



# Party Law in Modern Europe

The Legal Regulation of Political Parties in Post-War Europe

## Party Regulation and Party System Development in Macedonia (1990-2012)

Dane Taleski

Central European University

[danetaleski@yahoo.com](mailto:danetaleski@yahoo.com)

Fernando Casal Bértoa

Leiden University

[f.casal.bertoa@fsw.leidenuniv.nl](mailto:f.casal.bertoa@fsw.leidenuniv.nl)

The Legal Regulation of Political Parties

Working Paper 39

February 2014



European  
Research  
Council



UNIVERSITY OF  
BIRMINGHAM

© The author(s), 2014

This working paper series is supported by the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC research grant RES-061-25-0080) and the European Research Council (ERC starting grant 205660).

**To cite this paper:** Taleski, Dane and Casal Bértoa, Fernando (2014). 'Party Regulation and Party System Development in Macedonia (1990-2012)', Working Paper Series on the Legal Regulation of Political Parties, No. 39.

**To link to this paper:** <http://www.partylaw.leidenuniv.nl/uploads/wp3914.pdf>

This paper may be used for research, teaching and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, re-distribution, re-selling, loan or sub-licensing, systematic supply or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

ISSN: 2211-1034

## Abstract

*Party regulation in general has not been a matter of concern until very recently (Biezen, 2011; Biezen and Borz, 2012; Casal Bértoa et al., forthcoming). Un fortunately, in the most recent publications in the field scholars have tended to focus on the most consolidated South and East Central European democracies (Biezen and Casal Bértoa, work in progress) leaving aside regions like the Balkans where party regulation has played an important role in terms not only of party system formation but also on democratic transitions. In order to fill this gap, this paper explores how political parties have been regulated in Macedonia. Empirically, the paper analyses how the different types of regulation have affected the Macedonian party system in terms of formation and development. The main conclusion is that such laws have had a mixed impact on the country's political life.*

## Introduction<sup>1</sup>

In one of the most quoted statements that one can recall in the history of political science, Schattschneider (1942:1) affirmed that “political parties created democracy and modern democracy in unthinkable save in terms of the parties”. In spite of that, there are few scholars examining the specific content of party regulations.<sup>2</sup> Research trying to study the consequences at the systemic level is almost non-existent, while the work on party funding effects on party system stabilization has been more prolific (e.g. Casas-Zamora, 2005; Scarrow, 2006; Booth and Robbins, 2010; etc.). However, in-depth qualitative studies on the specific mechanisms linking the different aspects of party regulation (e.g. minimum number of signatures and/or members, activity restrictions, payout thresholds, etc.) and party system development are still lacking. With this paper we aim to contribute to covering that gap.

The regulation of party politics in Macedonia comes from different sources. On one hand there are the articles in the Constitution and several decisions from the Constitutional Court. On the other hand there are several laws that were passed throughout the years, as early as 1990, and their subsequent changes, as late as 2013. The first decade in the democratic development of Macedonia was marked with light regulation. The regulation that allowed organization of political pluralism was passed in April 1990, before the first independent plural elections in November 1990, before the declaration of independence in 1991 and before promulgation of the democratic constitution in 1992.

---

<sup>1</sup> We would like to gratefully acknowledge the support of the European Research Council (ERC starting grant 205660) in the preparation of this paper.

<sup>2</sup> Avnon (1995), Biezen and Borz (forthcoming), Janda (2005) and Karvonen (2007) constitute the only exceptions.

The first law for political party organization and financing was passed in 1994 and was in force until 2004. In 2001 a protracted inter-ethnic conflict was ended with the signing of a peace agreement. From 2002 the electoral system was changed to list proportional. The changes of the electoral system coupled with acceleration of the EU integration process, brought forth a need for new laws for political party regulations and party financing. The new laws for party organization and party financing were passed in 2004. However since then changes in the regulation were done practically every year and sometimes more than once per year. The rapid changes are to a lesser extent pushed by the EU as efforts to democratize the country during the integration process. To a greater extent the rapid changes are product of the political parties that are in power and their strategic calculus to influence the level playing field to their advantage.

The article is divided in four parts. Section one looks at the process of party regulation before the first free and fair elections in independent Macedonia in 1994. Section two briefly looks at the process of party constitutionalization. Section three summarizes the most important aspects of the first Macedonian Party Law (1994). Section four contains a similar analysis of the 2004 Party (Funding) Laws, trying to highlight their differences and (main) innovations. Finally, sections five to seven examine the possible effects such legislation has had (or not) on the Macedonian party system, either at the systemic or at the party level. The most important findings following from our analysis are summarized in the conclusion.

### **Party regulation in Macedonia: the origins (1990-1994)**

Republic of Macedonia declared independence in 1991 and promulgated a democratic Constitution in 1992. However the first democratic, plural and competitive elections were held in 1990, while the country was still part of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRY). The regulation for competitive elections and rules for establishing political pluralism were done by the last socialist parliament in Macedonia. On April 12, 1990 the Assembly of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia adopted a law for changes and amendments to the existing law for societal organizations and association of citizens (Official Gazette of Socialist Republic of Macedonia, No 12, 1990). The law for societal organizations and association of citizens was first passed in 1983. The changes from 1990 were the first introduction of political pluralism in the country. It allowed different political parties to be formed, registered and to stand in the first plural parliamentary elections in November 1990.

The law from 1990 allowed citizens, freely and voluntary, to form societal organizations and association of citizens for “developing different activities for accomplishing and satisfying economic, political, cultural” and other interests (Art. 2, Official Gazette No 12/90). The third

paragraph of article 2 clearly stipulates that citizens that are coming together for sake of political interests and goals “can organize political organizations, parties and other forms of political organizations (Ibid, para. 3). Even though this law was promulgated by the Assembly of the Republic of Macedonia, such rights were given to all citizens of SFRY. In that sense, any citizen of SFRY residing in Macedonia in April 1990 had the right to form, or join, a political party. In the first elections in November 1990 there were at least two parties whose organizations transgressed the borders of Macedonia. First was the League of Reformist Forces, a political party organized around Ante Markovic, the last Prime Minister of SFRY. The League was started in Belgrade, Serbia, but its branches stood in the parliamentary elections in several of the republics, including Macedonia. The League of Reformist Forces managed to get around 16 percent of the votes in the 1990 elections and to have the fourth biggest parliamentary group of 11 MPs out of total of 120. The second party was the Party of Yugoslavs in Macedonia that got substantially lower support, around 1,5 percent in the 1990 elections, and won 2 MPs.

The criteria for formation of political parties were quite liberal and low. It took a minimum of 10 adults with permanent residence in Macedonia to form political party in 1990 (Art. 12, Official Gazette No 12./90). The only restriction placed on the founders was that in the last five years they were not sentenced for criminal activities against “the basis of the social format and security of SRM and SFRY, against the armed forces of SFRY, against human and international law, against freedom and rights of citizens” (Art. 12, Official Gazette No 12/90, para. 3). Membership in political parties was granted under a written individual statement. Political parties were registered with the police on municipal level. The municipal level police kept the registry of political parties and their members. In conjunction with the limitations for founders, one could say that the socialist police was hesitant to allow wide political pluralism and wanted to have greater control and insight in the process. On the other hand putting the registration in the hands of the municipal police inside the republic was a protection of political pluralism from external factors. It was a clear sign to Belgrade, the federal center of SFRY, that it would not have a great impact in the formation and organization of political parties in Macedonia in 1990. Notwithstanding the involvement of the police in the early process of political party formation, 19 parties placed 928 candidates for the first plural elections in November 1990, along with 34 independent candidates.

