

Uros Suvakovic
University in Prishtina
with temporary Head Office in Kosovska Mitrovica,
Faculty of Philosophy/Department of Sociology

**POLITICAL PARTIES AND
NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS
OR
ON PROBLEM WITH POLITICAL
REPRESENTATION IN GLOBAL AGE***

Summary

Since the appearing in the bourgeois society, political parties have been the basic institutional intermediary between the will of citizens and representative institutions of representative democracy.

Considering the fact that political parties have appeared together with national state, and that these were “made simultaneously with elections and parliamentary procedures” (M. Duverger), the question is if in “the global age” (Giddens) the necessity for political parties to perform the function of political representation stops. Regarding the Europe, organizational, political and other adaptations of political parties are not comparable with measure of moving the field of making political decisions from national states to Euro-institutions, even in the case of establishing so-called European parties. The similar situation is with global institutions, like the OUN. On the other hand, the influence of nongovernmental organizations within national states pretending to represent political subjects strengthens even more, regardless the absence of legitimacy from the citizens and often without the internal election legitimacy within themselves. Their inter-

* The work is the result of the author’s participation in the scientific research III 47023 “Kosovo and Metohija between national identity and Euro-integrations” financed by the Ministry for education and science of the Republic of Serbia

national connecting, involvement in UN and EU bodies, influence to public opinion, pressure for making different state decisions – give them political strength and influence that even political parties do not have.

On their side, political parties are burdened with problems of political corruption, loss of ideological identity, “concern for votes”, which force them additionally into non-principle coalitions for gaining power. All this additionally compromise them in the eyes of citizens on whose support they rely and whose interests they should represent. All this lead us to the question if political parties live their last days and if we can imagine democratic institutions that will not be based on party political representation?

Key words: political representation, political parties, non-governmental organizations, globalization, global age, “governance without government”

ON TRADITIONAL COMPREHENSION AND FUNCTIONS OF POLITICAL PARTIES

Explicitly the appearance and the development of political parties, just as M. Duverge established at the time, was flowing simultaneously with development of elections and parliamentary procedures¹⁾. The appearance and the development of bourgeois society, and parliamentarian as one of the aspects of organization of authority in it, have led also to the appearance of political parties.

Citizens enter into the political institutions of system, the parliament first of all, with bourgeois revolutions. That entrance of citizens into the parliament was going on gradually and it was in direct correlation with expansion of voting right. Except for the general voting right that bourgeois revolutions have brought and which have shown, as we have seen, the trend of permanent expansion to mass layers of citizens, to finally become really general for all citizens of full age in contemporary time, bourgeois society guaranteed also other significant political rights, like the right for freedom of thoughts, the right to associate, freedom of press, freedom of gathering, etc. Existence of all these political rights was *condition sine qua non* of appearance and development of contemporary political parties. Scientific-technical and technological inventions should be added to this variety of political rights, whose mass application in the second half of the 19th century, during

1) Maurice Duverge, *Uvod u politiku*, Savremena administracija, Beograd, 1966.

the 20th century and now in the first decade of 21st century actually enabled mass layers of citizens to use these rights, giving them new qualities during the time. Before all, the importance of media should be pointed out here, firstly newspapers with circulation in millions, then film, radio, television and finally Internet, which provided technological basis for creation of political public, more or less democratically created public opinion, firstly within the national and today even within the regional and even global dimensions. Without the existence of all these conditions, even those regarding the existence of political rights and these scientific-technical and technological presumptions, a suitable social environment for appearance and development of political parties should not exist, but at the same time nor the political system of capitalism should be developed in a manner in which it was happening without political parties. This is because for its functioning it was necessary to provide existence of competition regarding who was going to exercise the power. This is natural, since competition is in the basis of capitalist manner of production – the competition for acquiring as big profit as possible. Therefore, it is understandable that political sphere should comply with the basic principle that exists in such a system in the sphere of relations in production. On the other hand, it appeared very soon that ideas of organizing society on the principle of direct democracy, pleaded for by Jean Jacques Rousseau, were actually utopian dreams more than a real possibility. European type of representative democracy implied the principle of separated power and existence of a representative body (parliament) that elects the government, which is responsible to it and which is an expression of political power relations in parliament. The first political parties were created like this, which had, still undeveloped, the same task and target that all the most developed parties of contemporary mankind have – gaining the power. Except for the fact that the first political parties are formed simultaneously with the model of parliamentary democracy of bourgeois society, it should be noticed also that at the same moment national states are formed in the territory of Europe. Therefore, parties adapt to both these facts, both program-politically and organizationally: the work in conditions of parliamentary democracy and acting within the national state. Such their acting lasts for several centuries.

If different actions of political parties are analyzed, it will be seen that different authors point out different elements that one organization should have in order to be called a political party. Therefore, some point

out the necessity of existence of more or less developed ideology, others look at the parties as the mean of accomplishing national interests, the third as organizations for gaining and exercising power, the fourth point out the class element, while the fifth try to give as comprehensive definition of these organizations as possible by synthetic provisions²⁾. Inclining towards the authors who tend to comprise all the most important elements of the idea of political party by a synthetic definition, we consider that these are “political organizations of ideological-political like-minded persons who relatively permanently associate and promote certain program orientations with basic aim of gaining, i.e. remaining on power or participating in power, by which they realize and assert interests, values and aims of those social groups that tend to represent, as the rule trying to present those interests, values and aims as much as possible as general ones, i.e. global”³⁾.

