

## Democracy as a political government

Viktorija Onssip  
Kaunas University

**Abstract:** Let's highlight Weber and Schumpeter. They agree in their criticism of the liberal idea of democracy; They believe that democracy as an ideal will never materialize in political dynamics. The political participation of the masses is always limited and therefore liberal democracy is at best a restrictive way of selecting leaders and thus granting them legitimacy to govern. At worst it is a form of attenuated authority aimed at ensuring the hegemony of a dominant political elite.

**Weber:** The domination of elites within the state apparatus is inevitable. Politics is a struggle for power and in its model develops a broad conception of the State.

**Schumpeter:** The best possible system is a competitive elitism consisting of a system of competition between parties in which democracy is only a source of legitimacy for the ruling elite.

Their ideal model would be a balance based on a division of labor between politicians and a passive electorate. It would be a strong and efficient government.

**Suzanne Keller:** Sociological perspective and political analysis. Elites are inevitable and necessary. In a society, different types of elites coexist that differ from each other.

Apart from being able to differentiate themselves, they are also differentiated because some of these elites have greater social weight than the others because of the activity they develop.

**Keywords:** Democracy, types of government, the world of states, the rule of people

---

### Introduction

*"Strategic elites"* Defined as those ruling minorities that claim or have assigned functions and influences over the whole of society in contrast to the fragmentary elites that only have their function in subsectors of society. Strategic elites are the ones with the greatest social impact.

In practice, the boundaries separating strategic elites from fragmentary elites are indefinite due to different degrees of authority, concrete context, history.

What are the roles of strategic elites? There are four functional problems that every society must solve:

- Design and achievement of objectives for that society.
- Adaptation and integration of that society.
- System maintenance.
- Resolution of internal tensions.

With these problems we identify four types of strategic elites:

- Design elites and achievement of objectives **Political elite**.
- Adaptation and integration **Economic, military, diplomatic and scientific elite**.
- Maintenance of the system **Elites who exercise moral authority (priests, officials, educators...)**.
- Conflict resolution Political elite**.

Unlike other historical periods, the recruitment of these strategic elites currently presents variations. Throughout history, recruitment has been based on social heritage (economy, education, social prestige ...) but in today's societies there are different signs although without losing the weight of social inheritance such as merit and ability.

To exercise their function, these elites have a system of compensation that society offers them. Some of these rewards are tangible material benefits but others are intangible (honors and influence). The specific rewards for a political elite at any given time will depend on what is scarce and desirable value in that society.

### 4.1. Political leadership

Necessary concept because it serves as a bridge between elite and mass (puts them in relation). Political leadership has never been an easy object to study. Throughout history, explanations are given that relate facts with legends (mythomania) and even theology is addressed.

**Machiavelli** "The Prince" studies a traditional subject from a new point of view.

From the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries there was an important transformation: consolidation of the absolute monarchy, enunciation of liberal principles, industrial revolution ... who act as egalitarian agents.

The heroic vision begins to be erased and leadership movements are observed from a more egalitarian perspective. Consideration of leadership from a less personal perspective and attempts are made to explain within general theories. However, in the 1950s this perspective changed and posed it in different terms. Leaders are observed differently and political analysis is combined with psychological analysis trying to improve the explanation of political systems.

The complexity of its study means that this study is multidisciplinary. Its multiple questions are raised from at least four different areas:

- Leadership as a reflection of the leader's personality.
- Leadership as a reflection of the character and situation of the followers.
- Leadership as art or technique.
- Leadership as a personal relationship between the one who studies it and its subject.

### **1.- Leadership as a reflection of the leader's personality:**

This personalistic approach to leadership studies took considerable emphasis on Political Science through **H. Lasswell**.

The politician shifts private affections to public objectives.

Political leadership makes demands of the whole person, we cannot divide the private sphere from the public one.

The systematic study of the personality of leaders leads us to work with biographies. Especially with political biographies.

We would have to read many biographies and establish comparative studies with the data.

### **Four types of comparisons:**

- Compare political leaders, statesmen with innovators in other fields, for example science, art, literature, religion... In this type of comparison the constant element is the process of mental and psychological innovation of these people.
- Compare leaders with each other. The constant common element is political leadership without taking into account other considerations of time and space.
- Compare an important political leader in a given medium with other less important political leaders. Here the constant is the situation and the isolated variable is the personality of the different leaders. It is useful, it is used a lot to explain the competition between leaders.
- Compare personal traits (of political leaders) formed in childhood and that persist in their adult life, whether or not they are characteristic of leadership (e.g. orphanhood, social position... how they affect leadership). Difficult, requires a lot of data.

### **2.- Leadership as a reflection of the character of the followers:**

Closer line of research because the social aspect prevails. Political leadership is a complex mediation process between the personality of the leader, the hopes of his followers, the circumstances surrounding them, and the goals he sets for himself. Therefore the need for direction is proportional to the distance between the circumstances that surround them and the goals they want to achieve.

This particular study is where the element of the leader's charisma fundamentally intervenes. The concept of charisma begins with **Weber** who for him is one of the forms of domination: charisma is: extraordinary qualities that a person has It is a personal trait, but it is more things, it is also a perception and we are interested that charisma is relationship.

It is usually said that charisma is faith, followers have faith, but this is not all so, the leader has to give proof of those extraordinary qualities. He has part of faith but proof is needed.

Charisma is not a fixed but variable data, there are different degrees.

It is not a permanent state, it can grow or decrease depending on the circumstances that are lived.

