

Democracy in Central Eastern Europe and European Union

Blerina Muskaj

PhD, University "Aleksandër Moisiu" Durrës-Albania

Abstract

Some of the countries in the region have contributed through assistance programs to develop and align their democracies with what the EU itself lobbies. EU aid to CEE is seen as a phenomenon of EU-perceived responsibility in the interaction of new democracies in Central and Eastern Europe. This paper will create a genuine study of the perceived responsibility for the development of democracies in these countries. It paints a clear picture of the development of democracy and the need for CEE countries to be under EU assistance. The assistance coming from this institution has given and continues to contribute to developing a democracy with strong executive foundations for society and beneficial to the region. In this way, the EU manages to achieve its objectives of achieving a federal union. When we say federal union we mean a Europe with the same democratic values and executive standards. In this paper the EU's responsibility for the new democracies of Central and Eastern Europe is seen in activities with EU programs to enhance institutions above democratic values. Having access to the issues facing the democracies of Central and Eastern Europe, the Council Acquis provides an overview in the field of democracy. The paper gives us the opportunity to look more closely at democratic forces in countries where the latter is still developing, aiming not only at the analysis of democracy, but also at the analysis of the European common market. We will look at these two EU phenomena in the context of the EU's perceived responsibility for the interaction of new democracies in CEE. The EU has undertaken this responsibility in the context of strengthening, developing and maturing new democracies on the European Continent. Giving its contribution through various programs designed in the form of grants, which are given to countries that are in the process of maturation, in the form of programs that pave the way for development. The question that arises at this stage is: Does democracy help in a market economy?

Keywords: market economy, Acquis, council, democracies, Central-Eastern Europe

Introduction

1. The notion of Democracy.

The nature of democracy: "Everyone has the right to take part in the government of his country, directly or through freely chosen representatives. Everyone has an equal right to access public services in his country. The will of the people is the basis of state power; this will must be expressed in periodic and free elections, which must be general and equal voting, as well as by secret ballot or according to the equivalent procedure of free voting".

Democracy is a form of government in which state authority derives from the people. The word "democracy"¹ comes from the ancient Greek word "demos" which means people and "kratos", which means power. The principles of modern democracy have been gradually developed by the religious movements of Calvinism during the seventeenth century, especially in Scotland, England and the Netherlands where communities began to support and share not only religious but also political ideas. The philosophy of freedom and equality was further enhanced during the Enlightenment period, which would later be recognized as the core values of democracy.²

The first democratic state was established in the USA, while France was the first European state established on democratic principles, after the French Revolution. After 1945 there was a spread of Western democracy in Europe and around the world, which replaced authoritarian forms of government. After the defeat of fascist governments, it seemed that the crisis that democracy experienced during the twentieth century was overcome. The long process of decolonization in which the right to self-determination was recognized by Western countries resulted in the advent of democracy in their former colonies. The dictatorships in Spain, Portugal, Greece, Argentina and Uruguay all became democracies in recent decades.³ With the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 and the collapse of the Stalinist system in Central and Eastern Europe, it was seen that democracy had indeed triumphed. However, not all countries that theoretically support democracy as a form of government do not respect democratic principles or the life of democratic practice. This rather as a paradoxical development demonstrates that maintaining a critical debate on democracy and democratization is a necessity.

¹ Kuci K., 2011, "Political Philosophy", UMSH Tirana, p. 29.

² Two basic principles of the French Revolution are the principle of freedom and that of equality. These principles are exactly what later became the basis of democracy. So, democracy works on these two principles today.

This is a small comparison between states that toppled their dictatorial system in the last years of the twentieth century.

³ Fischer L., "The Essential Gandhi: An Anthology of His Writings on His Life", Work, and Ideas, 2002, fq 203

"My notion of democracy is that the weakest should have the same chance as the strongest."¹

With regard to the essential elements of modern democracy it must be stated that it is difficult to measure what a democratic society is like. Yet a number of key elements constitute the foundations of any democratic society. To better understand these elements, education and learning at all levels play an essential role.

a. Equality - the principle of equality means that all human beings are born equal, should enjoy equal opportunities, participation in the political life of the community and equal treatment before the law. This also includes social and economic equality between women and men.

b. Participation - democracy is meaningless without participation, participation in the community and policy issues is a prerequisite for building a democratic system. Democracy is a form of participation, sometimes participation is a broad concept and contains not only strong political implications, but also social and economic ones. But participation alone cannot guarantee democracy.

c. Majority rule and minority rights Although democracy is defined by "people rule", it is in fact "majority rule". It also implies a majority obligation to take into account the different rights and needs of minority groups. The degree to which obligations are met is an indicator of the further increase of democratic values in society.