Regarding the functions of political parties in the society, different theorists insisted on different functions. Some older writers did this, e.g. Ch. Merriam⁴⁾ and R. Merton⁵⁾, whose differentiation of manifest and latent functions of political parties, matched with his functionalist theory, is very important. However, contemporary authors also insisted on different functions, like Z. Bauman⁶⁾, A. Heywood⁷⁾, and Serbian authors R. Lukic⁸⁾, R. Smiljkovic⁹⁾, V. Goati¹⁰⁾ and others. We consider that regarding the criterion of universality of functions they perform, it is possible to differentiate two types of functions of political parties in the society: a) general, universal functions that political parties perform in every society, and b) special functions that political parties perform only in some specific societies or even only in certain development periods of those specific societies. The latter ones are numerous and versatile. Regarding the former ones, the universal functions of political parties, there are four of them, as follows: ideology, political

2) Uroš Šuvaković, *Političke partije i globalni društveni ciljevi*, Treći milenijum, Beograd, 2004, str. 165-178.

3) Uroš Šuvaković, *Ibid*, str. 177-178.

4) Charles E. Merriam, *American Party System*, McMillan, New York, 1923.

5) Robert K. Merton, *Elements de théorie et de méthodes sociologique*, Armand Colin, Paris, 1997.

6) Zigmund Bauman, *Marksistička kritika društva*, Rad, Beograd, 1969, str. 15.

7) Andrew Heywood, *Politika*, CLIO, Beograd, 2004, str. 470.

8) Radomir Lukić, „Političke stranke“, *Sabrana dela*, knj. 11, Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, BIGZ, Beograd, 1995, str. 191-233.

9) Radoš Smiljković, *Političke partije*, Književne novine – komerc, d.d, str. 60-83.

10) Vladimir Goati, *Političke partije i partijski sistemi*, CEMI, Podgorica, 2007, str. 51-64.

representation, personnel selection and organizing own supporters for participation in political process¹¹⁾.

*WHO PERFORMS THE FUNCTIONS OF POLITICAL
REPRESENTATION IN GLOBALISED SOCIETY: POLITICAL
PARTIES OR NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS*

In the contemporary globalised post-industrial society, political parties continued to perform more or less the same social functions that they traditionally perform. One of the universal functions is also, as we have already established, the function of political representation. The problem appears today because contemporary society changes much faster than political parties organizationally adapt to those changes. Organizationally, parties are still adapted to parliamentary democracy within the national state. However, today more and more authorities are transferred from national parliaments to above-the-state organizations¹²⁾, like the United Nations or the European Union. In that sense there is a question if the contemporary political parties in such a new political environment still satisfactorily can perform their functions, first of all the function of political representation.

Let us take as an example the most global of all international (public) organizations – the Organization of United Nations. It rests on the agreement between governments of independent states. Without entering into disputation on representation and democracy of its most powerful body – the United Nations Security Council, or its most representative body – the General Assembly of UN, we establish the following: neither of these two bodies is based on the principle of representing citizens, in the way the national parliaments are constituted. It means in multiparty, democratic, competitive systems (Sartori), in the way of representation of political parties that are intermediaries between the people (citizens, demos) and the state. Bodies of the UN are based on representation of governments, where exemptions are not so rare that governments have no electorate legitimacy, or it is very disputable. Simultaneously, the United Nations Security Council has never in the history taken over greater mandates, sometimes directly breaching the UN

11) Uroš Šuvaković, *Metodološke studije o pitanjima sociološkog proučavanja političkih partija*, Filozofski fakultet Univerziteta u Prištini, Kosovska Mitrovica, 2011, str. 36.

12) The term “above-the-state organisations” in this work we use in sociological sense and not in the international legislation sense, where it has a little narrower meaning.

Charter¹³), as it is the case nowadays. On the other hand, although as we know parties do not represent in the UN the citizens of the states in which they act, there are other organizations included in the UN system – nongovernmental organization (NGO). Even during the foundation of the UN, as one of the main bodies, the Economic and Social Council was introduced, in which even 33 international NGO were recognized as so called “Consultative status” in the period 1946-1948¹⁴). In later phase of the UN and the Economic and Social Council development, NGOs were classified into several groups, but the number of only the NGOs with recognized status within the Economic and Social Council has been increased to 969 in December 1993¹⁵). In the same year appropriate status was recognized for 581 NGOs with UNESCO¹⁶), etc. Besides, the Department of Public Information Non-Governmental Organizations (DPI-NGO) was established. The role of this department was to coordinate cooperation with approximately 1,500 nongovernmental organizations throughout the world as the “partners of civil society”, with the aim to increase their cooperation and communication with the UN in accomplishing its goals. At the millennium forum of NGOs, the Secretary-General of UN Kofi Annan pleaded that NGOs should become the “new super-power” in partnership relations with the UN that should control the “world civil society”¹⁷).

Therefore, it is clear that in the most global of all international organizations – the UN, there is no place for representation of citizens by those with electorate legitimacy – political parties, but there is place for representation of various interests by those who are responsible to no one but to themselves and their financiers – and these are NGOs. Not only that there is place for them, but also the role constantly gains more importance, with their promotion by Kofi Annan to the “new super-power”. In fact, maybe the attitude regarding who should actually represent citizens in the global world was more precisely than Annan formulated by his predecessor at the position of the Secretary-General

13) Mohammed Bedjaoui, *Nouvel ordre mondial et contrôle de la légalité des actes du Conseil de sécurité*, Bruylant, Bruxelles, 1994.

14) Smilja Avramov, *Civilno društvo i nevladine organizacije: alternativni model svetske zajednice*, Nova Evropa, Beograd, 2006, str. 143-146.