The authority of a ruler can be charismatic for some and not for others. We have to ask ourselves if he is charismatic, for whom he is, to what degree, when.

Another distinction is to distinguish two distinct origins of charism:

- Direct personal contact between the leader and his immediate followers.
- It arises through indirect processes of mass communication.

The need for leadership is proportional to the helplessness of its followers. At this point it is important **R. Tucker** who elaborates *the Theory of Charismatic Leadership* and makes interesting contributions fundamentally by the expansion of **Weber's** concept of charisma.

The key to the charismatic reaction of the followers lies, basically, in misfortune. Every charismatic leader necessarily contains a promise of salvation. Starting from this misfortune **Tucker** explains the intense emotional relationship between leader and follower. This relationship is sealed by the periodic demand for proof that the leader will save you.

Based on the concept of misfortune he builds the distinction between *pure charisma* and *situational charisma*. In a situation of perception of a high degree of misfortune he will approach pure charisma.

Study of different circumstances between:

- Churchill (33)
- Roosevelt.
- Hitler.

In all three cases the situation of misfortune was more intense in Germany than in the other two cases (crisis of 29 and SGM). The German people had a much greater perception of misfortune: unemployment and poverty but also a huge anxiety of the middle class and offended nationalist sentiments (sense of humiliation) after the PGM and the Treaty of Versailles.

That is why the degree of pure charisma is greater in Hitler's case than in the other two.

The author elaborates three forms of misfortune:

- Fear: threat of physical force, war...
- Anxiety: situation of loss
- Existential fear: refers to identity conflicts, loss of identity signs.

Charismatic leadership always generates an attitude of hatred, since charismatic leadership always proposes a change and there are always people who do not want to change the situation.

The leader can adopt various postures towards misfortune:

Qualification of leaders:

- Vision of a solution: prophet.
- Unusual powers to direct the formula of solution: activist.

The difference is not very clear in practice; Many times it will depend, in the same character, on the moment we study:

- Marx is seen as a prophet, but he participated in the creation of the First and Second Internationals.
- Lenin Activist, but also contributes to political thought.

These leaders are usually very confident in achieving goals. The idea of conspiracy also influences a lot: it starts from an unfortunate situation, the leader says he has the solution: because misfortune comes from a conspiracy, and what must be done is a conspiracy against that conspiracy.

Conspiracy has magnetism. He manages to distinguish three cultural conspiracies from the Middle Ages in the West:

- Jesuit.
- Masonic
- Communist/capitalist
- Bean.

### **3.- Leadership as art or technique:**

Political leadership consists of finding the point of union between the variables: personality of the leader, the expectations of the followers, the circumstances and the goals and that capacity on behalf of the leader.

The leader has to make a discovery/adjustment. To the extent that we can find traits common to all leaders, it is plausible that we will find traits that facilitate this work.

**Rousseau** in "The Social Contract" gave the following definition of the best political leader: "*Superior intelligence knowing all the passions of men but not susceptible to any of them; totally detached from our nature but knowing it thoroughly and with a happiness independent of ours, but ready to take care of us.*"

It demands a peculiar combination of detachment and interest from the political leader.

It is more or less studied that in the career of a political leader there is a first phase of detachment and then a phase of commitment.

For the leader to be recognized and to be able to mediate between circumstances and goals, he needs more versatility than precision (he must be more attentive to small details, than to large circumstances, where to fit his project.

Part of this ability is to open new or obstructed communication routes.

Have the ability to discover ways of conciliation between opposing goals.

Establish a feasible order of priorities among the goals, in order to make them compatible.

When we talk about an important leadership, we must have a basic element: how much of its society and its history and other similar cases.

### **Attitudes of the leader**

Theoretical: detachment, delivery (commitment), perception of possible changes, communication, innovation.

**LESSON 5:** *Parliaments. Representation, decision and control. Bicameralism. The opposition. Types. Case studies.*

### **5.1. Representation, decision and control.**

The absence of Parliament is very rare. Approximation in democratic parliaments **minimum requirements** (attributes):

- Assembly nature.** They are schools made up of a fairly large number of people.  
It is a fundamentally non-hierarchical body because all the people who access it have the same situation.  
They have a greater number of members than any other institution of the State.
- Permanent nature.** They are not limited to individual decisions but parliaments can create a continuous decision-making flow and do not depend on any other institution. They are at the same level as any other state institution.  
The permanent character has to do with their autonomy.
- Internal pluralism.** It is the basis of Parliament's structure since it is an institution which by its very nature is obliged to collect a plurality of voices.
- Parliaments are at the top of **representative processes** of the State because they are based on the link established between political citizenship and the State.  
You see it more in parliamentary systems.

### **Minimum definition**

Parliament is a representative, permanent and pluralistic assembly. The absence of any of these elements would determine a substantial change in the nature of the institution.

The most politically relevant article is its representative character. Democratic political representation is a system of relations between rulers and citizens characterized by a high degree of institutional articulation.

Despite the voices that recall that parliaments have lost important, we must not forget:

- That parliamentary political elections are always a major event in political systems.
- That Parliament remains the best school of political leadership. In any country the national political class is predominantly composed of people with long parliamentary experience.
- That the vast majority of the most important political decisions within a political system must obtain a parliamentary sanction that should not be considered attributed a priori.

Parliaments are still obligatory seats of important decision-making. In addition, two important phenomena are meeting in Parliament:

- It is the recipient of inputs representing the interests of society.
- And producing outputs laws are elaborated that are solutions to the demands of society.