In order to be registered political parties had to submit the minutes from the founding session, the decision for formation and two copies of the statutes to the local police (Art. 17, Off. Gazz. 12/90). The police had 30 days to respond to the request. It could give a negative reply if the activities or statutes of the party were used to “overthrow the basis of social order established in the Constitution, jeopardize the independence of the country, brake freedom and rights of people and

citizens guaranteed by the constitution, jeopardize peace and equal international cooperation, inflame national, racial and religious hatred and intolerance, encourages committing criminal acts and insults the public moral” (Art. 23, Off. Gazz. 12/90). In the event that the police found something in the statute or program that was in breach of the law, they were compelled to give 30 days period for changes and amendments to the requested party. If the police did not respond in the given time, the law provided that the organization is registered.

A negative reply from the police meant starting a procedure in front of the district court to ban or forbid the political party. Appeal process was allowed in front of the Supreme Court of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia that was the last instance for all relevant adjudications (Art. 20 and 26, Off. Gazz. 12/90).

The organizational format of the political parties was left to the statute of the parties. However the 1990 law for societal organizations proscribed that the work of political parties is public. Parties also had the right to form alliances and to cooperate and join international organizations, if that was not in breach with the interests of the country and if the party statute provided for that (Art. 4, Official Gazette No 12/90). Parties were allowed to get financial resources from membership fees and donations, and other forms stipulated in their statute and law. Effectively this meant that parties had the right to perform business activities “if they fulfill the conditions proscribed in law for performing such activities” (Art. 34, Off. Gazz 12/90). In practice it meant that parties could have income from owning companies, renting facilities etc. This provision from 1990 was kept in the law for political parties in 1994, until the Constitutional Court annulled it in 2001. To support the newly formed political parties the law stipulated that parties with minimum of 1,000 members will get finances from the republic's budget in the amount of three average economic incomes per member (Art. 40, Off. Gazz. 12/90).

### **Party Constitutionalization: the 1992 Supreme Act**

The Constitution of Republic of Macedonia was promulgated in 1992. The Constitution provided main legal basis for political pluralism. Article 20 guarantees citizens' freedom of association for accomplishing and protecting their political, economic, social, cultural and other rights and beliefs. The second paragraph Article 20 grants citizens the right to freely form association of citizens and political parties. Both are voluntary organizations, as people have the right “to join and to leave them” (Art. 20, Constitution of RM). The next paragraph however sets limitation in the programmatic content and activities of political parties. They can't aim to “violently overthrow the constitutional order of the Republic or to start or call upon military aggression or inflame national, racial or religious hatred or intolerance” (Art. 20, para. 3,

Constitution of RM).

The Constitutional Court has the power to check the constitutionality of the programs and statutes of political parties. If the Constitutional Court finds that the statutes or program are not constitutional it has the power to ban the political party.

### **The 1994 Party (Funding) Law**

The first law for organization and financing of political parties in democratic Macedonia was passed in 1994. The Law for Political Parties was published in the Official Gazette of the Republic of Macedonia No 41/94 on August 5, 1994. It replaced the law for societal organizations and association of citizens from 1983 and subsequent changes from 1990 that allowed organization of political pluralism.

The law defines parties as “organized group of citizens that aim to participate in government” (Art. 2, Off. Gazz. 41/94). The law provides for citizens to form political parties in order to realize and protect their political, economic, social, cultural and other rights and beliefs of their members, to participate in the decision making process and to participate in elections on national and local level (Art 3, Ibid). Only citizens of Republic of Macedonia can be members of political parties.

According to this law the statute and program of parties can't aim to violently overthrow the constitutional order, to encourage or call for military aggression and to inflame national, racial and religious hatred and intolerance (Art. 4, Ibid). The law calls for the work of the parties to be public and parties to be organized and act on territorial principle (Art. 6, Ibid). Even though the provision for territorial principle is not concrete, it is taken to mean that parties should be organized and aspire to run on the whole territory of the country. Such a provision was set as a clause to prevent parties based on ethnic principles, that were organized on other bases. However the legal principle was not upheld in practice. At the time when the law was passed there were already several parties that represented ethnic minorities, were ethnically organized, stood on elections and had won mandates in the national Assembly and local councils. This was the case with the Albanian Party for Democratic Prosperity (PDP) and National Democratic Party (NDP), the Turkish Democratic Alliance of Turks and the Roma Party for Total Emancipation of Roma. Further on, in 1994 a splinter party from PDP was established and registered as the Party for Democratic Prosperity of Albanians (PDPA), which was latter renamed as Democratic Party of Albanians (DPA).

The provisions to start a political party were increased and the process was put under the competence of the judicial system. The law from 1994 required a minimum of 500 adults with permanent residence in the Republic of Macedonia to form a political party (Art. 7, Ibid). The

parties were registered with the District court in Skopje that took care of the party registry. To register the party needed to submit the decision from the founding session, the program and statute of the party. It is interesting to note that the decision to form the party needed to be accompanied with the personal names of the founders, their personal numbers and permanent addresses (Art. 8, para 2). Furthermore newly registered parties needed to have names and symbols that would be different from existing parties in Macedonia and abroad, and they could not have state or foreign symbols (Art. 9). In 15 days the district court had to accept the registration or sent back request for changes and amendments in the party documents. The Supreme Court was the last instance for all adjudications.

The law from 1994 proscribed that parties will stop to exist upon court decision, if the Constitutional Court finds the program or statute to be unconstitutional, when the party organs decide so or when the number of members falls under the legal criteria. This is why each party was required every year to submit to the court evidence that their membership is not below 500 (Art. 7, para. 2).

The financing of political parties under the law from 1994 came from private, public and other sources (Arts. 28 – 32, Off. Gazz. 41/94). The finances for parties could have come from membership fees, in kind contribution, income, own property, credits, gifts, donations, and from the state budget. There was a prohibition for parties to take finances from foreign individuals, organizations and governments, and from local public and state institutions, beyond the state provided budgetary funds, and from public companies.

The level of public financing was not set in the law, but the distribution was proscribed. 30 percent of the public financing was to be equally distributed among all political parties that received at least 3 percent of the votes in the last elections, while 70 percent was to be distributed among the political parties that had elected MPs and to be proportional to the number of MPs. The regulations for private financing distinguished between support for the party and support for political campaigns. Party donations from individual or legal persons could be up to 100 average salaries paid the last month according to the State Statistical Bureau, but they could be accumulated more than once per year. On the other hand for the political campaigns one off donations were allowed up to 200 average salaries. The funds for the political campaign were supposed to be put on a separate account as an electoral fund. The law required the parties to be transparent in their book keeping of income and expenditures, clearly marking the sources.

The financing of parties “from own sources”, meaning business activities, persisted until February 2001. At this point the Constitutional Court decided to annul the provision. The Constitutional Court procedure was started on initiative of one political party, the Democratic



Alliance. The Democratic Alliance objected the actions of some ruling political parties from 1998 to 2002 that tried to privatize and own several public companies. In the ruling the Constitutional Court was of the opinion that political parties are association of citizens, and not commerce organization, and that their actions are of idealistic nature and not of direct material interest for some group of citizens, for example the members of that party. In that respect the Court found that the term financing “from own sources” can't imply business activities of political parties because it is not constitutional (Constitutional Court decision on initiatives U. No 45/2000 and U. No 61/2000, 28 February 2001).