15) Peter Willetts, “From Stockholm to Rio and beyond: the impact of the environmental movement on the United Nations consultative arrangements for NGOs”. *Review of International Studies*, Cambridge University Press, no. 1/1996, pp 57-80.

16) Smilja Avramov, *Ibid*, str. 155.

17) Kofi Annan 2000. according to William Norman Grigg “Bulding World Order”, *International Freedom Foundation [IFF]*, <http://www.iff-ifoundfreedom.com/freedom/unamerican.html>

– Boutros Boutros-Ghali at the 47th Conference of NGOs in September 1994 by claiming that NGOs are the “basic form of representing population in the contemporary world”¹⁸⁾.

Introduction of NGOs into the system of the UN, starting with their foundation, was no accident. The goal was to promote the idea of the world civil society, whereby such an idea was especially strengthened with the fall of Berlin wall, collapse of real-socialism and implementation of the doctrine on the “new world order” based on supremacy of human rights over sovereignty of independent states. One of ideological promoters of this idea David Scheffer sends word: “Proving today that the norms of sovereignty, non-use of force and sacredness of internal affairs are far above the common human rights of nations, whose lives and prosperity are jeopardized, would mean ignoring difficult questions on international law and ignoring the pace of history”¹⁹⁾. This is actually just an ideological rationalization of the idea on humanitarian intervention, which was applied in practice for the first time during the First Gulf War, waged after the decision of the UN Security Council against Iraq. There were no such decisions of the UN Security Council in the next cases of “humanitarian intervention” (war against Yugoslavia, the Second Gulf War against Iraq, war against Afghanistan), whereby it was abused in the most recent case regarding the war against Libya. However, even the absence of the decision of the UN Security Council, did not prevent so called “humanitarian interventions” or “justified wars”, i.e. “aggressions” in traditional vocabulary of international law. “‘Humanitarian’ military intervention is characterized by impossibility to be justified by existing international law. Absence of legal basis is compensated by legitimacy..., it is based on moral justification and, finally, represents implementation of moral by ‘other means’... Its final result is paternalistic instead of allegedly humanitarian interventionism, since it starts neither from the presumption that all internationally recognized political subjects are not equal nor ‘of full age’ – neither in civilizational nor in cultural, moral or political sense”²⁰⁾. Where from the legitimacy for “humanitarian interventions” originate? From the universality of human rights. However, the USA, as correctly noticed by N. Chomsky, “exclude themselves from the obligation of respecting

18) Boutros Boutros-Ghali according to Smilja Avramov, *Ibid*, str. 160.

19) D. J. Scheffer: *Toward a Modern Doctrine of Humanitarian Intervention*, University of Toledo Law Review, Vol. 23, Winter, 1992.

20) Mile Savić, „Etika humanitarnih intervencija“, *Sociološki pregled*, Srpsko sociološko društvo, Beograd, br. 4/2009, str. 525, 526, 527.

basic principles of the world order, where they had one of the most important roles in their formulation and proclamation”²¹⁾. Such behavior of America brings in question the very idea of human rights, if it is not based on equality for everyone. Researchers correctly indicate the example of the aggression to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, performed under the mask of “humanitarian intervention”. However, nine years after the ending of the intervention, “the states that were the loudest in the appeal for the ‘humanitarian intervention’ are supporting illegally proclaimed independence of so called Republic of Kosovo, by which the real intention and the goals of the intervention from 1999 are finally stripped”²²⁾. U. Beck is right when he asks himself if “it is possible at all to speak about illegal or illegitimate regime of human rights?”²³⁾. Of course it is possible. Who has authorized protectors to protect human rights? As we have seen, even the most global organization – the UN has no electorate legitimacy to decide on destiny of states, peoples, citizens and their human rights. NGOs particularly do not have such electorate legitimacy, organizations that germinate like “mushrooms after rain” after termination of the “cold war”, especially in the states of the former Soviet block. They act mostly in the area of human rights and surely support “humanitarian interventions” for that purpose. Protectors of human rights have authorized themselves. Their problem is that “markets have become global, but politics still remained firmly rooted in sovereignty of states”²⁴⁾. NGOs are more suitable for basic form of organizing world society than political parties since they have no electorate legitimacy because they do not ask for it. Political parties depend on the will of citizens and electoral procedures and – regardless how distant they are from citizens nowadays – they finally have to ask for the support every fourth year. It is hardly to be expected that citizens as bearers of sovereignty of their states might support bombing of their own state, even political parties to support such a form of “humanitarian intervention” if they pretend to have any influence in their states, while NGOs surely can do that if their financiers require that from them. Two well-known authors M. Hardt and A. Negri conclude regarding NGOs that for them “just because governments do not manage them

21) Noam Chomsky, *Intervencije*, Rubikon, Novi Sad; Beoknjiga, Beograd, 2009, str. 176.

22) Zoran Dragišić, „Suverenitet i humanitarna intervencija“, *Srpska politička misao*, Institut za političke studije, Beograd, br. 2/2009, str. 62.

23) Ulrich Beck, *Moć protiv moći u doba globalizacije: nova svjetskopolička ekonomija*, Školska knjiga, Zagreb, 2004, str. 374.