## **5.2. Bicameralism.**

In practice there are variations in the configuration of Parliaments: MORPHOLOGY; There are two features:

- **Articulation in one or two chambers:** Years ago (Tito's Yugoslavia five chambers). Monocameralism The Chamber represents the population. Individual representation. Bicameralism One of the Chambers represents the population but the second chamber usually carries out territorial representation. There are exceptions: the House of Lords retains pre-democratic forms of representation (privilege).

Within bicameralism there can be two situations:

- **Symmetrical or real bicameralism:** the two chambers have the same theoretical weight.
- **Asymmetrical bicameralism:** One of the two chambers has greater political weight than the other. It is generally associated with two problems: derived from a problem of legitimacy and from the poor definition of the House.

Political parties will influence the functioning of Parliament. A parliament in which decisions are made by the parliamentary elite is very different from one in which decisions are made by the party apparatus. In the first case, parliamentary life is much richer.

## **2.- How the decision-making process is approached inside.**

There are two planes:

- **How majority-opposition relations are organized:** Work must be organized internally to make it clear that there are also a minority that have to speak.

Parliaments have had to create a complex system of rules and procedures to allow the orderly expression of all voices. This system is not the same in all parliaments.

- **Commission system:** Need to work in smaller groups. This system of committees makes their existence a reality, but not all parliaments are regarded in the same way.

A continuum can be established between a maximum of decentralization and a maximum of centralization. This identifies commissions vs. plenary.

Factors that advise favoring work in commissions:

- Functional specialization.
- Permanence.
- In those parliaments very given to the maximum of decentralization it is observed that there are more seats to distribute.

Against commissions:

The commissions operate with less publicity than plenary sessions and with less formal procedures and without the institutional presence of members of the government.

Two different types of parliaments can be built:

- **Polycentric Parliament:** Where all centrifugal variables of all dimensions are summed:
  - Royal Bicameral.
  - Parliaments that are not very cohesive or have many parties.
  - Limited relevance of the government-opposition binomial.
  - Strong commission system.
- **Adversarial Parliament:** Combines all centripetal variables:
  - Monocameral or bicameral asymmetrical.
  - Two-party system and/or cohesive and strong parties.
  - Close identification between government and parliamentary majority.
  - Weak commission system.

Both are ideal types. They approach them:

First Model U.S. Congress

Second model British Parliament.

When we talk about parliaments, we must talk about the **opposition**, because Parliament is the most appropriate place to exercise opposition. The exercise of parliamentary opposition has not always been like this.

Great Britain Country with the longest parliamentary tradition. Parliament open for more than 800 years. The opposition (discordant voices) appears linked to the bankruptcy of the unitary universe of politics (end of the MA). Politics is going to be a struggle of conflicting interests.

During the S. XIV and XV parliamentary criticisms of the Executive appear but they are very few because at that time a real punishment was stipulated on those criticisms (crimes of treason).

The situation varies in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries where there is a politicization of society. At first the opposition begins to be tolerated as a lesser evil and is tolerated because it is better that criticism manifests itself within the system. Opposition is still considered disloyalty.

Radical change from 1832. First major electoral reform and the electoral census is greatly expanded (census suffrage). This gives a twist to the political scene (cadre parties). First moment in the history of Great Britain in which there is a change of the Prime Minister by a member of the opposition due to the elections. It is totally unloaded in a halo of disloyalty and goes on to speak of loyal opposition to his majesty.

Some authors (Lowell) argue that this shift in the optics of the opposition is the greatest contribution of nineteenth-century Britain to statecraft.

### **5.3. The opposition**

#### **United States**

Here immediately appears the problem of majorities and minorities and the acceptance of political opposition within the State.

Etymologically it comes from the Latin voice *oppositio* to be against, in front, in front of something.

It is a concept that is defined in reference to another and from a negative perspective. Politically, the opposition is defined by that situation that is out of power.

In our everyday language we use it from two perspectives:

- **Opposition - Activity function** . In an objective sense. It is the activity aimed at controlling the actions of the government conditioning and influencing its political line from a different programmatic orientation and with a view to replacing that government with a different one. It is synonymous with political conflict. (e.g. vote against the government in Parliament)
- **Opposition - Organization** Subjective sense. We point to certain actors excluded from political power and represent their own interests or values different from those supported by the government. (e.g. PSOE).

We use both meanings commonly.

We must differentiate between minority and opposition because they are not the same. Sometimes a minority in Parliament is not opposition. E.g. CiU is not in the opposition because it supports the government.

#### **Nature of opposition in democratic states.**

Today we know that the function of opposition is legitimate and absolutely necessary. It is essential and essential.

The opposition-function is a guarantee of the separation of powers and is a guarantee of the democratic rule of law.

It is also always an alternative program of government as an expression of social and political pluralism.

The opposition - function is a future alternative of government.

We do not see these functions sometimes too clearly because it does not do its functions well. Opposition-function is a complex activity that can manifest itself at all levels of parliamentary proceedings.

The opposition has to have an objective design of the government's political direction. What is most visualized is what it does with respect to executive control. But it is not always its function that is exercised frontally, but sometimes it is obliged to exercise a function of consensus. This variation depends on each political system.

#### **Legal status of the opposition**

In general terms, it is the set of powers that the legal systems formally or informally recognize to the minorities that make up the opposition.

From the point of view of opposition - organization this statute translates into the requirement that minority parliamentary groups be present in the various parliamentary bodies.

From the perspective of opposition - function translates into the guarantees that are recognized to minorities of reserve time, initiatives ... for parliamentary work.