### **Modernizing party regulation: from stability to rapid changes (2004-2012)**

Republic of Macedonia had a protracted inter-ethnic conflict from January to August 2001. The conflict was between the Macedonian security forces and the Albanian National Liberation Army (NLA). The conflict ended with the signing of the Ohrid Framework Agreement (OFA). OFA changed the institutional design of the country, improving the instruments for minority protection and inclusion, such as the right to use minority languages and symbols, quotas for public employment, and veto rights in Parliament and local councils. OFA envisaged a process of decentralization, where many of the competences would be placed in the hands of the local municipalities. Under the influence of the OFA, and the need to improve minority representation, the electoral system was changed to closed list proportional before the parliamentary elections in September 2002. The NLA demilitarized and transformed into a political party Democratic Union for Integration (DUI) in May 2002. They won majority of the Albanian votes in 2002, and formed the ruling coalition government together with the Social Democratic Union of Macedonia (SDUM) and the Liberal Democratic Party (LDP).

This per se did not bring changes in the regulation for political parties. However it opened a debate and brought focus on the issue. There was a growing perception that political parties need to modernize and improve. Furthermore, as Macedonia was implementing the OFA and become more stable its Euro integration efforts increased. At the end of 2005 EU granted Macedonia candidate status for membership in the EU. The criteria that needed to be met to get the candidate status included changes and improvements in the political party regulation. Initially a new single piece of legislation was prepared that regulated party organization and financing. In the discussions with the EU representatives, and on proposal of the Liberal Democratic Party, the single piece of legislation was separated in two laws. One that regulates political party organization, Law for Political Parties (Official Gazette No 76/04 27.10.2004) and second that regulates party financing, Law for Financing Political Parties (Official Gazette No 76/04 27.10.2004). The division in two pieces of

legislation was done for the sake of clarity, but also to show more progress in regards to EU set criteria. Further on, a consolidated Electoral Code was promulgated in 2006 (Official Gazette No 40/06 31.03.2006). Previously different type of elections (local, parliamentary, presidential) were regulated in different laws. The idea of the Electoral Code was to set the rules for all elections. Also the Electoral Code set provisions for the financing of electoral campaigns, while the law for party financing regulates other financing.

#### *The 2004 Party Law*

The law from 2004 brought significant improvements in the party regulation in Macedonia. First it defined parties as “voluntary organizations of citizens, formed to accomplish and protect political, economic, social and other rights” wanting to participate in decision making processes in government and “accomplishing their goals through democratic forming and expression of political will by participating in elections” (Art. 2, Off. Gazz. 76/04). Furthermore Article 4 places a gender balance principle in assigning public functions, while Article 5 forbids discrimination for membership in political parties. The territorial principle for organizing political parties is kept, however parties are forbidden to form branches in public institutions (Art. 7, Ibid). While they are free and independent in choosing their internal structures, they can't form military or paramilitary structures (Art. 6, Ibid). Parties are defined as non-profit organizations, their work is public and they have the right to join international organizations and cooperate with foreign political parties.

Article 8, paragraph 2 places a ban on foreign parties to be active in Macedonia. However there are examples where some minority parties that have direct cooperation and are regarded to be branches of political parties in neighboring countries. This is the case with the Serbian Radical Party in Macedonia, latter to follow the line that split and become Serbian Progressive Party. The party name in Macedonia before the split was Serbian Radical Party and after the split Serbian Progressive Party. Also this is the case with the Independent Democratic Action that represents the Bosniaks in Macedonia and is regarded to be very close with the same party in Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The criteria for forming a party remained at a minimum of 500 adults. The rule was made more precise that they needed to have individual legal capability, and not only be of voting age. Joining and leaving parties was defined as voluntary. The process of registration stayed the same, along with the court procedures and the court registry of political parties. The instance for relevant adjudications was changed to the Appellate Court in Skopje. The provisions for stopping the existence of political party did not changed. According to the law from 2004 a party would be erased from the court registry if it decided so, on basis of court verdict, if the number of members became lower than needed to form the party and if the Constitutional Court found that the program

or statute of the party were unconstitutional (Art. 29, *Ibid*). The court procedures for establishing whether the party obeyed the law or not was placed in the competence of the public prosecutor.

In 2007, the ruling majority in Parliament, led by VMRO-DPMNE enacted changes to the regulation for party organization. They increased the minimum number of members to 1,000 (Law for Changing and Amending the Law for Political Parties, Official Gazette No 5/07 16.01.2007). The changes required each party to submit the necessary signatures, verified with a notary in 45 days. The verification needed to be done on special forms issued by the Ministry of Justice. If a party would fail to do so then it would be erased from the court registry and the responsible persons would be fined up to 4,800 euros. The law was passed in the first week of January 2007, however the deadline was set retroactively to start from January 1, 2007. The initiative of the ruling right oriented VMRO-DPMNE was largely seen as a strategic move to erase the existing smaller right parties and to consolidate the right political spectrum in one party.

Couple of smaller right oriented parties started initiatives in front of the Constitutional Court. First the Court found that setting the deadline retroactively was unconstitutional and annulled it (Constitutional Court Ruling, U. No 12/2007, 04.04.2007). Second, the Court canceled the deadline of 45 days for pre-registration, and the forms issued by the Ministry of Justice. Giving the forms to the Ministry of Justice in the Court's opinion was unnecessary declaration of individual political preferences to the executive. In the Court's opinion "the purpose of any law on political parties in a democratic society is to create conditions for accomplishing freedom of political organization and action, and not to limit such freedoms" (Constitutional Court Ruling, U. No 23/2007, 02.05.2007). The Court further stressed that the deadline should provide conditions to reorganize existing political parties, and not to serve to erase the existing parties. Thirdly, the Court erased the penal order, setting the court verification of the minimum members every two years in front of the court; failure to submit verification would automatically mean erasing the party from the Court registry without financial penalties from the responsible persons (Constitutional Court Ruling, U. No. 15/2007, 02.05.2007).

The ruling majority led by VMRO-DPMNE eventually accepted the Constitutional Court rulings. They passed a new Law for Changing and Amending the Law for Political Parties (Official Gazette No 7/08, 15.01.2008). They settled that political parties should submit notary verified signatures every four years to the court, in order to show and verify that they have minimum membership.

The last legal changes that affect the organization of political parties were passed in beginning of 2013, with a prolonged implementation date from January 1, 2015 (Official Gazette, No 23/13, 14.02.2013). The changes require political parties to set up internal "research-analytical

centers that will be financed by law” (Art 1. Off. Gazz. No 23/13). Adequate changes were made also to the law for financing political parties. The changes proscribed that up to 280,000 euros will be given to parties for such centers, the money will come from the budget of the Ministry of Justice and be kept on a separate bank account (Law for Changing and Amending the Law for Financing of Political Parties, Official Gazette No 23/13, 14.02.2013). The set up and functioning of the internal research-analytical centers is proscribed in a separate law, however it will all be implemented from January 1, 2015.

