

ПОЛІТИЧНІ НАУКИ

UDC 340.11:32

**COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF MULTIPARTY DYNAMIC SYSTEMS IN THE
MODERN WORLD ON THE EXAMPLE OF THE POST-SOVIET COUNTRIES
(RUSSIA, GEORGIA, AZERBAIJAN)**

Aloyeva Kamala Tofik kyzy

*Baku State University
Chair of Sociology and Political Science,
Baku, Azerbaijan*

Experience shows that the party system dominated by a single party emerged in countries that faced problems of socio-economic modernization, the construction of the modern state, the formation of civil society and the incorporation of the masses into political life. This allows to assert that in the twentieth century, the emergence of the party dominant party systems occur in countries with a "catch-up modernization". Most of these countries have traditional level of development and the structures of civil society are still very weak. In these circumstances, the government undertakes the strengthened measures for the formation of civil society, but at the same time strives to control this process. And one of the main elements of such control is usually dominant party, because, it is the ruling party. It should be noted that, regardless the form of domination, all the dominant party systems have similarities. This is because; these party systems decide essence common challenges. One of the features is the spread of patronage and orientations of cash bonds. The second feature is that the dominant parties often act as a center party. The third difference is that, in predominant party and dominant systems parties are usually used for the modernization political relationships. In authoritarian systems the dominant ruling party often uses non-democratic practices and procedures to maintain the dominance of the ruling group.

Key words: multiparty system, post-Soviet countries, dynamics of a multiparty system.

Introduction. Giovanni Sartori identifies 3 modifications of a multiparty system with a dominant party. He writes about the pre-dominant party system, the dominant party system and the authoritarian dominant system.

Statement of the task. The purpose of the work is to analyze the legal status. According to J. Sartori significantly different from each other, however, Sartori was able to identify and similarities.

Results of the study. Experience shows that party systems with the dominance of a single party arose in states faced with the tasks of social and economic modernization, the construction of a modern state, the formation of civil society and the inclusion of the broad masses in political life. We paid so much attention to the multi-party system with the dominant party because the party systems functioning in the post-Soviet space are often dominant party systems of various modifications.

Analysis of research and publications. A comparative analysis of multi-party dynamic systems in the modern world on the example of post-Soviet countries was studied by scientists: Sartori J. "Parties and party systems", Huntington S. "Political Order in Changing Societies", Blondel J. "Political Parties and Government Models in Western Democracies". The parties and party systems that are formed after the collapse of the USSR have both common features and specifics conditioned by social, economic, political and cultural conditions. "

Dynamics of multi-party system in Russia

According to researchers, the Russian model of a multiparty system with a dominant party can be attributed to dominant authoritarian systems [1, p. 55].

The authoritarian nature of the dominance of one party is determined by the following factors: First, to ensure the dominant position in the "United Russia" used a variety of non-democratic means – the restriction of media freedom, unfair elections, not quite a democratic law on parties, etc.

Secondly, United Russia has a very unique role in the system of state power, it serves as an appendage of the mechanism of public administration to ensure the process of making legislative decisions.

Thirdly, analysts believe that the inner-party life of United Russia is not so diverse and free in terms of factional struggle [1, p. 56].

In connection with the above, the question arises: "Will United Russia, the ruling party in Russia, contribute to democratization?". The forecasts for this issue are very cautious and cause it to have certain conditions. To this end, either presidential election is to be held on a party basis, or on the path to the practice of forming a government on the basis of the Duma party majority. In other words, ensuring access to power by other political parties will create the necessary incentives for the further development of party democracy. At the same time, it is stressed that this path, although probable, but very long.

The dynamics of the multi-party system in Georgia

Until very recently, party building in Georgia bore the imprint of the nomenclature model, and despite the change of generations, some of the past behavioral stereotypes of political elites have not yet been overcome. Shevardnadze's orientation toward socially close post-Soviet elites was motivated by a desire to compensate for both the lack of a clear vision of the future and the lack of internal support necessary to maintain power.