These guarantees, both in function and organization, what they foresee is that they have a leading role in the procedure but not in the resolutions that are resolved by majority.

### **Types of democratic opposition**

Huge range of typologies.

**Opposition in relation to the political regime.** Weare:

- Opposition in theregime.
- Opposition to the regime groups that are not in parliament.

### **Sartori**

- Constitutional opposition.
- Unconstitutional opposition.

### **Kirchheimer**

- Loyal opposition.
- Unfair opposition.

### **Opposition in relation to recognition:**

- Legal Opposition.
- Illegal opposition.
- Formalized opposition.
- Unformalized opposition.

Alluding to the degree of institutionalization that the opposition reaches within the regime.

### **Opposition in relation to the party system:**

#### **Dahl**

- Competition Different actors, there was no single line of opposition, those who compose it compete with each other.
- Cooperation Competition but at a certain time they have to cooperate.
- Fusion All opposition groups do it together.

### **Opposition in the context of the conflict**

- Interorganic opposition Normal opposition, political parties that are not in government.
- Intra-organic opposition The political struggle pits various state organs against each other.

Historically, the secular struggle between Parliament and the Crown (British case for example).

Today: U.S. President The U.S. has in front of it a Congress whose majority is from another party.

### **Institutionalization of the opposition**

The opposition has generally not been constitutionally recognized as a specific institution, unlike political parties. The degree of legal formalization is lower than its political significance.

There are very few exceptions where opposition is recognized.

Constitution in the Land of Baden May 1947. Article 120 states that opposition parties must feel co-responsible for political life and the direction of the State.

Constitution of the city - State of Hamburg of 1971. Article 23 literally states that the opposition is an essential part of parliamentary democracy.

Portuguese Constitution of 1976. Article 117.2 states: "Minorities are recognized as having the right of democratic opposition." They have developed a 1977 statute of the right of opposition. This is something that does not happen in any other State.

Undoubtedly, the main example is the **British case**, it is the most institutionalized opposition in the world. This situation has been favored by historical circumstances but also by political ones: majority system, two-party system, conflictual relationship between government and opposition

These circumstances have developed a very high process of institutionalization. The Opposition is configured as a great counter-power ("shadow government"). Opposition is capitalized.

The Opposition in Britain identifies the party that is not integrated into government and has the most seats in the House of Commons.

### **Wilding and Laundry**

The Opposition is the party in the House that is currently in a minority, organized unitarily and officially recognized that has had experience of government and is prepared to form an executive with its leader as Prime Minister when the existing cabinet loses the confidence of the country.

Other minorities may exist but they are not the Opposition.

The Opposition has a title: "The Loyal Opposition Your Majesty."

The formula of the British Opposition is to criticize everything and propose nothing.

It is a type of opposition that cannot be transferred to other places.

At each session, 20 days are allocated to deal with opposition matters, of which 17 are available to the Opposition and the other three to the rest of the opposition.

In the event that it was not known after an election who was the leader of the Opposition, he would be appointed the Spiker of the House.

**LESSON 6:** Executives. Direction and political elaboration. Big government. Types. Case studies.

### **6.1. Executives**

A political institution that is practically the central core of politics today in modern systems.

The name has become too small. In the eighteenth century is the liberal theory of division of powers of Montesquieu. The Executive executed the laws. This today is not unique. It is not their most important function.

Fundamentally, they are the ones who direct the internal and external policy of the State. They are the true core of political leadership = Political action = Executive = Government.

With the word government it also happens as with other concepts. In our everyday language we use it for different things:

- Political direction.
- When we point out the political actors, the institution.

Government comes from the Greek word " " = to lead with a rudder. Complexity in the meaning of "Executive" today. This makes the institution complex, very important.

We must speak of two different poles when we refer to "government": (sometimes they can seem contradictory).

### **6.2. Direction and policy making.**

Conceptual binomial political direction vs. Admon.

EXECUTIVES

Political management / Administration.

-----  
Innovation / Routine

Choice / Performance.

This duality of executives is shown according to what we intend to study.

- **Political Management:** it is characterized by its innovation. It's the creative part of politics. It is where value judgments in decision-making and arbitrariness intervene. It is also the space where politics seeks consensus.
- **Government-Administration:** In this pole the government refers to repetition, routine behavior. Regularity and normalization would be the characteristics of the action of the government-admon is the implementation, execution of what was launched in the first pole of the political direction.

The distinction between these two spheres is also made between:

- Political Direction Politics.
- Administration Law.

In the political direction the government escapes the control of legitimacy, while in the admon. if there is a control that is completely logical.



The two faces of the government, although it seems opposed, are united in the same institution, appearing linked to the monopoly of force (Weber) guarantee that these decisions will be obeyed. This is a sign of the importance that this institution has for the Political Community.

### **6.3. Types**

There would be two major classifications to talk about different types of governments:

- Very old, with more historical tradition, but today explains very little **Monarchy vs. Republic**. Traditional explanation:
  - Monarchy: Government of one.
  - Republic: government of several.
- Form of government (so called today) They give information about the Head of State. How you became head of state:
  - Monarchy: hereditary institution.
  - Republic: Elective Head of State.
- A second classification adds parliamentary models, more explanatory.
- Parliamentary System Parliamentary Government: implies either Monarchy or Republic, that the Head of State is one person and the Head of Government another.
- Presidential System In it, the Head of State and the Chief Executive are the same person. This makes the combination of Monarchy and Republic unthinkable.
- Parliamentary monarchy Sweden.
- Parliamentary Republic France (with peculiarities).
- Argentine Presidential Government (America except Canada, which is Parliamentary because it follows British system Head of State = Queen of England, are presidential systems).