24) George Soros, *O globalizaciji*, Samizdat B92, Beograd, 2003, str. 17.

directly, it is supposed that they act on basis of ethical and moral imperatives”, but in fact they are “the most powerful non-combat weapons of the New World Order”²⁵⁾. They conduct so called “moral intervention”, which is, according to Hardt and Negri, just “the first act that prepares military intervention”, against those states that are not willing to give up their sovereignty voluntarily in favor of “the New World Order”. Therefore, there is no electorate, democratic authorization for NGO, while political parties are firmly tied with it. Therefore, in the globalised contemporary world, political parties are not suitable for performing representative function as intermediary between the will of citizens and the decisions of power. That is the reason for insisting on civil society and NGOs in “above-the-state creations” (like the UN and a little less in the EU), while the role of political parties is practically stopped at the level of a national state. At the same time, NGOs impose themselves within national states as supervisor of political parties in many questions: from human rights, through problems with political corruption²⁶⁾ that are older than the greatest number of now influential NGOs, to environment protection. NGOs try in every way, and primarily through media, to compromise the idea of parliamentarism, electorate legitimacy and party representation. Besides, development of transition in certain former socialist states was flowing towards appearance and development of party state in multi-party conditions, which is additional contribution for compromising political parties with citizens²⁷⁾, where party leaderships, “which are more distant than ever from the people and from their membership”²⁸⁾, play the special role. If we add to it that political parties, especially in transitional states, were forced to agree even with extremely unpopular measures, both in the sphere of economy and in the sphere of politics, and even to accede regarding what was considered as the national interest²⁹⁾ and regarding which the national consensus existed³⁰⁾, it is clear why a drastic drop of confidence

25) Michael Hardt, Antonio Negri, *Imperija*, IGAM, Beograd, 2005, str. 50.

26) Uroš Šuvaković, „Korupcija i političke stranke u Kraljevini Srba, Hrvata i Slovenaca“, *Nauka, bezbednost, policija [NBP]*, Kriminalističko-policijska akademija, Beograd, br. 1/2011.

27) Uroš Šuvaković, „Partijska država: mogućnosti njenog nastanka i razvoja na primeru savremene Srbije“, *Teme*, Univerzitet u Nišu, Niš, br. 2/2009.

28) Radoš Smiljković, „Moralno-ekonomska kriza buržoaske restauracije u Srbiji i odgovornost elita moći“, *Politička revija*, Institut za političke studije, Beograd, br. 2/2011, str. 150.

29) Uroš Šuvaković, „Partije u Srbiji i Kosovo i Metohija (2000-2008)“, *Srpska politička misao*, Institut za političke studije, Beograd, br. 4/2009.

30) Uroš Šuvaković, „Partije u Srbiji i Kosovo i Metohija 1990-2000“, *Nacionalni interes*, Institut za političke studije, Beograd, br. 3/2009.

in political parties as intermediators between the will of citizens and state bodies has been achieved at the level of national states (e.g. only 5% of Latvians expressed confidence in political parties, and only 12% of their parliament³¹⁾). In the case of the EU, for which R. Dahl established a little more than two decades ago, that in it “institutions of ‘democratic’ transnational political community are hardly visible”³²⁾, it can be established that they have made progress regarding the time when he made this statement. However, not even today the decisions on the most important questions that the EU brings does not originate from the representative body based on the direct electorate will of voters – citizens of the EU, but on the complex mechanism based on the combination of dominant techno-bureaucratic principle, representation of governments of member-states of the EU and the least on direct elections. There are also European parties, but they have no basic organization – their membership is made of the same kind of parties that act at the level of member-states in the EU. Therefore, these are disaffected political organizations, without contact points with membership of the parties that constitute them. European parties actually are trying to perform the function of political representation at the level of the EU, but at least two important factors limit them: a) the manner of constitution and bringing decisions in the EU, and b) the fact that they are based on collective membership of the same kind of parties that act in the member-states of the EU, the reason for which they in multi-intermediate manner “protect” interests of appropriate parties. A socialist or a Whig is from a state is represented firstly by his local party leadership, then national party leadership, then the leadership of European party. European parties are, simply to say, too disaffected and too distant from the real problems of individuals. In fact, the answer to the question if these are “groups of national parties that coordinate at European plan”³³⁾ is affirmative. Statistical data on constantly low percentage of citizens voting at the elections for the European Parliament show that this is also the perception of citizens. While, we stress this, democracy rests on universal and equal right of individual.

31) Simona Grubo, “Church and State Relations in Latvia: Religion and Religious Issues as a Political Weapon in electoral Campaigns”, in *Social Relations in Turbulent Time*, abstract book, ESA 10th Conference, Geneva, September, 7-10th, 2011, p. 721.

32) Robert A. Dahl, *Demokratija i njeni kritičari*, CID, Podgorica, 1999, str. 419.

33) Petar Matić, „Političke partije i evropski izbori“, *Politička revija*, Institut za političke studije, Beograd, br. 4/2008, str. 1080.

In fact, the question that placed in the subtitle of this section regarding who performs the function of political representation in the contemporary globalised world – political parties or NGOs, should be: is there a legitimate political representation in the contemporary globalised world? The answer to this question, I should say, is processable: in proportion as democratic sovereign states influence decisions of “above-the-state creations” (and it is getting less and less every day), there is a traditional international-lawful legitimacy that decreases and disappears with increase of the role of self-authorized representatives of civil society – NGOs (whose importance and influence rise every day). Creation of above-national parties, like the European ones, for now cannot be considered as powerful contribution to providing political legitimacy and performing functions of political representation. One should say that it contributes to the idea of destroying idea of the need for democratic legitimacy for political decision making, as well as playing with political representation as the function of political parties.