The first political parties of the perestroika period, with the exception of a few small socialist-oriented associations, mainly focused on achieving Georgia's state sovereignty and fighting the communist legacy. Nationalism was seen as the most effective alternative to communist ideology.

In the political arena of Georgia, after the fall of Soviet power, there was an extremely diverse system of political parties and organizations. The long dominance of the one-party system ended, and the politically active social strata fell to the other extreme, forming an impressive number of parties and movements, which, however, is characteristic of societies in the transition period [2].

The multi-party system, which has acquired several hypertrophied forms in Georgia, is gradually beginning to enter a rational (quantitatively) channel: today there are four relatively influential parties in the political sphere. However, as it was said, the party alignment of forces is difficult to call balanced in conditions of obvious domination of the ruling party.

The functioning of political parties in Georgia is also determined by a number of internal factors, from which several key ones can be identified. First of all, this absence, or the secondary nature of a clearly formulated ideology, a system of values, programs – and, accordingly, inconsistency and lack of principle of behavior directed only at participation in elections, achievement and retention of power.

In a certain sense, there is a division of parties into right-wing and left-wing parties, but this division is very arbitrary. All more or less influential parties lean to the left, to some extent support the idea of a strong and paternalistic state.

Such opportunism leads to the fact that parties and society in general are guided first and foremost by leaders and their personal qualities or past achievements, slogans and promises,

and not by a consistent program of actions, an attractive system of values or political principles [3, p. 82] At present, the period of formation of parties cannot be considered passed, because at the early stage of the emergence of modern parties there is a significant personification, i.e. unification around a popular personality and pragmatic goals without a clear distinction of programs.

It is also interesting that the ruling party of Georgia came to power as a result of the emergence of opposition from the ruling elite, in the conditions of weakness of the traditional opposition and incorporating a significant number of politicians who have shifted to the side of the new government [4, p. 11-12]. Such a model seems to be quite typical in conditions of semi-authoritarian regimes. It is the split of the ruling party that is the main factor of political dynamics, when the political opposition is weak, has no popular leader and, naturally, does not develop.

In this situation, the question arises whether the Georgian society (and, in general, the transitional post-Soviet society) is capable of creating a mass political party of the Western type that unites people with similar views on state building, the same values and a constructive, positive orientation. There is a certain crisis and de-ideologization of parties around the world, but in the transition societies this process develops differently. The authors suggest that the excessive dynamism of political life does not allow parties to ripen and form, and it is hardly possible to expect a radical change in the situation in the near future.

The dynamics of the multi-party system in Azerbaijan

According to European ideas of democracy, building a clear party system of two, three or more major political organizations that compete among themselves in elections is considered a sign of the development of civil society institutions. Unlike the general European tendencies in the development of party systems, Azerbaijan, while retaining the exclusively majority principle of parliamentary elections, while, in fact, is moving along the path of creating a large number of parties, with the domination of one party, and, accordingly, in the absence of a system of real party rivalry. This explains the primacy of personal, not ideological, struggle, the minimal difference in political platforms of parties. However, the initial stage of formation of political parties in Azerbaijan can be considered completed.

Formation of political parties and organizations of Azerbaijan began parallel to the processes of "perestroika" and reflected the structure of society, the prevailing public moods, views and ideas of public figures and intellectuals. Since 1988, the formation of political organizations of Azerbaijan has occurred under the significant influence of the problem of Nagorno-Karabakh. This problem was a surprise for the Azerbaijani society, but played a leading role in public and political dynamics. Practically speaking of the Armenian population in Nagorno-Karabakh was a catalyst for the development of socio-political processes in Azerbaijan. The circumstances of the late 80's and early 90's have an impact on the party building of Azerbaijan and at the present time. If there is a "classical" European pattern of arrangement of political forces in Georgia – "left-right", and in Armenia – somewhat peculiar scheme "traditionalists-liberals", then in Azerbaijan there was a "blending" of these two schemes, which led to great uncertainty in ideological orientations. Most of the parties of Azerbaijan declared their social ideology, defining the spectrum to which they belong.