The second classification refers to two distinct dimensions of analysis of government institutions:

#### **1.- Legitimation of governments, of executives: institutional modalities that guarantee legitimacy.**

- Direct legitimation: Direct legitimation Argentina.
- Indirect legitimation: Indirect legitimation Norway (any parliamentary monarchy)
- The executive with **direct** legitimacy is one to which the body that grants legitimacy – the electorate – has no power to dissolve it. He has to wait if he does not like it at the expiration of the term and add mechanisms of non-reelection (presidential systems the mandate of the Executive is fixed). For example, Argentina in the Alfonsín stage has to call elections before – unthinkable in presidential government – Menem wins. This was a crisis because it bankrupted the presidential system.

In the Executives of direct legitimation, the granting and withdrawal of legitimacy takes place in a single institutional moment. The electorate lacks the capacity for autonomous activation. This leads (except for Argentina) to greater stability of the Executives.

- In governments of **indirect legitimation** there is a link between Executive and electorate the Parliament, = permanent constitutional body, which does not exhaust its functions in the election of the executive, but enjoys broader powers.

Comparing the two cases in theory (in practice it is more difficult) it seems that the electorate has greater capacity for movement in the parliamentary system (but in the hands of its representatives).

#### **2.- The second dimension of analysis is the structure of the Executive.**

- **Monocrático:** Ejecutivo que presentaría una estructura de dos niveles:
- Superior clearly Chief Executive. President or Prime Minister.
- Inferior Rest of the components of the executive subordinate to him.

Within this structure we can give two examples:

- **Presidential:** Pte Chief Executive. Also head of state.

And in the United States what we call Ministers are called Secretaries.

This designation implies greater subordination.

- *Cabinet Government* British case. The strength of the Prime Minister, does not need an investiture session, becomes Prime Minister as soon as the election results are known.

**b) Collegiate executive:** A single level. The essential components are the Head of Government and the Ministers. You can see who is the Prime Minister and who is the Ministers. To make it clearer let's turn to Sartori's division:

- First above its unequals: British case (halfway between the two types). Chief Executive who is at the same time head of the party. He can hardly be dismissed by a vote of no confidence in Parliament and appoints and changes ministers as he pleases, there is ample room for manoeuvre.
- First among unequals: German Chancellor Model (similar to the Spanish case). Prime Minister who may be but may not be leader of the party. He cannot be easily dismissed by a vote of no confidence in Parliament. He is expected to remain in office even if the Ministers fall. First among unequals because he can dismiss but not vice versa.
- First among equals (primus inter pares): Prime Minister who is most likely not leader of the party. He falls when his cabinet falls. Generally in the cabinets he composes he is obliged to put Ministers who are imposed on him outside. He has little control over the group. e.g. Italian Prime Minister.

### **LESSON 7: General debate on the performance of institutions. I: The theory of party government.**

We are going to put governments and parties in relationship. The questions we can ask arise from how we deal with the political phenomena that occur.

Let's go from 1945, the WWII ends. This war will mean the victory of democracies over totalitarianisms and democracy will break through as the only form of legitimate government.

From that moment on, interest in the study of democratic systems and especially in the Welfare State increased.

Political parties and executives had traditionally been studied.

In the 60s they begin to consider a reflection on the performance of democracy. Within this perspective is where studies on the theory of party government appear. From 1945 onwards, logically the studies that are most enhanced are electoral studies. 20 years later, other elements of analysis are sought to find an explanation for this not excellent functioning of democracy.

There is a study perspective that will revolve around political parties and also on governments. In the sense that governments are configured as the most important political institutions, political parties take on enormous importance. On this conception revolves the theory of party government. The search for a theoretical framework has not yet yielded an explanatory theory that is sufficiently satisfactory. There is no single theory of party government because it has been seen from different perspectives which gives rise to different points of view.

We can make, in a very general summary, a distinction between two different optics:

- Theories that conceive party government practically equivalent to a model of political organization.
- Theories about party governance that restrict this expression to the relations between the two actors (governments and parties).

The two conceptions are very different. The first is practically everything, the second is much more concrete.

- **Theories that conceive party government practically equivalent to a model of political organization.**

Definition of MINTZEL and SCHMITT (1981): "*Form of societal regulation of conflict in which a plurality of organized political parties democratically play a relatively dominant role both in the sphere of socio-political mediation and in the decision-making process.*"

It is practically a definition of political system, although it is not the classic definition because political parties appear in a dominant position.

**KATZ:** It is so difficult to encompass the notion of party government that it attempts to define party government on the basis of three conditions:

- All important decisions of government must be made by people elected by the people, through political parties or by individuals accountable to them.
- Public policies must be decided between the ruling party, when there is a one-color government, or by negotiation between parties when there is a coalition.
- The Prime Minister and the most relevant people within the cabinet must be selected within their parties and be accountable to the people through such organizations.

They seem obvious to us because it reflects how democratic political systems work.

Katz adopts a rationalist paradigm and so that leads him to think that parties are teams of individuals who cooperate under the prism of rational actors oriented in their action to obtain their purposes.

**Consider the matches:**

- As cohesive teams that behave to achieve their goals.
- Oriented towards the control of political power through elections and appointments.
- They claim legitimacy for their actions thanks to their electoral participation.

For Katz, party rule is an ideal type that reflects what in historical terms has represented the adaptation of bourgeois parliamentary institutions after the adoption of universal suffrage.