We are facing, in fact, an attempt to find substitute for political parties regarding their functioning as political representation. It surely is not the first time, there were such attempts also within national states, but this is the most serious attempt to replace the legitimacy originating from the will of citizens and intermediates through various political parties with self-authorization of NGOs to present a will. It is not the only one, but surely one of the “reasons” at global level that is referred to for such an easy resign from asking legitimacy is that “formal organizations that act on basis of instructions of sovereign states are far more inefficient to respond to global needs of global economy. We accepted legitimacy, transparency and responsibility for more efficient decision making in economic sphere; the difficult question is: how to balance competitive goals of legitimacy and efficiency.”³⁴⁾ (Sic!). This theoretician of the “new world order”, who has become famous with his thesis on imperishableness of neoliberal capitalism and the “end of history”³⁵⁾ (1989/1990), further explains that “loose, informal structure” have a priority in processes of decision making, pleading that this hides the “secret” of success of NGOs, confessing its deficit in legitimacy and with unspoken question – “so what?”.

34) Francis Fukuyama, *Amerika na prekretnici: demokratija, moć i neokonzervativno zaveštanje*, CID, Podgorica, 2007, str. 134.

35) Francis Fukuyama, „The End of the History”, *The National Interest*, 16/1989, Summer

Therefore, G. Sartori is partly right when establishing that “alternative legitimacy is not confronted” with democracy³⁶⁾. It is correct, but it is also correct that it has enemies, although Sartori does not see that. The enemy of democracy is abolishment of legitimacy as the basis for decision making. Democracy has no alternative legitimacy, but in contemporary global society the question of legitimacy is not questioned at all, but as Fukuyama points out, “efficiency” of decision making. In that sense, the legitimacy, just as the sovereignty, becomes an “old fashioned demand”.

WORLD GOVERNMENT OR GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

Although in the literature mentioning of world government may be placed even in the 18th century³⁷⁾, and pre-modern ideas on a “world state” even earlier – in the period of traditional states³⁸⁾ when the first criticism of such concept appeared³⁹⁾, it is certain that in the preliminary phase of establishment of the UN, American delegation was promoting the idea that the Security Council should gradually become the world government. Albert Einstein with a group of his collaborators demanded establishment of world government with the authority to control nuclear technology and peace in the world after the use of atomic bomb in the war with Japan. According to the order of the president Kennedy, the American Institute for Defense Analysis submitted in 1962 the “Memorandum No. 7”, whose author was L. Bloomfield regarding the possibilities of disarmament process and creation of world government. The report showed no optimism for establishing world government in “regular manner”. With the aim to speed up the process, he “suggested generating ‘hard crises and wars’... and ‘series of sudden traumatic shocks’”⁴⁰⁾.

With the fall of real-socialism, it seemed that the moment was adequate for reviving the idea on world government. “I bet that within the next one hundred years the nation as we know it will be out of date: all states will recognize only one global authority... Internal affairs of

36) Giovanni Sartori, *Demokratija šta je to*, CID, Podgorica, 2001, str. 275.

37) Jan Van Helsink prema Smilja Avramov, *Ibid*, str. 238.

38) Saša Gajić, „Predmoderne ideje o svetskoj državi“, *Srpska politička misao*, Institut za političke studije, Beograd, br. 2/2010.

39) Saša Gajić, „Kritika ideje o svetskoj državi“, *Srpska politička misao*, Institut za političke studije, Beograd, br. 4/2009.

40) Smilja Avramov, op.cit.

a nation used to be out of reach of the world community. Nowadays the orderer for ‘humanitarian intervention’ is becoming acceptable”⁴¹⁾. However, it appeared that the last two decades were not in favor of Talbott’s chances to win the bet. Relations in the world were not developing in a straight line, in favor of cold war winners. America also soon discovered that world government would not be in her favor. “World government is not a practically achievable goal at this moment of history. America surely would not renounce her sovereignty – nor it should do it – to an above-national government in the world without a minimal consensus necessary for joint management”⁴²⁾. Refusing the idea of creating world government “for several next generations”, Brzezinski pleads for establishing the leadership of America based on “global partnership founded on joint interests” in the interest of America as “superpower plus”⁴³⁾. The new idea is: management without government or global governance. With such an attitude, this author once again confirms the incontestable fact that America is doing only what is in her national interest.

“Global governance is not international but, in fact, ‘transnational’. It does not refer to relations between nations, but political agreements outside and above national states... Nongovernmental organizations (NGOs, like Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch and Greenpeace) represent global civil society helping in creation of global governance norms”⁴⁴⁾. Therefore, not even in the idea of “global governance” or “management without government” there is place for requesting legitimacy of such management i.e. such ruling, therefore there is no place also for political parties that should intermediate for interests of citizens. The idea of U. Beck on creating “parliament of citizens of the world that, as a global sovereign, democratically makes decisions on conditions of global order”⁴⁵⁾ and as the author himself admits, in cosmopolitan regime based on dogma on human rights on behalf of which everything is allowed, “it is neither predicted, nor it is applicable option”.

41) Strobe Talbott, “The Birth of the Global Nation”, *Time magazine*, , 1992, July, 20th

42) Zbigniew Brzezinski, *Američki izbor: globalna dominacija ili globalno vodstvo*, Politička kultura, Zagreb; CID, Podgorica, 2004, str. 146.

43) Zbigniew Brzezinski, *Ibid*, str. 143, 146.

44) John Fonte, „Američki konzervativizam susreće globalizaciju: izazovi transnacionalne levice i transnacionalne desnice“, *Srpska politička misao*, Institut za političke studije, Beograd, br. 1-2/2007, str. 12.