The question arises: What does democracy include as a notion? According to the reasoning, but also according to various literatures, democracy includes the rule of law, the electoral system, good governance, the sovereignty of the people and the conditions for free elections. So the nature of democracy is diverse. We will analyze each of the above concepts to better understand the diversity of democracy.

With regard to the rule of law, we must first clarify which terminology we must accept: the rule of law or the rule of law, terms that are widely used today in the political and legal literature. Both terms have the same meaning, express the same concept, that of the close and reciprocal connection between the state and the law. The definition of the rule of law varies by authors and eras. The rule of law is first and foremost a theoretical model of the organization of political systems. It has become a fundamental topic of politics as it is considered one of the main characteristics of a democratic regime, but it is not necessarily a democratic regime. Generally a rule of law is not necessarily democratic, but any democratic state is a rule of law. The rule of law thus seems like a first stage in the formation of a democratic state. Its opposite

¹ Fischer L., *"The Essential Gandhi: An Anthology of His Writings on His Life"*, Work, and Ideas, 2002, fq 203.

is despotism or police regime, where arbitrariness and regime of violence reign. It happens that the notion of the rule of law is opposed by the notion of the Reason of the State.

According to an old definition,¹ the rule of law is an institutional system in which public power is subject to the rule of law. It is based on the essential principle of respect for the law, everyone is subject to the same right, whether this individual or public power. So in a special case

the actions of the state or of a political leader may be challenged if they are deemed not in accordance with the law. The Austrian jurist Hans Kelsen² redefined this concept of German origin in the early twentieth century, as a "state in which legal norms are hierarchical so that its power is limited." In this model, each rate gets its validity in accordance with the above rates.

The rule of law can be summarized according to the formula: "No one is above the law". In general, this regime groups a set of legal norms that protect citizens from arbitrary forms of (executive) power. For a state of law to exist, the obligations arising from the state must be formal, impersonal, binding and sanctioned. In other words, the laws must: 1) be made public, 2) no one can escape them, 3) they must be realistically enforced, and 4) the violation of the laws must lead to sanctions.

The rule of law is closely linked to the observance of the hierarchy of norms, the separation of powers, the equality of subjects of law before legal norms, the existence of independent jurisdictions and the guarantee of the civil and political rights of individuals. These are the basic conditions that a Rule of Law must meet.

2. Electoral system and democracy.

Much of the constitutional creation has emerged in relatively recent times: the worldwide movement towards democratic governance in the 1980s and 1990s has stimulated a new urgency by exploring sustainable models of government of respective representation, along with the assessment of fresh electoral systems. This process has been encouraged by the widespread logic that the choice of institutions can have a significant impact on the wider political system - for example, it is increasingly accepted that an electoral system can help to "engineer" cooperation and integration into society. Separated. The creation of the electoral system now accepted as relevant to major governance issues, and arguably as one of the most influential, of all political institutions.

By providing this detailed analysis of selections and consequences, and by showing how electoral systems have worked in a democratic world, we hope to achieve two things:

¹ Bashkurti L., "Public International Law", ILIRIA Prishtina, 2009, p. 109.

² Bashkurti L., "Public International Law", ILIRIA Prishtina, 2009, p. 109.

- o expand knowledge and illuminate political and public discussions;
- o enable the drafters of the constitution to make a selection with information, thus avoiding some of the effects of dysfunction and destabilization of the selections of special electoral systems

At the most basic level, electoral systems show that in general elections votes are cast in seats won by parties and candidates. The main variables are:

1. the electoral formula used (i.e. whether it is a majority or proportional system, and what mathematical formula is used to calculate the allocation of seats)
2. the size of the region, not how many voters live in a region, but rather how many members of parliament are elected in that region.

3. Good governance and democracy.

Derived from micro-economic theory and Anglo-Saxon administrative science, the notion of "good governance" was introduced in the 1990s by the World Bank as a necessary condition of development policy. For the World Bank, governance includes the norms, traditions, and institutions through which a country exercises its authority over the common good in the optics of development. Good governance also includes the capacity of government to effectively manage its own resources and to implement appropriate policies, as well as the existence of democratic control over the agents charged by the authority.¹ For the World Bank², good governance is "the way power is exercised in managing the economic and social resources of a developing country." Governance, according to the IT Governance Institute, "aims to provide strategic orientation, ensure that objectives are achieved, risks are properly managed and that resources are used responsibly." It takes care with priority to respect the interests of those "who have rights" (citizens, public authorities, shareholders, etc.) and to make their voices heard in the conduct of affairs.