#### *The 2004 Party Funding Law*

The Law for Financing of Political Parties brought substantial improvements (Official Gazette No. 76/04, 27.10.2004). It made the system for financing political parties more clear and transparent. It defined the parties as not-profit organization, whose financing is public and transparent. It gave the power and competence to the Ministry of Finance and State Auditor to check that. It also gave right to every citizen and party member to have access to the state of party financing (Art. 5, Off. Gazz. No 76/04).

The sources for party finances were defined as public and private. Public sources constituted finances from the State Budget. Article 9 proscribed that 0,06 percent of the state budget will be allocated for annual financing of political parties. This amount would be distributed in the following manner: 30 percent equally to all parties that won at least 1 percent of the votes on national or local level, and 70 percent to parties that won mandates on local or national level, proportional to the mandates that they won.

Private sources for financing political parties are: membership fees, donations, gifts, sponsorships, sales of promotional and propaganda materials and own sources defined with the law (Art. 13, Ibid). The annual membership fee could not exceed one annual average salary (Art. 14, Ibid). Donations can be monetary, or in kind contributions in goods or services, that can be used for the activities of the political party. Giving preferential prices to political parties, for consumer goods or services, is also regarded as donation. In such case the difference between the market price and the price for the party is regarded as donation. The total annual amount of donations can't be over 200 average salaries for legal persons and 100 for individuals. Parties were obliged by the law to have a registry of all donations, liable for checks to the Ministry of Finance.

The Law for Financing Political Parties forbid business activities. However it allowed parties to have income from interest rates from bank deposits, leasing property, income from sales of audio, video and print materials with the logo of the party, as well as author's right, income from tickets for manifestations organized by the party (Art. 19, Ibid). According to the law Parties could not be financed by foreign government, organizations and individuals, any kind of public institution

or company, be it on national or local level, non-governmental organizations and religious associations, or anonymous donors (Art. 20, Ibid). Breach of the financing rules is penalized with loss of public financing for the upcoming year. Parties also can't have finances in foreign banks and they can't solicit money or pressure individuals or companies to give donations. The Law obliged the parties to prepare an annual financial report no later than March 31, and to submit it to the State Auditor (Art. 27, Ibid).

The Law for Financing Political Parties was first changed by Constitutional Court Ruling. Article 32 stipulated that if a party breaches the financing rules twice in one year, it would not be eligible for financing in the upcoming year. The Court found this unconstitutional and annulled the article, since the breaches were not precisely determined it leaved a legal possibility for two penalization for same breach (Constitutional Court Ruling U. No 174/2005, 08.03.2006). The next bigger changes were done in 2009 with the Law for Changing and Amending the Law for Financing of Political Parties (Official Gazette No. 96/09, 31.07.2009). The changes decreased the level of donations to 150 average salaries for legal persons and 75 for individuals. The changes also required the parties to publish their annual financial reports on their web sites and at least one daily newspaper, and included the Internal Revenue Service as a control institution, along with the Ministry of Finance and the State Auditor. The financial fines for responsible persons were also increased. For individuals they were increased to be 1,000 to 2,000 euros, from 500 to 700 euros, while for legal persons they were set at 5,000 to 10,000 euros from the previous 3,000 to 5,000 euros.

In 2011 changes were done to the Law for Financing Political Parties (Official Gazette No. 148/2011, 21.10.2011). The changes proscribed that the funds for financing the political parties will not come from the state budget, but from the budget of the Ministry of Justice. They were still at the same level 0,06 percent of the state budget, but their allocation would come from the Ministry of Justice. Furthermore, the State Electoral Commission was put in charge to give results of all parties performance at the last national and local elections as to determine the distribution of the public financing. In 2012 new changes were enacted with the Law for Changing and Amending the Law for Financing of Political Parties (Official Gazette No. 142/12, 13.11.2012). The changes envisaged that donations from legal persons, concerning preferential prices, will be counted on issued invoices and not on paid invoices. Further to that parties registry of donations should also be made public every six months, especially disclosing all donations from subject directly or indirectly connected to the party. The fines for breaches of the level of donations or the annual reports and donation registry were increased. The fines constitute temporary suspension of public finances, until the breach is resolved, or loosing public financing for period of three months. One can see this as an attempt of

the ruling VMRO-DPMNE to have stronger mechanism to discipline the opposition by having stronger control over the financing of political parties. It should not be neglected that after the parliamentary elections in 2011, the financial report of VMRO-DPMNE showed that they have a debt of 3,3 million euros. In other words, they spent 3,3 million euros more than they raised through donations and membership fees. They acknowledge the debt, but made no efforts to legally close it even after the elections finished. A similar situation happened during the local election in 2013. The mid-term financial report of VMRO-DPMNE showed that in the first half of the electoral campaign they spent 10 times more than they raised.

Part of the problems with the financing of electoral campaign is that this is subject regulated in the Electoral Code. The provisions for the financing of the electoral campaign are part of section VI, Articles 83 – 87 (Official Gazette No. 40/06, 31.03.2006). In the first version of the electoral code parties were allowed to spend 60 denars (a bit less than 1 euro) per voter (Art. 84, Off. Gaz. No 40/06). Effectively this put a cap to total campaign spending around 1,7 million euros for parliamentary elections, equivalent to the total number of registered voters in the country. Campaigns couldn't be financed with public or foreign finances. Donations for the electoral campaign was set at 5,000 euros from individuals and 20,000 euros from legal persons. The finances were to be placed on a separate bank account opened for that purpose no earlier than 48 hours before the start of the campaign. All campaign costs were to be paid from that account. After the elections were done parties needed to submit a financial report to the State Auditor, State Electoral Commission and the Parliament. Only parties that won mandates on local and national level were eligible for remuneration of 15 denars (cca. 0,25 euro) for each vote they would win.

The Electoral Code was changed several times since 2006. The first changes that influenced the financing of electoral campaigns were done with the Law for Changing and Amending the Electoral Code (Official Gazette, No. 136/08, 30.10.2008). A major change was that parties were allowed to spend up to 180 denars (cca. 3 euros) per vote, which lifted the cap to 5,1 million euros for parliamentary elections. Another change was that in kind contributions in goods and services were also allowed as donations during the campaign. At this point parties were obliged to have a register of donations during the electoral campaign which would be different from the regular register of donations. Additional changes included a restriction on state and local institutions to buy media time for advertising. Also media outlets were required to disclose reports on advertising space sold to parties.

The changes made were result of OSCE/ODIHR recommendations, and EU's effort to improve the legal framework, after the parliamentary elections in 2008. In these elections the ruling VMRO-DPMNE spent a lot of public money for advertising the work of public institution which

they controlled. Some of the campaigns were run at preferential prices in media outlets in ownership of their coalition partners. VMRO-DPMNE had in a way a double campaign, one paid in by the party, and second paid by the public institutions.

In 2011 more changes to the Electoral Code were made, in regards electoral campaign financing (Law for Changing and Amending the Electoral Code, No. 44/11, 05.04.2011). The limit for donations from legal persons was moved from 20,000 euros to 5 percent of the total income in the previous year. Also the requirement for parties to prepare a mid-term financial report for the electoral campaign was introduced. Remuneration of 15 denars (cca. 0.25 euro) for each vote won was allowed for parties that did not won any mandates if they won at least 1,5 percent of the total turnout. After the 2011 parliamentary elections the OSCE/ODIHR report criticized some of the practices during the elections and came out with several recommendations. The general conclusion was that the ruling parties use the institutional instruments and public resources for their campaign and that there is distorted media presentation of political parties. Ruling parties being more positively portrayed and given more media time. Some of OSCE/ODIHR recommendations include greater separation between the state and party officials, reconsidering the cap for total spending during the electoral campaign and in regards the allowed cap for donation from legal persons, and more concrete rules for media presentation of political parties. However before the local elections in March 2013 the key recommendations of OSCE/ODIHR were not implemented.