45) Ulrich Beck, *Ibid*, str. 376.

His supporters base global governance on distinction between “political society” organized in political parties that tend for gaining power and is based on sovereignty of states-nations and request for electorate democratic legitimacy of that power and “civil society” organized in great number of civil NGOs that do not tend to domination but “help” to the state in processes of reformation and democratization⁴⁶⁾, which includes not only the national, but also the level of local self-management⁴⁷⁾. Important place in this projection entrusted to all those who have no electorate legitimacy: various NGOs, both local and international, corporations and so called “cap-organizations” that should join and coordinate their actions, confirms that global governance is a hegemonic project that is supposed to provide a “fig-leaf” to the potentates for continuation of their ruling over the majority of mankind, without questions of that majority if they agree to such the project. His supporters even do not dispute that this denies the key presumptions of the traditional democracy. As S. Avramov points out, “governments in this context make no decisions any more in the sense of satisfying national interests. The power of national majority in parliament is irrelevant”⁴⁸⁾. The question without the answer, which among the oldest in the political philosophy, sounds: who guards the guardians? Or why someone claims that those who look for support for their attitudes among citizens (political parties in sovereign and democratic states) less successfully represent interests of citizens comparing to those who do not ask citizens about anything, but self-authorize themselves for making various decisions directly referring to the same citizens (NGOs, some international public organizations)? The answer may be obtained when a simple fact is noticed, as J. Stiglitz have done it, that “globalization today is not in the interest of many poor states in the world”⁴⁹⁾. Globalization process till today significantly has depend differences between the rich and the poor states, while no tendency is noticed this tendency to be stopped or even slow down. In continuation of applying such tendencies, more appropriate are those executors who need not to ask for

46) Marina Ottaway, Thomas Carothers, “Toward Civil Society Realism” in *Civil Society Aid and Democracy Promotion* (Marina Ottaway and Thomas Carothers, eds.), Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington, 2000, p. 293.

47) Arvydas Guogis, Romualdas Kacevičius, Andrius Stasiukynas, “Municipalities and Non-Governmental Organizations In Two Lithuanian Districts: View From Two Models”, *Facta Universitatis. Series: Philosophy, Sociology, Psychology and History*, Univerzitet u Nišu, Niš, br. 1/2010.

48) Smilja Avramov, *Ibid*, str. 243.

49) Joseph E. Stiglitz, *Protivrečnosti globalizacije*, SBM-x, Beograd, 2002, str. 225.

consent of the citizens in their own states for continuation of their impoverishment, and these are NGOs.

*GLOBAL, AS WELL AS ANY OTHER, DEMOCRACY
IS IMPOSSIBLE BASED ON SELF-AUTHORIZED,
NOT THE WILL OF THE PEOPLE*

Appearance and development of political parties without doubt are connected with the appearance and development of parliamentary democracy in national states, with gaining and spreading political rights and freedoms in civil society, where distinguished place hold the general voting right, the right for political associating, freedom of press, freedom of speech, etc. Except for these rights that represented the necessary condition of development of contemporary political parties, technical-technological achievements in the last hundred years or so, especially the one referring to the invention and use of mass media, have contributed to gaining the power and significance of political parties.

The process of globalization in the contemporary post-industrial society performs in direction of reducing the role of political parties as the traditional mechanisms of political representation. This is for the reason that above-state organizations, both global like the OUN and regional like the EU, do not constitute on democratic, representative principle, but on some other, let us say bureaucratic-technocratic principle. Therefore, for that reason remains the necessity for the representative function of political parties and for their role in the process of creation of global social goals. On the other hand, with their programs and organizational structure, political parties are still adapted to performance within the national state and its representative body – the Parliament. Transfer of authority from national to above-national bodies leads to reduction of their power and influence in the contemporary globalised post-industrial society.

According to the concept of the “New World Order”, non-governmental organizations appear and develop on a massive scale, as “self-authorized groups”, having no legitimacy nor they try to gain some in a democratic battle, but for which it is doctrinaire “supposed that they act on basis of ethical and moral imperatives”. They actually should be substitute for political parties at the above-the-state level. Just because of the fact that they do not fight for the electorate democratic legiti-

macy, they are more adequate for the new “above-the-state creations” which are not based on democratic principles of political parties, the appearance and development of which were connected with the parliamentary democracy within the national state.

“Governance without government” or “global governance” is based on this idea. In that sense respected theorist describe it as “post-international”, pointing out that in the case of America it is also “post-constitutive” and “post-democratic” (J. Fonte, 2007, p.12), i.e. establishing that our epoch “is not only post-communist, but also post-democratic” (A. Zinovjev, 1999). In the concept of the existence of democratic order, the one as we have known during the 20th century, there was also the place for existence and development of nongovernmental organizations, as non-political groups that promote certain general human, humanitarian interests, both on micro plan and at the global level, but which do not perform political representation that is *per se* function of political parties. According to the concept of the authors of the idea on “global governance” or “ruling without government”, one of the main, universal functions of political parties – political representation of citizens on basis of electorate legitimacy, would die gradually, and with it also the purpose of political parties existence. Self-authorized NGOs would take their place in full capacity, without any democratic legitimacy, but with the idea on “regularity” of their “moral global acting”. A hope remains to us that the idea of state sovereignty and legitimacy originating from the people and intermediates through political parties in the people’s representation of state-nation is not so weak, so that it might be soon replaced with “global governance”, without real democratic control, but on behalf of democracy and human rights guarded by those who have given themselves such authorization.