So good governance is related to the functioning of public authorities. The "manner of exercising power" must respect the following principles:

- The principle of transparency which means freedom of access to administrative documentation, freedom of information, guarantee of an administrative justice and motivation of decisions taken.

¹ Non-paper Harnessing the transition experience in EU's external relations: From policy to implementation. Non-paper by the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovak Republic, and Slovenia. Available at http://www.mzv.cz/file/591175/non_paper_on_the_transition_experience.pdf, accessed 2 Shkurt 2011.

² World Bank official site, shiko për më shumë: World Bank official site, Prill 2009.

- The principle of accountability which means the responsibility of decision makers, controls over administration, control over public markets, administration of public money, etc.

- The principle of participation which means giving opportunities to all actors to participate in the development process.

In Western societies governed by liberal democracy, governance refers to interactions between the state, political bodies, and society, including lobbying systems and coalitions of public and private actors. Good governance aims to make public action more efficient and closer to the public good and the common interest, as well as more legitimate. It aims to make societies easier to govern and more balanced, so that they do not overuse their resources and are able to renew them.

The European Commission has registered its notion of governance in the White Paper on European governance.¹ Thus, the term European governance defines the rules, processes and behaviors that influence the exercise of power at European level, especially in terms of openness, participation, responsibility, efficiency and coherence. These five "principles of good governance" strengthen those of subsidiarity and proportionality. This definition is also included in the Lisbon Treaty.

Good governance can be seen as an ideology of Social-State non-engagement, even as a theory of state decomposition, which has been in operation since the neoliberal turn of the 1980s. The abandonment of the term "government" and its use can be denounced. of the term "governance", explaining that it is a demolition of the decision-making power of the state, as a guarantor of popular sovereignty, replacing it with participatory democracy, which has no real political attribute. The slide from government to government shows that it passes from a civilization of popular sovereignty embodied in republican constitutions, a guarantor of the general interest, into a pragmatic, particularist and utilitarian society, the guarantor of special economic interests, in which the notion of the good of joint no longer has room.

4. Nationalism and democracy.

Nationalism can be seen as an integral part of consolidating the identity of a new state.

Whatever the reasons, the fact is that after the end of the Communist Party rule in the world an increase of national movements and national feelings was witnessed in post-communist Europe. Nationalism has been used as a tool of political mobilization and support so that in a number of countries, the rhetoric and symbols with the greatest electoral appeal were national.² The nationalist idiom had orientated an important

¹ European Commission, për më shumë shiko:
http://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/strategies/2011_white_, 2011

² Verdery. K., "Transnationalism, Nationalism, Citizenship, and Property: Eastern Europe since 1989", 1998, fq 294.

place in the cultural repertoires of actors and had given meaning to post-communist transformations.¹

More specifically, Brubaker² distinguishes between types of nationalism, which have interacted to destabilize new or restructured states in post-1989 Europe. Thus we mention "national minority nationalism" that seeks to prevent and eliminate discrimination and exclusion. Further another type of nationalism is "foreign homeland nationalism", which sees itself as responsible for the welfare and fate of the non-citizen co-accused, ethnic minority in another state and intervenes on its behalf. This kind of nationalism does not protect national problems. It is about ethno-nationalism. This kind of nationalism can be a major obstacle to democratization in post-communist states because "post-communist governments give the impression that they do not represent the citizens, but the nation." All this suggests that in light of the nationalism that marked the political scene in Central and Europe Eastern after the fall of communist regimes, in

countries with significant ethnic minorities, the population will be slower in the process of democratic consolidation, thus reluctant to affirming the rights of ethnic minorities and their interests in societies where nationalism is prevalent will be an obstacle to democratic consolidation. European Nationalism and Euroscepticism for new EU members.

The phenomenon of Euroscepticism became apparent in the 1990s. This is because we have a change in the governing system and the demand of many states to become part of the community. History has shown that the term appeared in Great Britain when it was preparing for European integration.³

There are several definitions for this phenomenon and there have always been different views regarding the definition of this phenomenon. Some argue it as a negative signal of a gap between politicians' desire (to be part of the EU) and ratification of treaties. Many times some treaties have failed in their first vote by the people, but this did not happen in the second vote and the existing treaties have been ratified, but always with the consent of the people.⁴

However it is important to recognize that Euroscepticism can have positive attributes. These will be understood as awareness, interest, critical capacity of the people, in the sense that the European people remind the political elite that can not govern without

¹ Brubaker . R., "*Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe*",1996, fq 68.

² Brubaker. R., "*Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe*", 1996, fq 7.

³ The Oxford English Dictionary defines the Eurosceptic as "a person who has doubts or reservations about the benefits of cooperation that should be enjoyed by EU member states", p. 323.