Party rule is the evolution of the parliamentary system. He argues that treating party government as an ideal type helps us to seek approximations or separations from the model when we study concrete cases.

How should this model work? From four elements:

- Ability to implement specific public policies.
- Skill that is had for those policies to produce the desired effects.
- Ability to choose the right goals.
- The party must be prepared and willing to carry these policies to the end and bear their costs.

From Katz's perspective, party rule is a strategy followed by a group of individuals (political parties) to seek control of the government.

It must be borne in mind that in rational analysis we must talk about cost-benefits. What benefits do these groups of rationalist individuals (parties) seek?

Getting to the government and then re-election is the maximum benefit that a party can achieve because it serves to continue fulfilling the objectives.

Costs? Matches involve commitment, cooperation and discipline.

**Factors influencing the interactive logic between executives and supporting parties**

There are many factors that influence, we will talk about two groups:

- Group composed of the specific characteristics that affect the **decision-making process** of political systems: political institutions, party systems and actors.
- Factors related to the **nature of the decisions** that are made. Depending on the subject, the decisions are different and also depending on the situation (normality or emergency).
- Specific characteristics that affect the decision process.**

**Institutions:** we find that it is not the same to raise relations in a parliamentary or presidential model.

**Party systems:** We can find three different situations.

- Only one party forms a government. Monocolor governments. Two-party systems or predominant party systems.
- Minority governments. It comes from a multi-party party system.
- Coalition governments. Multi-party party systems.

Three areas of observation: appointments, public policies and clientelism.

- Only one party forms a government.

**Appointment:** We generally find that the main party leaders are usually also the main members of the party. We are going to call this **LEADERSHIP FUSION**. Normally these cases tend to benefit the executive more than the party.

**Public policies:** The party has a program adopted at the last Congress. But those politicians adapt that program, the fusion of leadership also favors the executive more.

**Clientelism:** Low level of distribution of favors due to the cohesion of the party that supports the executive and that cohesion acts as a source of legitimacy for the position of both but above all for the executive.

- Broad coalition.* (Case opposite to the previous one)

**Appointments:** All members of the executive have to be decided by each of the parties, but these people do not control the decision-making positions of each party. The parties predominate over the executive.

**Public Policy:** Each party seeks to control every detail of public policy adoption. Although there is distribution of portfolios does not mean that later they have autonomy.

**Clientelism:** Very wide level of distribution of favors because it serves to ensure cohesion between the different parties that form the coalition.

Minority government.

**Appointments:** Only the parties that intervene have to do with the appointments although partially, because there is always a party that has the minority majority and asserts it with respect to its partners.

**Public policies:** The largest of the parties in the coalition has an advantage in determining public policies. But that advantage will be displaced by the executive's own initiative that will propose public policies and then asks its partners if they agree or not.

**Clientelism:** A relatively low level is accused because the government is increasing this initiative and is achieving a position of hegemony that allows it not to distribute favors only in very specific cases.

In the first case, the executive-support party relations have greater weight of the executive.

In the second, party on executive.

Third, at the beginning the party weighs more but in the end, if the executive remains, it is done with a greater space than the party.

The different actors also give us information regarding these relationships.

### **Political parties**

**Ideology:** Important fact because it is the vehicle through which we learn what political project he wants to carry out.

**Organization variable:** The key to government-party relations is internal cohesion. The more cohesive parties would in principle be more predisposed to control the executive. The few, it is more difficult to pose the dominance over the executive.

**Positions of the leaders:** It is very important. Three different possibilities:

- The important leaders are only in government.
- The important leaders are only in the party.
- We combine the two cases.

In the case of **leadership merger** we can find two situations:

- Let leaders tend to foster government domination over the party. Trend that occurs more. Mistake because the government will last less than the party and this attitude creates discomfort in the party.
- Leaders who tend to try to find a balance between government and party, trying to combine the political demands of the party with the technical demands of the cabinet. Balance where both institutions have something to say.

### **Nature of decisions**

Important appreciation: party of support and government are different things. They have different reasons for being, governments have to have higher views, those of the State, governs the nation, people who have not voted for it,... The parties always have more partial, more concrete interests. These differences in nature pose a conflict between the two.

There are three areas of decision that are privileged by the government over the party:

- In emergency situation. The government makes a decision without probably consulting the party.
- Excessively technical problems where explaining them would be a great waste of time.
- Everything that has to do with the execution of public policies, here the government acts as the head of the administration.

For **BLONDEL** and **COTA** we can talk about two types of situations:

- Reinforcement situation** where the government controls the process of public policies and appointments depend on them, the executive always has the key.
- Compensation.** The government depends on the party for appointments but the party submits to the government as far as the public policy process (the whole process) is concerned.

**LESSON 8:** *General debate on the performance of institutions. II: Parliamentarism versus Presidentialism.*

### **Presidentialism**

- Direct or almost direct election of the Head of State. This is defining but not definitive because in Austria, Iceland and Ireland they directly elect their Head of State but without powers. Then they are parliamentarians.
- The government is neither appointed nor ousted by parliamentary vote.

The government is a presidential prerogative, it is the President who appoints and dismisses the members of his government.

- The President heads the executive, there is no dual authority. The Head of State is the same person as the Head of Government.

When these three conditions are met, we speak of a pure presidential system. This system is tested for the first time in the US and then exported to other countries (the export has not been mimetic).

U.S. presidentialism is characterized by the division of powers between executive and legislative (Parliament). The legislature cannot remove the President nor can it influence the internal affairs of the executive. But the President cannot dissolve Congress.