Урош В. Шуваковић

**ПОЛИТИЧКЕ ПАРТИЈЕ И НЕВЛАДИНЕ ОРГАНИЗАЦИЈЕ
ИЛИ
О ПРОБЛЕМУ ПОЛИТИЧКЕ РЕПРЕЗЕНТАЦИЈЕ
У ГЛОБАЛНОМ ДОБУ**

Сажетак

Од свог настанка у буржоаском друштву, политичке партије су основни институционални посредник између воље грађана и репрезентативних институција представничке демократије.

Имајући у виду чињеницу да су политичке партије настале упоредо са националном државом, те да су оне „створене истовремено са изборима и парламентарним процедурама“ (M. Duverger), поставља се питање да ли у „глобалном добу“ (Giddens) престаје потреба да политичке партије врше функцију политичке репрезентације. У мери у којој се, када је о Европи реч, поље политичког одлучивања измешта из националних држава у евро-институције, не долази и до организационог, политичког и другог прилагођавања политичких партија тој чињеници, чак ни у случају формирања тзв. европских партија. Слична је ситуација и са глобалним институцијама, попут ОУН. С друге стране, унутар самих националних држава све више јача утицај невладиних организација, које претендују да представљају политичке субјекте, без да за то имају изборну легитимацију од стране грађана, а почесто ни интерну изборну легитимацију унутар њих самих. Њихово међународно повезивање, укључивање у тела ОУН и ЕУ, деловање на формирање јавног мњења, притисак на доношење различитих државних одлука, даје им политичку снагу и утицај који често немају политичке партије.

Са своје стране, политичке партије су оптерећене проблемима политичке корупције, губитка идеолошког идентитета, „бригом за гласове“ која их гура у непринципијелне коалиције ради освајања власти, што их све додатно компромитује у очима грађана на чију се подршку ослањају и чије интересе би требало да репрезентују. Све нас то води питању да ли политичке партије живе своје последње дане и можемо ли замислити демократске установе које неће почивати на партијском политичком репрезентовању?

Кључне речи: политичка репрезентација, политичке партије, невладине организације, глобализација, глобално доба, „владавина без владе“.

REFERENCES

- Avramov, Smilja: *Civilno društvo i nevladine organizacije: alternativni model svetske zajednice*, Nova Evropa, Beograd, 2006.
- Bauman, Zigmund: *Marksistička kritika društva*, Rad, Beograd, 1969.
- Beck, Ulrich: *Moć protiv moći u doba globalizacije: nova svjetskopolitička ekonomija*, Školska knjiga, Zagreb, 2004.
- Bedjaoui, Mohammed: *Nouvel ordre mondial et contrôle de la légalité des actes du Conseil de sécurité*, Bruylant, Bruxelles, 1994.

- Brzezinski, Zbigniew: *Američki izbor: globalna dominacija ili globalno vodstvo*, Politička kultura, Zagreb; CID, Podgorica, 2004.
- Chomsky, Noam: *Intervencije*, Rubikon, Novi Sad; Beoknjiga, Beograd, 2009.
- Dahl, Robert: *Demokratija i njeni kritičari*, CID, Podgorica, 1999.
- Dragišić, Zoran: „Suverenitet i humanitarna intervencija“, *Srpska politička misao*, Institut za političke studije, Beograd, br. 2/2009.
- Duverger, Maurice: *Uvod u politiku*, Savremena administracija, Beograd, 1966.
- Fonte, John: „Američki konzervativizam susreće globalizaciju – izazovi transnacionalne leve i transnacionalne desnice“, *Srpska politička misao*, Institut za političke studije, Beograd, br. 1-2/2007.
- Fukuyama, Francis: „The End of History?“, *The National Interest*, 16, Summer, 1989.
- Fukuyama, Francis: *Amerika na prekretnici: demokratija, moć i neokonzervativno zaveštanje* CID, Podgorica, 2007.
- Gajić, Saša: „Kritika ideje Svetske države“, *Srpska politička misao*, Institut za političke studije, Beograd, br. 4/2009.
- Gajić, Saša: „Predmoderne ideje o svetskoj državi“, *Srpska politička misao*, Institut za političke studije, Beograd, br. 2/2010.
- Goati, Vladimir: *Političke partije i partijski sistemi*, CEMI, Podgorica, 2007.
- Grigg, N. William: “Bilding World Order”, *International Freedom Foundation [IFF]*, <http://www.iff-ifoundfreedom.com/freedom/unamerican.html>
- Grubo, Simona: “Church and State Relations in Latvia: Religion and Religious Issues as a Political Weapon in electoral Campaigns”, in *Social Relations in Turbulent Time*, abstract book, ESA 10th Conference, Geneva, September, 7-10th, 2011.
- Guogis, Arvydas, Kacevičius, Romualdas, Stasiukunas, Andrius: “Municipalities and Non-Governmental Organizations In Two Lithuanian Districts: View From Two Models”, *Facta Universitatis. Series: Philosophy, Sociology, Psychology and History*, Univerzitet u Nišu, Niš, br. 1/2010.
- Hardt, Michael, Negri, Antonio: *Imperija*, IGAM, Beograd, 2005.
- Heywood, Andrew: *Politika*, CLIO, Beograd, 2004
- Lukić, Radomir: „Političke stranke“, *Sabrana dela*, vol. 11, Beograd, Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, BIGZ, 1995
- Matić, Petar: „Političke partije i evropski izbori“, *Politička revija*, Institut za političke studije, Beograd, br. 4/2008.
- Merriam, Charles: *American Party System*, McMillan, New York, 1923.
- Merton, K. Robert: *Elements de théorie et de méthodes sociologique*, Armand Colin, Paris, 1997.