### **On the Consequences of Party Regulation for Party System Development**

Huntington (1968) was the first scholar to suggest a relationship between the two variables here studied: namely, party regulation and party system development. According to him, “certain forms of corruption (e.g. illegal donations) can strengthen a parliamentary party and in turn this institutionalized party can develop rules [...] to protect the integrity of the political process from weaker parties” (quoted in Roper, 2002a: 179). Unfortunately, after Huntington’s classic work, this issue was neglected until Katz and Mair (1995) decided to focus on it. In what has come to be known as the “cartel party thesis”, both authors suggested a change in the role played by political parties in modern democracies. Thus, rather than private organizations closely link to civil society, parties are now considered to be “public agencies” increasingly entrenched with the institutions of the State (van Biezen, 2004; Kopecký and van Biezen, 2007). This will obviously have important consequences for the party system, the most important of which is the attempt of the existing political parties to monopolize the resources of state by increasing the level of party regulation in general, as well as the number of legal requirements either for party formation or for the access to public-owned media or state subsidies (Katz and Mair, 1995; Scarrow, 2006; Biezen and Rashkova,

forthcoming).

One of the ways, perhaps the most important, in which existing parties have tried - collusively - to reduce “the impact of those seeking to challenge the political status quo” (Scarrow, 2006:629), guaranteeing at the same time their dominance at the systemic level, is by the introduction of public subsidies available for those parties with a certain level of electoral support. The idea, then, is that by raising financial barriers to the establishment of new parties, public funding can contribute to the cartelization and, therefore, freezing of the party system (Katz and Mair, 1995:15, Biezen, 2004). In empirical terms, scholars have found that in systems where public funding is available not only the “vote shares of parties between elections” stabilize (Birnie, 2005:932), but both party replacement and fragmentation decreases (Booth and Robbins, 2010:641-642).<sup>3</sup> Interestingly enough, the latter effect is also dependent on the type/level of funding available: namely, the more difficult the access (i.e. high payout threshold), the lower the number of parties (i.e. ENP) in the system, and *vice versa* (van Biezen, 2000:337; Spirova, 2007:161). More recently, Booth and Robbins found “evidence that when parties cannot receive state fund, and concomitantly face restrictions on fund-raising in the private realm, the costs for parties are high and result in a reduction in the ENP in elections – and not just the stability of these parties” (2010:644).

Comparative political theory has also pointed out other manners in which party regulation can affect, either negatively or positively, the party system. These include, more generally, the amount of detail with which political parties are being regulated and, more specifically, the precise rules regulating party dissolution and/or registration. Indeed, and together with funding legislation, the latter constitutes one of the most studied effects of party regulation on party system formation and development. In particular, both Hug (2001) and Tavits discovered, on the one hand, that “a monetary deposit for registering a party” can, by increasing the costs of entry, “significantly discourage the emergence of new parties and help to keep existing party systems stable” (2006:109; 2007:127). On the other, and contrarily to the logic expectations (Roper, 2002:181; Rashkova, 2010:36), they also found a positively relationship between “the number of signatures required for party registration” and the number of new party entries (2006:110-111). The logic being that “the signature requirement creates a false sense of security for the new party elites about their perception of viability” (2007:128).

Together with the requirements for party creation, dispositions regulating the party dissolution can have a relevant impact at the party system level (Bale, 2003). Thus, and as it has

---

<sup>3</sup> For the opposite argument, see Casas-Zamora (2006: 44-45; 218-219), Koole (1996:517), Roper (2002:181) or Tavits (2007:127). Other scholars have found “no effect” at all (Grzymała-Busse, 2007:200; Rashkova, 2010:36; Roper and Ikstens, 2008:2-3; Scarrow, 2006:635; Tavits, 2006:109).



been argued elsewhere (Casal Bértoa *et al.* 2012), the banning of a “relevant” party may not only increase the level of electoral volatility, but totally change the patterns of government formation (e.g. Turkey, Basque Country, etc.).

Finally, Biezen and Rashkova (forthcoming), building on Katz and Mair’s original thesis, have recently found that “increasing party regulation [has] a negative effect on the number of new party entries”, but only after controlling for post-communist countries (2011:7, 16).<sup>4</sup>

[Table 1 here]

In order to test the relationship between party regulation in general, and legislative changes in particular (table 1), and party system formation and development in Macedonia, and following Birnir (2005) and Scarrow (2006), table 2 displays five different systemic indicators: namely, the level of electoral volatility (i.e. Pedersen’s Index),<sup>5</sup> the number of new parties entering the system, the number of parties winning at least 0.5 per cent of the vote, the “raw” number of parties winning legislative seats and, finally, the share of parties winning less than 5 per cent of the vote.

[Table 2 here]

According to what we have seen in the previous section, the amount of party regulation has increased exponentially since the first Party Law in 1990. However, and if political formations have continued to appear in the Macedonian political scene, they have done so in a very limited (and minor) way. In fact, and with just two exceptions (Democratic Alternative in 1998 and Democratic Union for Integration in 2002), the Macedonian party system has revolved around a limited number of “historical”<sup>6</sup> parties clustered in two almost inimical blocs. In fact, and accordingly to what scholars have hypothesized, between the moment of the “great leap forward” in terms of the amount of party regulation (i.e. adoption of the 2004 LPP) and the present, the number of new parties entering the system has suffered an important reduction (see column 2 in the table above), suggesting a positive relationship between the latter phenomenon (i.e. party creation) and the amount of party regulation.

In relation to the specific content of party regulation, and taking into consideration that, in contrast to other Eastern European countries (e.g. Latvia, Slovakia or Ukraine), no deposit fee is required in any of the Party Laws, another way in which party legislation may have influenced the Macedonian party system refers to the number of minimum signatures needed to officially register a party: namely, 500 between 1990 and 2006; 1,000 from 2007 afterwards. When looking at the total number of parties in the system (either at electoral – column 3 – or parliamentary – column 4 –

<sup>4</sup> For a similar argument, see Gherghina *et al.* (2011).

<sup>5</sup> Calculated on the basis of the results displayed in table A (in the Appendix).

<sup>6</sup> The term “historical” is used here for all those parties that were formed at the time of independence or immediately afterwards and, in any case, before the first free and fair parliamentary elections in 1994.

level), it is possible to observe an important short-term decreasing effect: namely, from 14 and 8 parties in 2006 to 8 and 5 in 2008, respectively.

In a similar vein, the number of new parties clearly dropped by 80 percent in 2008. Such reductive effects can also be observed in the long run. Thus, there has been a clear tendency towards party concentration after the 2007 reform made it more difficult for parties to register. In particular, the number of electoral/parliamentary parties has on average decreased by almost half (from 15/9 parties in the period 1994-2006 to 8.3/5 parties afterwards). Similarly, the number of new parties in the system is clearly inferior in the second period (4.7 vs. 2).