The central defining feature of the US model is the existence of an autonomous executive branch. This does not mean that the President is indifferent that he does not have support in Congress, it will depend on each moment the President relies on the members of his party or those of another party.

Factors influencing the performance of the North American system:

- Lack of ideological principles in the European sense.
- Existence of weak and undisciplined parties.
- A policy focused on local issues. Fundamental factor.

With these three elements the President can obtain sufficient support from Congress by negotiating favors for local districts. This leads us to see that the American State is a weak State, built on the distrust of citizens towards public powers. They have a minimal state.

The most important thing for a U.S. congressman is the voting record for his district. This model has been exported to Latin America but the result is totally different.

The export of the North American model does not have the same performance in the rest of the continent. In Latin America, presidentialism is fragile, perhaps Costa Rica is the country where the presidential system works best. It is a practically unique case. Venezuela since 1958 can speak of a certain stability in the Government. In Colombia, since 1949, there has been a significant political deterioration. Peru, from 79 to 92. Argentina, Uruguay, Brazil and Chile since the 80s have begun a period of stability. Paraguay maintained some stability until a month ago. In Ecuador, Bolivia, Honduras, the Dominican Republic, Nicaragua and Guatemala there is a lot of instability.

In general terms, the difficulties are related to economic stagnation, inequalities, socio-cultural legacies...

The fundamental political problem is because presidentialism is not accompanied by a suitable party model. That is why the debate between presidentialism and parliamentarism is gaining more strength.

### **Parliamentarism**

Parliamentary systems owe their name to their basic principle: Parliament is sovereign.

We are used to defining it as a model of collaboration between powers. But this needs precision. When we talk about collaboration of powers we mean that the legislative and the executive collaborate and if they do not do so the legislature can be endangered. There are two threats: legislative against executive motion of censure. Executive vs. legislative dissolution. But it must be qualified, the motion of censure is the extreme solution to a usual situation such as government control.

Therefore the weapons of the legislature against the executive are habitual, while the dissolution of the chamber is sporadic. The legislature is popularly elected.

When we talk about parliamentarism, we are talking about different political regimes. We can speak of three different types of parliamentarism (ideal types):

- English-type Prime Minister or Cabinet system:** The executive prevails over Parliament. There is no need for an investiture session, the office of Prime Minister is automatically occupied.
- At the other extreme is the French-type Assembly Government** (Fourth Republic 1946-58). It practically prevents governing. It is based on the following features:
  - The cabinet does not run the legislature, Parliament sets the agenda.
  - Power is dispersed and even atomized.
  - Responsibility practically disappears altogether (because there are many actors).

- Little to no party discipline.
  - Prime ministers and their governments cannot act quickly or decisively.
  - Coalitions do not resolve disagreements and are never sure they have legislative support.
  - Governments never speak with a single, clear voice.
- Between the two is parliamentarism controlled by the parties.**  
The indispensable factor for the functioning of parliamentarism is the existence of disciplined political parties.  
There are other approaches (lesson 6. Types of Prime Ministers).

### **Semi-Presidentialism**

Complicated hybrid. There are different types. The best known is the **French model** of the Fifth Republic that emerged in 1958. It operates based on the idea of shared power, the President of the Republic must share power with the Prime Minister and in turn the Prime Minister must obtain the parliamentary support of the Assembly.

The characteristic of any presidentialism is the dual power structure. The French have a two-headed but unequal system; The greatest force oscillates from one to another. President of the Republic 7 years without dismissal and with the possibility of re-election.

The majority system provides some convenience. The oscillation of power depends on the political dynamics that take place at each moment.

When there is no cohabitation (President and Prime Minister are from the same party) the bicephaly becomes a single head (President grows spectacularly). French semi-presidentialism has evolved into a truly mixed system based on a flexible structure of dual authority. Historically one of the clearest cases is that of the Weimar Republic that did not work.

Another case is that of **Portugal**. When they leave the dictatorship (74) a Constitution is drawn up (76). The constitutional reforms have been leading to a parliamentarism.

In the reform of 82 the power of the President to ask for the resignation of Governments and Ministers is eliminated; Its legislative powers were curtailed. It is limited in its power to dissolve Parliament and to veto the legislature.

The great constitutional crises are due to the confrontation between the President and the Prime Minister that occur very frequently (when they are not from the same party).

**Finnish model** (since 1919). The President of the Republic heads the meetings of the Executive when dealing with the subjects reserved to the President of the Republic (foreign policy). When domestic policy issues are discussed, meetings are chaired by the Prime Minister.

The President elects the Prime Minister and sets conditions on the composition of coalition governments. Everything else functions as parliamentarism.

The most curious is the **case of Russia**. Since the constitutional referendum of 93 it falls into the category. The semi-presidential state is not acting flexibly but is continuously leading to confrontation between the President and the Duma. The President appoints the Prime Minister and Deputy Prime Minister but it has to be ratified by the Duma. If the Duma rejects the appointment three times, the President can dissolve the House and call new elections.

The situation applies in the event that a government receives a vote of censure twice (the President terminates Parliament).

It is the most extreme system of semi-presidentialism, the weakest is the Finnish.

### **Common features:**

### **Conclusions**

- The Head of State (President) is elected by popular vote either directly or indirectly for a specified period.
- The Head of State shares executive power with the Prime Minister, thus establishing a dual authority structure based on three criteria:
- The President is independent of Parliament but is not allowed to govern alone and consequently his will is channelled through the Government.
- The Prime Minister and his Cabinet are in some cases independent of the President because they report to Parliament. Subject to the vote of confidence, of censure.
- The dual authority structure that characterizes semi-presidentialism allows for different balances of power between the two heads depending on political dynamics.