The beginnings of the multiparty system began to be formed at the end of 1988 in the form of so-called alternative social movements, people's fronts, which mainly represent movements for national revival in the republics, and other informal associations. The legal point of reference on this path was the abrogation by the Third Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR of a constitutional provision on the leading role of the CPSU and the legalization of the principle of political pluralism. This was a very difficult decision for the country.

From the standpoint of the modern mentality, which has already adapted to life under the conditions of extremely short historical time, it seems strange that the problem of the total monop-

oly of the CPSU, the most urgent for perestroika Soviet society, became the subject of broad public discussions only at the peak of glasnost – in the late 1980s. But even at that time the attitude towards it was very ambiguous. Speaking about the dynamics of parties and party systems in Azerbaijan, it is necessary to take into account two very important from a methodological point of view.

The first moment was formulated by the famous American researcher T. Svyatokhovsky, who noted that a specific feature of the political sphere of Azerbaijan is that political parties are formed around the personality of the leader, and not around ideas, programs, and ideologies [5, p. 32].

The second point, which in our opinion should be taken into account, is a tangible consolidation trend in the regions – in other words, this is regionalism, including in the political sphere. This becomes obvious if one observes the regional composition of individual political parties.

At a time when the flywheel of historical events in the post-Soviet space was just beginning to develop, the chances of a democratic movement to noticeable success in its confrontation with the CPSU seemed small. The Communists are clearly well prepared for change. While one part of the party, with an unexpected entrepreneurial spirit, joined the processes of denationalization of socialist property that it initiated (even managed to convince certain circles in the West and part of the domestic democratic public that the transformation of property into the USSR is possible only through nomenclatural privatization), its other a part took the position of criticizing any privatization and was preparing to use again the unjustified discontent of the broad masses with the injustices of privatization act as a defender of the disadvantaged and create a powerful social base for the revival of the communist movement.

However, in the mass consciousness, the defeat of the Communist Party was at that time not so obvious. Although, according to the ISPR of the RAS, more than half of the population fully agreed with the decisions to suspend the activities of the CPSU and believed that this party should not resume its activities, 28% of respondents, on the contrary, were convinced that the Communist Party should be reborn, and almost half of the communists surveyed (46%) were ready to resume their membership in the party [6, p. 1024]. At that, only every fourth respondent was sure that after the CPSU's ban, the country would follow the path of democratic development, and simultaneously, as much as it believed, that in this case the dictatorship of the new government awaits the country. It is significant that half of the respondents could not definitely speak on this issue. Thus, in society, unlike the higher echelons of power, there was clearly no euphoria of victory.

It, according to observers, "split and hid."

After the collapse of the CPSU, the process of establishing a multi-party system in Azerbaijan entered a qualitatively new stage. If earlier the political activity of parties and movements of different orientations was mainly directed against the CPSU and the allied center identified with it, now they were forced to seek a new basis for self-expression and self-identification (this primarily concerned the so-called democratic movement, which in fact business has always been just a union of "against", not "for"). I say "so-called" because "democrat", "democratic movement", etc., is just a demagogic name acceptable to the people's ears, all anti-communist.

At the same time, it is somehow forgotten that Communists also stand for democracy, but proletarian democracy, that is, non-legal, using the masses as a means of suppressing the individual. An anti-communist democracy is a bourgeois democracy; legal, liberal, based on the principles of protection of minority rights, individual freedom. And for bourgeois democracies (i.e., democracy in a positive and not simply anti-communist sense), there are still no conditions in Azerbaijan, since there is no civil society and there is no middle social stratum that could be a real bearer of the basic values of bourgeois democracy-freedom, property and law.