⁴ Gfeller A., "*Building a European Identity*", France, The United States, and the Oil Shock, Berghahn Books, New York, 2012, fq 123.

the consent of society. The political elite here has less of a superior position than the people they elect.

But why are EU member states more skeptical than those who want to be part of it?

Member states are more skeptical because they have the opportunity to see up close how the EU works as an organization aiming to move towards a federation. Those within the Union are more inclined to lean towards non-functioning as a federation, so they are skeptical of this issue. This comes as a result of a Europe with history and the fear that this Europe may be extinguished if it is decided to proceed with the creation of a single state *ex novo*.

At the current stage of the *sui generis* organization, which is the European Union, it should be noted that each member state is a different nation from the others and none of them speaks or is represented as European.

It is the peoples, the different cultures that each state carries that do not allow the creation of a federal state because we have a clash of cultures or a clash of civilizations. The creation of a European Federal State would mark a new world order for international relations on a global scale.¹

If we compare it with the USA, it would be said that: "The USA is compact with the states that make it up. Its institutions are formed, mature, developed and the American Parliament (to compare it with the European Parliament) or the Senate as it is otherwise known, makes decisions for all states only in the presence of senators of member states, without requiring the vote of the people. . Stay with the institutions because their importance appears when they represent the US as the only one in the international arena. The result of this process is that they do not have an individual past or culture as European countries do, they simply produce and market it. The US, has a Constitution while the EU failed in its attempt to create one. The explanation for this is a consequence of what I argued above. The Constitution failed and with it failed any attempt towards a Europe state. In the ensuing Lisbon Treaty, the term Foreign Minister was also replaced by the High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy. Precisely to avoid any misunderstanding in this regard. There is also no article dealing with EU symbols such as the flag or anthem.

On 1 January 1999 the Euro starts as the common currency in banking transactions. 11 member countries adopt the common currency. Three countries such as Denmark, Sweden and Britain decide to delay the decision. The coin did not succeed from the beginning. During the year its value fell by about 30% compared to other major world currencies. According to federalist theory, to impose integration, a full-fledged political system is needed, such as the federal government in the US.

¹ Picture or reflection. The term framework is used in giving arguments on the goals of a phenomenon or a process. In our case we distinguish between the phenomenon that is globalism and the process that is globalism.

As stated above, the EU is not an end product. Merger is in a dynamic process of change and what the final form it will take is difficult to predict. The EU institutions have competencies in several areas and pursue objectives set out in the treaties. This means that they are not free to choose their objectives in the same way as a sovereign state does, and that they are unable to cope with the challenges that sovereign states face today.

To return to Euroscepticism, we mention the fact that perceptions of the EU in the UK have changed more dramatically than in many other Member States.

The undisputed proof in this regard is the exit of this country from the European Union. It should be noted that this is the first experience of a country leaving the European Union.¹

On the other hand it must be said that leaving the European Union was not a surprise to anyone. This is because in 2004 there was a relatively low level of confidence and a relatively negative image of the EU. Calculations in% clearly show that "citizens do not tend to trust the EU", from 2004 which was 48% in 2012 went to 80%.²

Dominated by a constant fluctuation between national interests and the partially integrative interests that favor national ones, Britain has always been considered a difficult partner of the EU. The Conservatives' rise to power in 2010 gradually began to re-expose the government's stance on Eurosceptic ideas. These attitudes would also be reflected in the public speech on Europe, by the Prime Minister of Cameroon. The political ideas presented in this speech repositioned Britain again towards a choice option: negotiating a new agreement with the EU, and in case of failure a popular referendum to decide on leaving, or staying in the EU.

The referendum held years ago suggests for the first time a concise, clearly stated question about leaving or staying in the EU and is considered to have been one of the boldest promises that carries in itself a multifaceted risk, exposing it unnecessarily. Britain in the face of isolationist situations. In parallel with this political initiative, Britain confirmed that it would not participate in the reform of the EU Economic and Monetary Union, as well as stated a consideration for withdrawal from EU Justice and Home Affairs. British dissatisfaction has also been expressed in other areas affecting relations with the EU. Despite the bold promise of holding a referendum, the ideas expressed in Cameroon's speech address a range of issues. One of the main reasons is estimated to have been Britain's fading role in the EU, as the financial and economic crisis has significantly highlighted the role of the eurozone in the EU. The focus on a deeper integration of the euro area, has become an engine of integration, causing the latter to take the lead in other political areas, such as that of further economic and political deepening, with federalist tendencies.

¹ Titulluar Brexit.