Moreover, the abovementioned conclusions are reinforced by the fact that the observed decreasing tendency only started after the “costs of entry” was increased, and not at the time a new – more proportional – electoral system was introduced (in 2002). In fact, the new electoral system has not produced any psychological effects (either at the short- or long-term). In terms of its mechanical effects, a certain reductive effect could be observed, but only in the long-run: after the third election, and just at the time the Macedonian legislator also decided to increase the number of obstacle to be faced by new parties. For all these reasons, we can conclude that an important “registration” effect in the Macedonian party system took place after 2008.

Taking into account that no political parties have been banned/dissolved in Macedonia since the inauguration of democracy in 1992, we pass now to examine the possible systemic effects of party funding regulations. If, as Katz and Mair (1995) hypothesized, public funding guarantees both the survival and supremacy of already existing parties assuring the stability of the structure of inter-party competition, all the indicators displayed in table 2 should experience a notable increase (as small party activity will be stimulated) after the decrease in the payout threshold in 2004 (from 3% to 1%) and a small decrease after the introduction of stricter finance regulations in the 2009-2012 period. Interestingly enough, and with the exception of the NWP and the SPVS in 2006, all the indicators above clearly run contrary to the theoretical expectations. Thus, while a certain consolidation of the Macedonian party system could be perceived immediately afterwards of the 2006 legislative elections, clearly reinforced with the following 2008 elections, the last elections have brought some doubts about the extent to which this is the case as electoral volatility, the vote share for small parties, and the number of both new and electoral parties suffered an slight increase.

### **On the Consequences of Party Funding Regulation for Party System Development**

In contrast to the theoretical expectations, our previous analyses clearly show no connection between party system development and public subsidies, neither with its presence nor its type. The question is then: does this really mean that party funding regulations have no impact on the party

system at all? In our understanding such “expected” effect takes place at the party, rather than the systemic, level. Our intuition<sup>7</sup> is that while parties relying only on private funding will have it difficult to survive, publicly subsidized political forces will be able to survive as partisan organizations even in the event of important losses of electoral support.

[Table 3 here]

Although a first look at table 3, which distinguishes between parties receiving public subsidies (in italics) and those which do not, could lead us to reject such “organizational” effect as some Macedonian parties have managed to survive in spite of relying almost exclusively on private funds (e.g. MAAK, SDPM or VMRO-DP), while others fell into oblivion despite having received an important amount of public funds (e.g. DPM, PEO or DA); the truth is that these constitute “the exception”. Indeed, a closer examination of the links between public funding and party survival in the table above reveals that while most of the political forces deprived of public subsidies were forced to dissolve (up to 12) or were absorbed (1) immediately or after the next elections; most publicly funded parties have continued to play a prominent role within the party system (e.g. VMRO, SDSM, DUI and DPA).<sup>8</sup> Moreover, while “historically” important forces as PCERM or PDP (both after 2006) disappeared from the political scene as soon as they failed to reach the payout threshold, parties like SPM, DPT (both after 1998) or PEI (after 2008) managed to overcome their “journey in the desert”, at least momentarily, thanks to the financial generosity of the State.<sup>9</sup>

[Table 4]

The table above, which displays the survival rate of Macedonian political parties making a clear distinction between non- and publicly funded parties, summarizes our findings. In clear support to our initial hypothesis, there is not even one case in which the survival rate of those parties below the payout threshold exceeds the survival rate of those parties with access to public allocations. Trying to avoid possible critics in the sense that the higher survival scores of publicly funded parties are determined by parliamentary parties, table 4 also shows when available the survival rate available (in brackets) of those non-parliamentary parties over the so-called payout threshold. Although, as expected, the differences here are not so pronounced, it is especially in these cases that the positive relationship between public funding and party continuity comes to the fore.

All in all, it seems clear to state that while the introduction of a rather generous regime of

<sup>7</sup> Interesting enough, and perhaps with the exception of Spirova (2007) and Casal Bértoa and Spirova (2013), no works following this “causal” path could be found in the literature.

<sup>8</sup> Even if deprived of state support between 1990 and 1993, as “post-communist successors”, both SLD and PSL had important economic “private” assets inherited from the previous political regime (Szczerbiak, 2001).

<sup>9</sup> Both UP and SdPL even managed to return to parliament and form their own parliamentary group in 2001 and 2007, respectively.

public party funding in Macedonia has not been able to prevent the consolidation of the party system, the former have clearly helped the institutionalization of political parties themselves by allowing certain party organizations to endure, especially in the case of electoral backlash, while condemning into oblivion to all those parties deprived of it.

### **Conclusions**

Ever since Huntington we know that the consolidation of democracy requires the introduction of new political party regulations capable of safeguarding political pluralism “without government harassment or restriction of opposition groups” (1991). In Macedonia the regulation of party politics, which clearly allowed for the appearance of democratic multi-party system, actually came from different sources.

In general, our article points out how the regulation political parties as organizations have had an impact on the consolidation of the party system as a whole, by reducing the total number of parties, hindering the creation of new political forces that may challenge the *status quo*, fostering the dominance of a reduce number of institutionalized parties as well as helping the preferences of voters to stabilize.

Contrary to what most scholars have maintained, the same cannot be said of the party funding regime, which despite being designed to open up the political system, has not managed to avoid the abovementioned process of concentration and institutionalization at all levels of political party competition. This is not to say, however, the rather extensive regime of public subsidies to parties have not had an impact of the development of the latter. In fact, access to State financial support has helped most parties to endure, despite being unable to fulfill their office- and policy-seeking goals.

### **References**

- Biezen, van I. (2011): “Constitutionalizing Party Democracy: the Constitutive Codification of Political Parties in Post-war Europe”, *British Journal of Political Science*, v. 42, pp. 187-212
- Biezen, van I. and Borz, G. (forthcoming): “Models of Party Democracy: Patterns of Party Regulation in Post-war European Constitutions”, *European Political Science Review*
- Biezen, van I. (2000): “Party Financing in New Democracies: Spain and Portugal”, *Party Politics*, v. 6, n. 3, pp. 329-342
- Biezen, van I. (2004): “Political Parties as Public Utilities”, *Party Politics*, v. 10, n. 6, pp. 701-722
- Birnir, J.K. (2005): “Public Venture Capital and Party Institutionalization”, *Comparative Political Studies*, v. 38, n. 8, pp. 915-938