The main political parties of Azerbaijan

The party "New Azerbaijan" is the ruling pro-presidential political party of Azerbaijan, numbering in its ranks at the beginning of 2005, according to official data, about 360 thousand members and playing a dominant role in the political life of the country.

The PNA was established on November 21, 1992 by Heydar Aliyev's supporters in the Nakhichevan Autonomous Republic. After the overthrow of the late President Abulfaz Yelchibey in June 1993, Colonel Suret Huseynov, the PNA came to power, and its leader Heydar Aliyev was elected president. According to PNA secretary Ali Ahmedov, since the first congress (December 1999) the number of party members have increased from 160 to 230 thousand, and the number of primary organizations – from 4300 to 5400.

The organizing committee of the party was established in September 1992, formally – on the initiative of the so-called. "Group 91" – representatives of the scientific and creative intelligentsia of Azerbaijan, as well as economic leaders who addressed the chairman of the Supreme Mejlis (Council) of the Nakhichevan Autonomous Republic (NAR) Heydar Aliyev with the request to head a new party.

The party's chairman in late March 2005 was the country's President Ilham Aliyev, who replaced his father – Heydar Aliyev. Observers point out that the law "On Political Parties" of 1992 was violated, according to which the head of state has no right to head the political party [7].

In the 2000 and 2005 parliamentary elections, the party received an overwhelming majority of votes. In particular, in 2000 the party received 62.3% of the vote and 75 out of 125 seats in the parliament. Representatives of opposition parties, however, declare large-scale fraud and falsification during the parliamentary elections.

The party enjoys the maximum support of state bodies in conducting its election campaigns. As the main tasks, the ruling party sees strengthening the country's economy, preserving social and political stability, and resolving the Karabakh problem.

The New Azerbaijan Party has an absolute majority of deputy mandates in the Milli Majlis, it has become a solid and reliable political base for the current regime. The party is formed according to the regional principle, here the representatives of the Nakhichevan-Irevan region predominate, the main purpose of which is to be in power and create favorable conditions for the party leaders economically and politically. The ideological profile is closer to the liberal-democratic; at least, this orientation is officially declared by the party.

The Musavat party is the oldest party in Azerbaijan. It was created at the beginning of the last century by the leader of the national movement Mammad Emin Rasolzade. In 1918-1920, during the first republic, this party having a majority in the parliament formed the government. During the years of the establishment of Soviet power, many members were subjected to repression; many immigrated to Turkey, where they continued their activities. After the fall of the Soviet regime, in 1992 the Musavat Party congress was held, restoring the activity of the party in the territory of Azerbaijan. The basis of "Musavat" is composed of the most famous functionaries of the Popular Front of Azerbaijan and patriotic representatives of the intelligentsia. The then speaker of the Milli Mejlis, Isa Gambar, was elected chairman of Musavat, who has been chairing him for more than 10 years.

Today Musavat is the largest opposition party in the country. The number of the party is quite high: it unites about 30 thousand people in its ranks. To date, members of the party are many representatives of the creative intelligentsia, university circles, politicians and public figures. In the 2000 parliamentary elections, the party received 4.9% of the vote and 2 out of 125 seats in the parliament. In 2003, her candidacy Isa Gambar in the presidential election, according to official figures, received 12.2% of the vote.

The party "Popular Front of Azerbaijan" (PFPA) was transformed in 1995 from the mass organization of the same name. Her leader, until his death in 2000, was ex-President of Azerbaijan Abulfas Elchibey – organizer and first chairman of the People's Movement of Azerbaijan. Many parties in the country are chipped away from the NFA or formed by leaders who left the ranks of the NFA. In 2000, the PFPA underwent the deepest crisis in its history, split into two roughly equal wings: "Classical", headed by Mirmahmud Miralioglu (Fattayev) and "jurist" headed by Ali Kerimli. However, the disintegration processes did not end there. From both wings of the PFPA, separate individuals, groups and even whole district and city organizations continue to depart, claiming to unite the party on their own base.