- Ottaway, Marina, Carothers, Thomas: “Toward Civil Society Realism” in *Civil Society Aid and Democracy Promotion* (Marina Ottaway, Thomas Carothers, eds.), Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington, 2000.
- Sartori, Giovanni: *Demokratija šta je to*, CID, Podgorica, 2001.
- Savic, Mile: “Etika humanitarnih intervencija”, *Sociološki pregled*, Srpsko sociološko društvo, br. 4/2009.
- Scheffer, J. Davide: “Toward a Modern Doctrine of Humanitarian Intervention”, *University of Toledo Law Review*, Vol. 23, Winter, 1992.
- Smiljković, Radoš: *Političke partije*, Književne novine komerc d.d, Beograd, 1993.
- Smiljkovic, Radoš: „Moralno-ekonomska kriza buržoaske restauracije u Srbiji i odgovornost elita moći“, *Politička revija*, Institut za političke studije, Beograd, br. 2/2011.
- Soros, George: *O globalizaciji*, Samizdat B92, Beograd, 2003.
- Stiglitz, E. Joseph: *Protivrečnosti globalizacije*, SMBx, Beograd, 2002.
- Šuvaković, Uroš: *Političke partije i globalni društveni ciljevi*, Treći milenijum, Beograd, 2004.
- Šuvaković, Uroš: “Partijska država: mogućnosti njenog nastanka i razvoja na primeru savremene Srbije“, *Teme*, Univerzitet u Nišu, Niš, br. 2/2009.
- Šuvaković, Uroš: “Partije u Srbiji i Kosovo i Metohija 1990-2000”, *Srpska politička misao*, Institut za političke studije, Beograd, br. 3/2009.
- Šuvaković, Uroš: “Partije u Srbiji i Kosovo i Metohija (2000-2008)”, *Srpska politička misao*, Institut za političke studije, Beograd, br. 4/2009.
- Šuvaković, Uroš: *Metodološke studije o pitanjima sociološkog proučavanja političkih partija* Filozofski fakultet Univerziteta u Prištini, Kosovska Mitrovica, 2011.
- Šuvaković, Uroš: “Korupcija i političke stranke u Kraljevini Srba, Hrvata i Slovenaca“, *Nauka, bezbednost, policija [NBP]*, Kriminalističko-policijska akademija, br. 16/2011.
- Talbott, Strobe: “The Birth of the Global Nation”, *Time magazine*, 1992, July, 20th
- Willetts, Peter: “From Stockholm to Rio and beyond: the impact of the environmental movement on the United Nations consultative arrangements for NGOs”, *Review of International Studies*, Cambridge University Press, no. 1/1996. doi:10.1017/S0260210500118455
- Zinoviev, A. (1999), *L'interview à Victor Loupan*, Paris: *Figaro Magazine*, July 24th

Резиме

Од свог настанка у буржоаском друштву, политичке партије су основни институционални посредник

између воље грађана и репрезентативних институција представничке демократије.

Имајући у виду чињеницу да су политичке партије настале упоредо са националном државом, те да су оне „створене истовремено са изборима и парламентарним процедурама“ (M. Duverger), поставља се питање да ли у „глобалном добу“ (A. Giddens) престаје потреба да политичке партије врше функцију политичке репрезентације. У мери у којој се, када је о Европи реч, поље политичког одлучивања измешта из националних држава у евро-институције, не долази и до организационог, политичког и другог прилагођавања политичких партија тој чињеници. Чак и у случају формирања тзв. европских партија, оне су вишије удаљене од грађанина-појединца, да би се он осећао делом њих. Разлог те недовољне прилагођености партија интегрисаној Европи је тај да се савремене евро-институције доминантно формирају на бирократско-технократском принципу, а не на принципу политичког репрезентовања воље грађана. Слична је ситуација и са глобалним институцијама, попут ОУН. С друге стране, унутар самих националних држава све више јача утицај невладиних организација, које претендују да представљају политичке субјекте, без да за то имају изборну легитимацију од стране грађана, а почесто ни интерну изборну легитимацију унутар њих самих. Њихово међународно повезивање, укључивање у тела ОУН и ЕУ, деловање на формирање јавног мњења, притисак на доношење различитих државних одлука, даје им политичку снагу и утицај који често немају политичке партије. Чак се данас може говорити о томе да невладине организације готово имају ексклузивна права на промоцију и заштиту интереса из домена политичких права грађана, еколошке проблематике, равноправности полова, права на различитиост и сл, па и на то да буду супервизори рада политичким партијама.

Са своје стране, политичке партије су оптерећене проблемима политичке корупције, губитка идеолошког идентитета, „бригом за гласове“ која их гура у неприincipијелне коалиције ради освајања власти, што их све додатно компромитује у очима грађана на чију се подршку ослањају и чије интересе би требало да репрезентују. Све нас то води питању да ли политичке партије живе своје последње дане и можемо ли замислити демократске установе

које неће почивати на партијском политичком репрезентовању? Аутор наглашава да идеја државног суверенитета и легитимитета који потиче од народа и посредује се преко политичких партија у народном представништву државе-нације није толико слаба, да би могла у догледно време бити замењена „владавином без владе“, неком врстом „глобалног управљања“ без стварне демократске контроле, а у име демократије и људских права која чувају они који су сами себи дали такво овлашћење.

Овај рад је примљен 3. септембра 2011. а прихваћен за штампу на састанку Редакције 11. новембра 2011. године.