# On some problems of classification of political parties

Major methodological problem in the study of political parties is their classification (typology). Since it has always faced by all researchers of political history and thesis, making sure the theoretical complexity and ambiguity of the problem, in the absence of a unified or at least "basic" classification, expressed in a multiplicity of approaches and criteria for the typology of parties and the need to develop some basic consensus in the block theoretic and methodological issues.

It should be stressed that this issue is generally better developed by political scientists than historians, though among them there is no expression of the unity of approaches, criteria for the classification of political parties both in historical terms, and especially in modern conditions. In political science usually focuses on the possibility of using different criteria, among whom some consider the root characteristics parties, and others - and even minor random.

Modern western political science in most cases it carries out the classification of parties based on the recognition of plurality and the equivalence of various characters. Therefore, both parties used the division of authoritarian and democratic, ideological and pragmatic, national and regional, religious and secular, the massive, human and elitist, representative and mobilizing etc. Such a classification allows to characterize the party with the various parties. At the same time, recognition of the multiple criteria poses a risk of ignoring or belittling the basic characteristics of the parties (their software and ideological beliefs, strategies, tactics, etc. [1, p.30].

It should be recognized as a practical value of modern political science thesis on the appropriateness of including the association of specific variants of the typology of political parties with the objectives of a particular scientific study of the relationship types of parties and party systems in terms of social development [2, p.4].

Russia's modern history political science does not operate, unfortunately, a single (common) typology of political parties as the pre-revolutionary Russia, and modern Russia. Thus, some experts focus on the party systems of the past and the degree of political opposition parties in the present [3, s.278-350]. Another group of scientists shared the western methodological principle of equal criteria for analyzing the plurality of political parties [4, p.231-232]. Third exercise typology based on the organizational structure and membership, the scale of the two - and a multiparty system [5, p.183-187], etc.

In our opinion, in Russia (and Belarussian) science of history and political science at hand: a) inappropriate recognition of absolute mass, at least, the class classification criterion of political parties, and b) the absence of a single scheme (hence the common criteria) typology of domestic and foreign parties; c) attempt to provide universal and the most commonly accepted classification system of parties. In this third problem is solved very slow and difficult, when confronted with the contradictions and discrepancies of scientific, political, ideological and subjective nature.

Nevertheless, there is the feeling that the system of political parties is not chaos and, therefore, can be theoretically rationalized. Petersburg researcher SI Stepanov wrote that "the classification as a method of learning a large number of empirical material, as a sign of comprehension of essence of the phenomenon ... is a value in themselves political science instrument to adequately reflect the political reality of the retrospective and predictive functions" [6, p.16 ].

Certainly, there is almost universally accepted fact that reduction is attributed to the ability of social-class approach, previously the most common in the Soviet historical science. The current realities of the information society requires a change outdated view of politics as a "concentrated expression of economics", a review of the political party as the exponent of the interests of certain social classes and groups.

At the same time, even in modern Russian generalizing "History of the Party" works are conspicuously absent unity of approaches, criteria and opinions as a matter of classification of political parties and the general methodological understanding of party-political issues.

For example, a textbook on the history of political parties of Russia in 1994 the publication pointed out that the classification of parties is carried out "on all of the inherent characteristic features: a social framework, political program, strategic and tactical principles. The authors insisted that the basis for the classification of parties must be shown the entire set of factors (social class, political, national, moral and ethical, religious, etc.). However, they noted that, depending on the goals and objectives of the analysis of political parties is one of many criteria could speak to the fore, while the other plays a supporting role [7, p.8-9]. Then as in the textbook were identified: a) All-Russia party and the national b) the monarchy, the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois and separately Bolsheviks [7, p.11].

Encyclopedic edition on the history of political parties in pre-revolutionary Russia (1996) assumed that the fundamental differences between the parties and movements clearly traced to the doctrinal level, and therefore proposed to allocate three software-political bloc (directions): conservative, liberal and socialist parties [8 , p.5-6]. Immediately it should be noted that instead of the category of "socialist" was more appropriate to use the term "radical".

Modernize Russia's textbook on the history of political parties (2000) concludes that "the current state of knowledge allows us to propose the following classification: conservative, liberal, centrist and socialist parties and movements" [9, p.9]. The term "centrist" is not commented and not explained, so do not understand exactly what the party should be assigned to this unit.

I think that, firstly, fundamentally unacceptable to classify political parties on the basis of diverse criteria and need to come to the greatest possible recognition of the leading (basic) criteria of historical typology of parties. Second, the structuring of the national parties (Belarusian, Polish, Jewish, etc.) do not always fit into the overall classification of political parties.

In our view, the basic criterion for classification can be software-ideological orientation of political parties, suggesting their division at the reactionary, conservative, reformist (liberal) and radical (revolutionary). And within each block must take into account the degree of political radicalism of certain parties in relation to related political structures. We believe that this theoretical and methodological approach can be used both for the parties of the past, and for the systematization of modern parties.

At the same time does not exclude the possibility of using both categories of "right - left - the centrist" party. In this case, however, should pay attention to the fact that: a) the typology (in the tradition of the French Revolution) greatly simplifies the problem, because in such a scheme is difficult to squeeze the religious, ethnic-national and other interests, and b) historically adjustably very content of the concepts "right" and "Left", c) is extremely difficult to more or less clearly defined what constitutes a party-political center.

Underlining the complexity of the classification of national parties in a public education, we can assume that when they are organizing, in addition to the base (software-ideological) principle should be considered: a) the extent of radicalism in relation to public and political center (Imperial, Federal ...) b) the presence (absence), confessional component, etc.

With Russian historians and political scientists linked classification of political parties with the state of public consciousness. They use the categorical chain "value - philosophy - ideology - the doctrine. In this world view is characterized as a general picture of the world, and a hierarchy of preferences based on varying values, ideology - as a description of the desired state of society and the main directions of movement to it, the doctrine - as the action and tactics to achieve the goals set by ideology.

Every effort shall be emphasized that in their understanding of the "Party - consciously organized and socially active representative of a particular type of mass consciousness" [6, p.17]. In an attempt to give an absolute historical typology of political parties (especially modern Russia) St. Petersburg, scientists are taking as a basis for ideological values (national, liberal, socialist) and allocate the appropriate group of parties [6, sch.19-23]. We believe that such an approach, on the one hand, quite convincingly reasoned arguments, but on the other hand, needs to historical specificity, and further theoretical analysis
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