As a result, it is difficult to judge the actual number of PFPA today. Nevertheless, at the mass events, the official wing of the Popular Front, led by A. Kerimli, recently displays about the same number of supporters as other leading opposition parties. The authorities, considering the PFPA weakened by the schisms that occurred, allowed six of its representatives to the parliament. The leader of the "classical" wing of the Popular Front Party, M. Miralioglu, showed solidarity, with protesters against the falsification of the authorities by the opposition parties, and refused the deputy mandate. Having violated the plans of the authorities, who proposed to create a "constructive" opposition from the PFPA, Kerimli severely criticized the ruling regime, and to strive not only to preserve, but also to consolidate his party's place in the camp of national democratic forces. He became one of the initiators and organizers of the Coordinating Center for Opposition (KOC). PFPA has developed international relations. It is supported by the well-known daily newspaper of the republic "Azadlig".

I would like to emphasize that the above parties are the most influential in the political sense. However, this is far from all political parties functioning in the Republic of Azerbaijan today. In addition to these parties, 54 parties are currently registered with the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Azerbaijan [8, p. 136].

Our cursory review of the formation of a multi-party system in a number of post-Soviet countries confirmed the almost axiomatic conclusion that parties and party systems formed after the collapse of the USSR have both common features and specificity conditioned by social, economic, political and cultural conditions.

References:

1. Meleshkina E.Yu. Domination in Russian or the World Phenomenon / E.Yu. Meleshkina // Political Science № 1. – M., 2006. – 226 p.
2. International Center for Civil Culture "Political Parties of Georgia", T. 1998.
3. Tarkhan-Muravi G. Political parties in Georgia. Strengthened formation / G. Tarkhan-Muravi. – M., 2006.
4. Nodia G. Political parties in Georgia. Building democracy in Georgia / G. Nodia. – T., 2003.
5. Svyatokhovskiy T. Russia and Azerbaijan. Border region in the transitional period / T. Svyatokhovskiy. – B., 2000. – 373 p.
6. Gazette of the Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR and the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. – M., 1991. – № 35. – 1300 p.
7. On Political Parties : The Law of the Republic of Azerbaijan. – 1992.
8. Mamedov F. Political parties of Azerbaijan: from one election to another / F. Mamedov, T. Allahyarova. – B., 2010. – 136 p.

**ПОРІВНЯЛЬНИЙ АНАЛІЗ БАГАТОПАРТІЙНИХ ДИНАМІЧНИХ СИСТЕМ
У СУЧАСНОМУ СВІТІ НА ПРИКЛАДІ ПОСТРАДЯНСЬКИХ КРАЇН
(РОСІЯ, ГРУЗІЯ, АЗЕРБАЙДЖАН)**

Алойєва Кямаля Тофик кизи
*Бакинський державний університет,
кафедра соціології і політології
м. Баку, Азербайджанська Республіка*

Досвід показує, що партійні системи з домінуванням однієї партії виникали у державах, перед якими стояли завдання соціально-економічної модернізації, будівництва сучасної держави, формування громадянського суспільства та включення широких мас до політичного життя. У більшості цих країн рівень розвитку традиційний, а структури громадянського суспільства ще дуже слабкі. У цих умовах держава провадить посилені заходи для формування громадянського суспільства, проте прагне при цьому контролювати цей процес. І одним з елементів такого контролю зазвичай є домінуюча, вона ж правляча партія. Всі домінантні партійні системи, незалежно від форми домінування, мають особливості. Одна з таких – це поширення патронату і орієнтацій наявних зв'язків. Другою особливістю є те, що домінантні партії часто виступають як партії центру – центристські партії. Третя особливість у тому, що у преддомінантних і домінантних системах партії використовуються у певній мірі для модернізації політичних відносин. У домінантних авторитарних системах панівні партії часто використовують недемократичні практики і процедури для підтримки панування правлячої групи.

Ключові слова: багатопартійність, пострадянські країни, динаміка багатопартійності у сучасному світі.