- Booth, E. and Robbins, J. (2010): “Assessing the Impact of Campaign Finance on Party System Institutionalization”, *Party Politics*, v. 16, n. 5, pp. 629-650
- Casal Bértoa, F., Piccio, D.R. and Rashkova, E. (forthcoming): “Party Laws in Comparative Perspective: Evidence and Implications”, in Ingrid van Biezen and Hans-Martien ten Napel (eds.) *Political Parties and Public Law: The Netherlands in Comparative Perspective*. Leiden: Leiden University Press
- Casal Bértoa, F. and Spirova, M. (2013): “Get a Subsidy or Perish! Party Funding and Party Survival in Europe”, *The Legal Regulation of Political Parties Working Paper Series* (n. 29)
- Casas-Zamora, (2006): *Paying for Democracy: Political Finance and State Funding for Parties*, Colchester: ECPR Press
- Dimovski, V. (2011): Pre-electoral coalitions in Republic of Macedonia [in original Димовски, Виктор. Предизборните коалиции во Република Македонија], *Research study*. Skopje: Progress
- Gherghina, S., Chiru, M. and Casal Bértoa, F. (2011): “State Resources and Pocket Money: Shortcuts for Party Funding in Romania”, *DISC Working Paper Series*, n. 13
- Kasapović, M. (2010): “Macedonia”, in Dieter Nohlen and Philip Stöver (eds.) *Elections in Europe. A Data Handbook*. Baden-Baden: Nomos
- Katz, R.S. and Mair, P. (1995): “Changing Models of Party Organization and Party Democracy: The Emergence of the Cartel Party”, *Party Politics*, v. 1, n. 1, pp. 5-28
- Koole, R. (1996): “Cadre, Catch-All or Cartel? A Comment on the Notion of the Cartel Party”, *Party Politics*, v. 2, pp. 507-523
- Rashkova, E. (2010): “Political Learning, Legal Constraints and Party System Development: How do Party Law and Democratic Maturity Affect the Number of Parties?”, *The Legal Regulation of Political Parties Working Paper Series*, v. 5
- Roper, S.D. (2002): “The Influence of Romanian Campaign Finance Laws on Party System Development and Corruption”, *Party Politics*, v. 8, n. 2, pp. 175-192
- Roper, S.D. (2008): “Introduction: The Influence of Public Finance on Postcommunist Party Systems”, in Steven D. Roper and Janis Ikstens (eds.) *Public Finance and Post-communist Party Development*. Aldershot (England): Ashgate
- Sartori, G. (1976): *Parties and Party Systems*, UK Cambridge University Press
- Scarrow, S. (2006): “Party Subsidies and the Freezing of Party Competition: Do Cartel Mechanisms Work?”, *West European Politics*, v. 29, n. 4, pp. 619-639
- Spirova, M. (2007): *Political Parties in Post-communist Societies*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan

#### **Legal References**

Law for Changing and Amending the Law for Societal Organizations and Associations of Citizens

(Official Gazette 12/90, 13.04.1990)

Amendments to the Constitution of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia (Official Gazette No 28, 21 September 1990)

Decision of the Executive Council of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia (Official Gazette No 34, 1990:597)

Constitution of the Republic of Macedonia (Official Gazette No. 52/91, 22.11.1991)

Law for Political Parties (Official Gazette No. 41/94, 05.08.1994)

Constitutional Court Ruling on initiatives U. No. 45/2000 and U. No 61/2000, 28.02.2001

Law for Political Parties (Official Gazette, No 76/04, 27.10.2004)

Law for Changing and Amending the Law for Political Parties (Official Gazette No. 5/07, 16.01.2007)

Constitutional Court Ruling on initiative U. No.12/2007, 04.04.2007

Constitutional Court Ruling on initiative U. No.23/2007, 02.05.2007

Constitutional Court Ruling on initiative U. No. 15/2007, 02.05.2007

Law for Changing and Amending the Law for Political Parties (Official Gazette No.7/08, 15.01.2008)

Law for Amending the Law for Political Parties (Official Gazette No.23/2013, 14.02.2013)

Law for Financing Political Parties (Official Gazette No. 76/04, 27.10.2004)

Constitutional Court Ruling on initiative U. No. 174/2005, 08.03.2006

Law for Changing and Amending the Law for Financing Political Parties (Official Gazette No. 96/09, 31.07.2009)

Law for Changing and Amending the Law for Financing Political Parties (Official Gazette No. 148/11, 21.10.2011)

Law for Changing and Amending the Law for Financing Political Parties (Official Gazette No. 142/12, 13.11.2012)

Law for Changing and Amending the Law for Financing Political Parties (Official Gazette No. 23/13, 14.02.2013)

Electoral Code (Official Gazette No. 40/06, 31.03.2006)

Law for Changing and Amending the Electoral Code (Official Gazette No. 16/08, 30.10.2008)

Law for Changing and Amending the Electoral Code (Official Gazette No. 44/11, 05.04.2011)

Law for Changing and Amending the Electoral Code (Official Gazette No. 142/12, 13.11.2012)

Law for parties' research and analytical centers, Official Gazette, No 23, 22.02.2013)

## **Tables**

Table 1. Relevant changes in party regulation in Macedonia

	1990-1993	1994-2003	2004-2012
<i>Ban of parties</i>	NO	NO	NO
<i>Deposit fee</i>	NO	NO	NO
<i>Number of members</i>	10	500	1,000 (2007)
<i>Public funding</i>	YES	YES	YES
<i>Payout threshold</i>	1,000 members	3%	1%
<i>Limited private funding</i>	NO	SOME	MORE (2009)

Table 2. Macedonian Party System Indicators

Electoral Year	Electoral Volatility	Number of New Parties*	Total Number of Parties	Number of Winning Parties	Small Party Vote Share
1994	-	-	22	11**	36.4
1998	34.6	4	10	7	9.7
2002	23.3	5	14	7	15.8
2006	20.4	5	14	8**	12.5
2008	10.3	1	8	5	6.5
2011	14.2	3	10	5	11.8

Note: In our calculations mergers and electoral coalitions (\*) and independent candidates (\*\*\*) are excluded

Sources: Own calculations

Table 3. Party Funding and Party Continuity

% votes	1994*	1998	2002	2006	2008	2011
In parl.	<i>SDSM-SPM VMRO/DP PDP/NDP DPM/LP DPT/SDPM PCERM</i>	<i>VMRO SDSM/PDP PPDA- NDP/LDP</i>	<i>SDSM-LDP VMRO DUI/DPA PDP/NDP II SRM</i>	<i>VMRO SDSM-LDP DUI-PDP DPA VMRO-DP NSDP</i>	<i>VMRO SDSM- LDP DUI DPA</i>	<i>VMRO SDSM DUI DPA</i>
<5.0 ≥3.0		<i>SPM- PCERM- DPT</i>				
<3.0 ≥1.0	<i>RP/MAAK VMRO-DP</i>	<i>DPSM VMRO- DOM</i>	<i>SPM DA/DS</i>	<i>DOM/PEO ZNPM PEI/DA</i>	<i>PEI</i>	<i>RDK VMRO-NP ND/OM/LDP</i>
<1.0 ≥0.5	<i>SKM/RPM VMRO- MNDS PDA-IP DPSM/KPM</i>	<i>PPM MAAK</i>	<i>VMRO-M VMRO- VMRO DCPZ ND</i>	<i>SDPM GMP NDP II</i>	<i>PDP DUA SDPM</i>	<i>PPD</i>

Source: Kasapovic (2010)

Table 4. Survival rate (in %) of Macedonian political parties

Party Funding	1994	1998	2002	2006	2008
Yes	100	100 (100)	100	76.9 (60)	100 (100)
No	55.6	50	57.1	33.3	66.7





