parties? An Empirical test in the Swiss Cantons*, "Party Politics" 1999, vol 5, nr. 3, s. 283–302.
19. Lijphart A., *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries*, Wyd. Yale University Press 1999.
20. Linder W., *Schweizerische Demokratie: Institutionen, Prozesse, Perspektiven*, Wyd. Haupt 2005.
21. Lytvyn V., Romaniuk A., *Velyki koalitsii u konteksti koalitsiinykh uriadiv bilshosti: kontseptualizatsiia, politychni prychyny ta naslidky na prykladi parlamentskykh demokratii u Yevropi*, „Naukovi zapysky Instytutu politychnykh i etnonatsionalnykh doslidzhen im. I.F. Kurasa NAN Ukrainy" 2013, vol 2, nr. 64, s. 473–504.
22. Mednis I., *Partiju laiki Latvijā (1988-2002)*, Wyd. Drukātava 2007, s. 262–270.
23. Müller W., Strøm K., *Coalition governments in Western Europe*, Wyd. Oxford University Press 2003.
24. Nurmi H., Nurmi L., *The parliamentary election in Finland, March 2003*, "Electoral Studies" 2004, vol 23.
25. Papadopoulos Y., Kobi S., Moroni I., *Les processus de decision federaux en Suisse*, Wyd. L'Harmattan 1997.
26. Pearce M., Stewart G., *British Political History 1867-2001: Democracy and Decline*, Wyd. Routledge 2002.
27. Pugh M., *State and Society. A Social and Political History of Britain 1870-1997*, Wyd. Arnold/Hodder 1999.
28. Rose R., *The End of Consensus in Austria and Switzerland*, "Journal of Democracy" 2000, vol 11, nr. 2, s. 26–40.
29. Smart N., *The National Government: 1931-40*, Wyd. Macmillan 1999.
30. Smith-Siversten H., *Latvia*, [w:] Berglund S., Ekman J., Aarebrot F. (eds.), *The Handbook of Political Change in Eastern Europe: [second edition]*, Wyd. Edward Elgar Publishing 2004, s. 107.
31. Steffen G., Thomas B., *Government Status and Legislative Behaviour Partisan Veto Players in Australia, Denmark, Finland and Germany*, "Party Politics" 2006, vol 12, nr. 4, s. 521–539.
32. Thewes G., *Les gouvernements du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg depuis 1848*, Wyd. Service Information et Presse 2007.
33. Thorpe A., *Britain in the 1930s. The Deceptive Decade*, Wyd. Blackwell 1992.
34. Tsebelis G., *Veto players: how political institutions work*, Wyd. Princeton University Press 2002.
35. Williamson P., *National Crisis and National Government. British Politics, the Economy and the Empire, 1926-1932*, Wyd. CUP 2003.
36. Woldendorp J., Keman H., Budge J., *Party Government in 48 Democracies (1945-1998): composition, duration, personnel*, Wyd. Kluwer Academic Publishers 2000.