² European Council On Foreign Relations, the Continent-Wide Rise of Euroscepticism, 2012.

This highly-argued scenario over the UK materialized with the UK's exit from the EU.

Attitudes towards the EU in Finland are¹ a bit contradictory as the level of support for Finnish membership and for the single currency is high, while the levels of support for Finnish membership and trust in the EU are very low. The economic crisis has polarized Finns, but growing criticism of the EU has somewhat strengthened pro-European sentiment.

Association Agreements with the EU are a first step on the path to full membership in the European Union. Most importantly, this process has caused the alignment with the *acquis communautaire*, the EU legislation, with the legislation of these countries.

The signing of EU Agreements with Central and Eastern European countries will have an impact on the democratic consolidation of these countries. EU pressure and monitoring a country's imminent opportunity to meet EU criteria should help a country stay on track for the democratic project. Therefore, we must see that, *ceteris paribus*, the sooner a country gives the signs of the EU Agreement, the faster its democratic consolidation

Conclusion

Regarding the study, the focus of this study is Central and Eastern Europe and the relationship with the EU, where the link to the interaction needs of democracies is direct and reciprocal. Being a very broad topic, and addressing the perceived responsibility of the EU with the interactions in the new democracies in Central and Eastern Europe is seen as a whole it has been chosen to focus on the problematic of how this democracy affects the execution of aid programs. in this region by the EU. International factors have influenced the democratization of Central and Eastern Europe, providing assistance in the form of programs. The fall of the dictatorial system in this period is seen as a revolution characterized by two important features: The first feature is characterized by the dissolution of the Soviet Union, a peaceful dissolution. The second feature of this dissolution marks the re-world order. In this feature it is clear that we are ahead of the development of a society based on democratic principles. The key questions already posed in the political debates are: what impact do aid programs have on the development of democracy? How the EU perceives responsibility through programs helper it offers? These are the main questions that guide the structure of this paper and the requirements for recognizing a wide range of issues that provide us with a complete overview and as close as possible to concrete and accurate conclusions. This paper analyzes and explains a wide range of political interactions between these countries with the EU, its main actors, the respective governments with their statements and positions, etc. This range of interactions includes cooperation, confrontation, and individual games in the interest of meeting the goals of each party.

¹ Or have been for the eight countries that joined the EU in 2004.

Today, democracy has reached an important point in the development of Central and Eastern Europe. Democratic institutions are more widely accepted in this region. Today more Europeans live in democracies. Recognizing the development of democracy in the region in question, we see that there is distrust in political institutions, as well as in participation in free and democratic elections.

The study aims to analyze the EU's responsibility for the interaction of democracies in CEE. This objective can not be achieved without considering a number of other aspects related to it, starting from the historic moment of the creation of communities and to the conditions that led the countries of Eastern and Central Europe towards EU membership.

The main problem of the study is the study of the consolidation of democracy in Central and Eastern Europe and the way of influence of democracy in the development of the region. Functional consequences and democratic performance are considered more important, combining it with the responsibility that comes before the EU, to help these countries to recover through aid programs. These programs are made available to countries with short-lived democratic experience.

The EU presents the democratic performance of the countries of Central and Eastern Europe in the form of the so-called Copenhagen criteria, regarding the ability to take on the obligations of membership. These conditions, which are economic-political, require democratically defined standards by meeting the criteria of a free economy. The problem in this case lies in the implementation and commitment of states to these criteria.

References

- [1] Brubaker. R., "Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe"
- [2] European Council On Foreign Relations, the Continent-Wide Rise of Euroscepticism, 2012.
- [3] Gfeller A., "Building a European Identity", France, The United States, and the Oil Shock, Berghahn Books, New York
- [4] Gombert, T., Blasius, J., Krell Ch., Timpe, M., "Basics of Social Democracy" (PDF). Social Democratic Reader. Translated by Paterson, James Berlin. Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung. Retrieved 31 January 2016.
- [5] Non-paper Harnessing the transition experience in EU's external relations: From policy to implementation. Non-paper by the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovak Republic, and Slovenia. Available at http://www.mzv.cz/file/591175/non_paper_on_the_transition_experience.pdf, accessed 2 February 2011.
- [6] Pridham G., "Democratization in Central and Eastern Europe: a comparative perspective" by S. White, J. Batt and P. Lewis (eds.), Developments in Central and East European Politics 3. (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003

- [7] The Oxford English Dictionary defines a Eurosceptic as "a person who has doubts or reservations about the benefits of cooperation that should be enjoyed by EU member states".
- [8] Verdery. K., "Transnationalism, Nationalism, Citizenship, and Property: Eastern Europe since 1989"