## Appendix

Table A. Electoral results in Macedonia

<b>Parties</b>	<b>1990</b>	<b>1994</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2011</b>
VMRO/DPMNE	14.3	14.3	28.1	25	32.5	48.8	39
NDM	-	-	-	0.2	-	-	-
SRM	-	-	0.3	0.6	-	-	-
DS	-	-	-	1.3	-	-	-
PCERM	0.5	0.7	-	0.2	-	-	-
SPM	7.8	-	4.7	2.2	-	-	-
DPTM	0.3	1.9	-	-	-	-	-
DOM	-	-	-	-	1.9	-	-
PPM	-	-	0.5	0.2	-	-	-
VMRO/DP	-	1	0.3	-	0.1	0.2	-
VMRO/MNDS	-	0.7	-	-	-	-	-
VMRO/T	-	0.5	-	-	-	-	-
VMRO/O	-	0.1	-	-	-	-	-
VMRO/DOM	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
VMRO/M	-	-	-	0.9	-	-	-
VMRO/VMRO	-	-	-	0.7	-	-	-
VMRO/NP	-	-	-	-	6.1	-	2.5
ZPMN	-	-	-	-	1.3	-	-
DRUM	-	-	-	-	0.3	-	-
OM (II)	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.5
DD	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.1
GPM	-	-	-	-	-	0.3	-
TMRO	-	-	-	-	0.2	0.2	-
SJM	1.6	0.1	-	-	-	-	-
RZPM	0.2	0.3	-	-	-	-	-
PDA-IP	-	0.7	-	-	-	-	-
RPM	-	0.6	-	-	-	-	-
GLPM	-	0.2	0.3	-	-	-	-
SDSM	21.8	32.5	25.1	41.4	23.3	23.6	32.8
NSDP	-	-	-	-	6.1	-	-
PODEM	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.4
SDU	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.2
PSD	-	-	-	-	-	0.4	-
SKM	-	0.8	0.2	-	-	-	-
LPM	16.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
LDP	-	-	7	-	-	-	1.5
DP	-	11	-	-	-	-	-
SHPM	-	-	0.2	-	-	-	-
PEI	-	-	-	-	1.2	1.5	-
NA	-	-	-	-	0.5	-	-
DPSM	-	0.5	1.3	-	-	-	-
STLS	-	-	-	-	0.3	0.4	-
RSSM	-	-	-	-	0.1	0.4	-
DNET	-	-	-	-	0.1	0.4	-
DA	-	-	10.7	1.5	1.2	-	-
DC	-	-	-	0.5	-	-	-
ND	-	-	-	0.5	-	-	-
LD	1.2	-	-	0.5	0.3	-	-
MAAK	4.2	1.2	0.5	0.2	-	-	-

DPM	-	2.1	-	0.2	0.1	-	-
DUI	-	-	-	12.1	12.2	12.8	10.2
PDP	21.2	8.8	19.3	2.4	-	0.7	0
NDP	0.4	3	-	-	-	-	-
DPA	-	-	-	5.3	7.5	8.3	5.9
ND (II)	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.8
NDP (II)	-	-	-	2.2	0.5	-	-
SDPM	1.6	1.2	-	0.3	0.9	0.7	0.2
RP	2.9	1.6	0.1	-	-	-	-
KPM	-	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.1	-	-
MNP	2.4	-	-	0.2	-	-	-
DU-PP	1.2	0.5	-	-	-	-	-
DHPM	0.3	0.4	-	-	-	-	-
PPNM	-	0.2	-	-	-	-	-
POMNI	-	-	-	0.2	-	-	-
RPM (II)	-	0.1	-	0.2	-	-	-
NV	-	-	-	0.1	-	-	-
PnP	-	-	-	0.1	-	-	-
PP	-	-	-	0.1	-	-	-
NDS	-	-	-	-	0.4	-	-
PEO	-	-	-	-	1.4	-	-
MP	-	-	-	-	0.2	-	-
PDI	-	-	-	-	0.2	-	-
OM	-	-	-	-	0.1	-	-
LSM	-	-	-	-	0.1	-	-
TMORO/VEP	-	-	-	-	0.1	0.4	-
DUA	-	-	-	-	-	0.7	0.4
NDU	-	-	-	-	-	0.2	0
RDK	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.7
PPD	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.8
Independents	1.7	13.8	0.2	0.6	0.7	0	0
<i>Others</i>	0	0.7	0	0	0	0	0

**Party acronyms:** DA = Democratic Alternative; DC = Democratic Centre; DD = Democratic Right; DHPM = Christian Democratic Party; DNET = Movement for National Unity of Turks; DOM = Democratic Renewal of Macedonia; DP = Democratic Party; DPA = Democratic Party of Albanians; DPM = Democratic Party of Macedonia; DPSM = Democratic Party of Serbs in Macedonia; DPTM = Democratic Party of Turks; DRUM = Democratic-Republican Union of Macedonia; DS = Democratic Union; DUA = Democratic Union of Albanians; DUI = Democratic Union for Integration; DU-PP = Democratic Union-Party of Peasants; GLPM = Civil-Liberal Party of Macedonia; GPM = Group of Electors "Panco Minov"; KPM = Communist Party of Macedonia; LD = League for Democracy; LPM = Liberal Party of Macedonia; LSM = Leftist Forces of Macedonia; MAAK = Movement for All-Macedonia People's Party; MNP = Macedonian People's Party; MP = Macedonian Party; NA = National Alternative; ND = New Democracy; ND (II) = New Democracy (II); NDM = People's Movement of Macedonia; NDP = People's Democratic Party; NDP (II) = National Democratic Party; NDS = New Democratic Forces; NDU = National Democratic Union; NSDP = New Social Democratic Party; ND = People's Will; OM = United Macedonians; OM (II) = United for Macedonia; PCERM = Party of Full Emancipation for Roma in Macedonia; PDI = Party for a Democratic Future; PDP = Party of Democratic Prosperity; PEI = Party for European Future; PEO = Party of Economic Renewal; PnP = Party of Justice; PODEM = Party of United Democrats of Macedonia; POMNI = Rebirth and Alliance for a Macedonian National Idea; PP = Progressive Party; PPD = Political Party Dignity; PPM = Party of Pensioners of the Republic of Macedonia; PPNM = Political Party of Unemployed in Macedonia; PSD = Party for Free Democrats; RDK = National Democratic Revival; RP = Workers' Party; RPM = Workers' Party of Macedonia; RPM (II) = Republican Party of Macedonia; RSSM = Radical Party of Serbs in Macedonia; RZPM = Workers-Peasant Party; SDA-IP = Party of Democratic Action-Islamic Path; SDPM = Social Democratic Party of Macedonia; SDSM = Social Democratic Union of Macedonia; SDU = Social Democratic Union; SHPM = Social Christian Party of Macedonia; SJM = Party of Yugoslavs in Macedonia; SKM = League of Communist of Macedonia; SPM = Socialist Party of Macedonia; SRM = Union of Roma in Macedonia; STLS = Union of Tito's Left Forces; TMORO/VEP = Fatherland's Macedonian Organization for Radical Renewal/Vadgar-Egej-Pirin; TMRO = Permanent Macedonian Radical Unification; VMRO/DOM = International

Macedonian Revolutionary Organization/Movement for the Restoration of Macedonia; VMRO/DP = International Macedonian Revolutionary Organization/Democratic Party; VMRO/DPMN = International Macedonian Revolutionary Organization/Democratic Party for Macedonian National Unity; VMRO/MNDS = International Macedonian Revolutionary Organization/Macedonian National Democratic Alliance; VMRO/O = International Macedonian Revolutionary Organization/Unity; VMRO/M = International Macedonian Revolutionary Organization/Macedonian; ; VMRO/T = International Macedonian Revolutionary Organization/Fatherland; VMRO/VMRO = International Macedonian Revolutionary Organization/International Macedonian Revolutionary Organization; ZNPM = Agricultural People's Party of Macedonia.

*Sources:* Dimovski (2011) and Kasapović (2010)