### Bibliography

- [1]. Armstrong, J. A. (1988). Toward a framework for considering nationalism in East Europe. *East European Politics and Societies*, 2(2), 280-305.
- [2]. Andor, L. (2015). Fair mobility in Europe. *Social Europe Occasional Paper*.
- [3]. Bergson, A. (1991). The USSR before the fall: how poor and why. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 5(4), 29-44.
- [4]. Daviddi, R., & Ilzkovitz, F. (1997). The Eastern enlargement of the European Union: Major challenges for macro-economic policies and institutions of Central and East European countries. *European Economic Review*, 41(3-5), 671-680.
- [5]. Delsoldato, G. (2002). Eastward enlargement by the European Union and transnational parties. *International Political Science Review*, 23(3), 269-289.
- [6]. Draxler, J., & Van Vliet, O. (2010). European social model: No convergence from the East. *European Integration*, 32(1), 115-135.
- [7]. Dreger, C., Kholodilin, K., Lommatzsch, K., Slačálek, J., & Wozniak, P. (2008). Price convergence in an enlarged internal market. *Eastern European Economics*, 46(5), 57-68.
- [8]. Dunay, P. (1994). NATO and the East: A Sea of Mysteries. *World Policy Journal*, 11(3), 123-127.
- [9]. Gorodetsky, G. (1990). The impact of the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact on the course of Soviet foreign policy. *Cahiers du Monde russe et soviétique*, 27-41.
- [10]. Grieco, J. M. (1995). The Maastricht Treaty, Economic and Monetary Union and the neo-realist research programme. *Review of International Studies*, 21(1), 21-40.
- [11]. Guiraudon, V. (2001). Weak weapons of the weak? Transnational mobilization around migration in the European Union. *Contentious European*, 163-86.
- [12]. Healey, D., & Healey, D. (2002). Homosexual existence and existing socialism: New light on the repression of male homosexuality in Stalin's Russia. *GLQ: A journal of lesbian and gay studies*, 8(3), 349-378.
- [13]. Hillion, C. (2014). The Copenhagen criteria and their progeny. *EU enlargement (Oxford, Hart Publishing, 2004)*.
- [14]. Kandogan, Y. (2000). Political economy of eastern enlargement of the European Union: Budgetary costs and reforms in voting rules. *European Journal of Political Economy*, 16(4), 685-705.
- [15]. Kojevnikov, A. (2002). The Great War, the Russian Civil War, and the invention of big science. *Science in Context*, 15(2), 239-275.
- [16]. Levesque, J. (1974). Modèles de conflits entre l'URSS et les autres états socialistes. *Canadian Journal of Political Science/Revue canadienne de science politique*, 7(1), 135-142.
- [17]. Pejovich, S. (2006). 3. The effects of the interaction of formal and informal institutions on social stability and economic development. *Institutions, Globalisation and Empowerment*, 56.
- [18]. Peterson, J. (2017). Juncker's political European Commission and an EU in crisis. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 55(2), 349-367.
- [19]. Price, J., Sloman, L., Gardner, R., Gilbert, P., & Rohde, P. (1994). The social competition hypothesis of depression. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 164(3), 309-315.
- [20]. Sapir, A. (2006). Globalization and the reform of European social models. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 44(2), 369-390.
- [21]. Scherpereel, J. A. (2010). EU cohesion policy and the Europeanization of Central and East European regions. *Regional & Federal Studies*, 20(1), 45-62.
- [22]. Stephanson, A. (2002). Fourteen notes on the very concept of the Cold War. In *Rethinking Geopolitics* (pp. 74-97). Routledge.
- [23]. Threlfall, M. (2003). European social integration: harmonization, convergence and single social areas. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 13(2), 121-139.
- [24]. Troitiño, D. R. (2021). La «Década Digital» de la Unión Europea: desarrollos e impactos sobre su ciudadanía y economía. *IDP. Revista de Internet, Derecho y Política*, (34), 1-14.
- [25]. Troitiño, D. R. (2022). The European Union Facing the 21st Century: The Digital Revolution. *TalTech Journal of European Studies*, 12(1), 60-78.
- [26]. Troitiño, D. R. (2022). La estrategia de las instituciones de la Unión Europea ante el reto de digitalización. *Revista CIDOB d'Afers Internacionals*, 17-40.
- [27]. Troitiño, D. R. (2022). El futuro digital de la política europea.
- [28]. Waaldijk, K. (1994). Standard sequences in the legal recognition of homosexuality-Europe's past, present and future. *Australasian Gay & Lesbian LJ*, 4, 50.
- [29]. Walby, S. (2004). The European Union and gender equality: Emergent varieties of gender regime. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 11(1), 4-29.

- [30]. Whitman, R. G. (2004). NATO, the EU and ESDP: an emerging division of labour?. *Contemporary security policy*, 25(3), 430-451.
- [31]. Wivel, A. (2005). The security challenge of small EU member states: interests, identity and the development of the EU as a security actor. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 43(2), 393-412.
- [32]. Wodak, R., & Boukala, S. (2015). European identities and the revival of nationalism in the European Union: A discourse historical approach. *Journal of language and politics*, 14(1), 87-109.
- [33]. Young, J. W. (1994). Cold War Europe, 1945-1989: A Political History. *The English Historical Review*, 109(433), 1039-1040.