THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STATE AND SOCIETY

Ferat POLISI[1], Robert DAUTI[2]

[1]*Department of Political science, Faculty of Law, University of Tetova*
[2] PhD. Candidate, Faculty of Law
*[*]*Corresponding author e-mail: ferat.polisi@unite.edu.mk*

Abstract

Relations between state and society were supposed to be tackled in theoretical, empirical, and historical context in the political sociology throughout the 20th century. Nothing was more important and sociological relevant than the nation-state. By evaluating and assessing the idea of public sphere and the idea of debate on 'civil society', it resulted with many challenges and impacted the political sociology.

Keywords: state, society, political sociology

1. The relationship between state and society

Relations between state and society were supposed to be tackled in theoretical, empirical, and historical context in the political sociology throughout the 20th century. Nothing was more important and sociological relevant than the nation-state. By evaluating and assessing the idea of public sphere and the idea of debate on 'civil society', it resulted with many challenges and impacted the political sociology.

The nation-state (typical form of community politics in modern times), until now it was understood as an empirical reference to the political sociology and as an interchangeable term with 'society'. This was considered as an abstract and generic term in practice. In the light of the tradition of political sociology research, the nation-state had important meanings, and it was the catalyst for all the themes involved. In fact, this allowed specific topics of political sociology to gain insight even as part of broader process.

The famous scholar Reinhard Bendix (1977, 1964), investigated the constitution of the nation-state in comparative aspects linked it with the issue of citizenship. This issue is among the most essential and crucial in political sociology and it was also addressed by a very controversial and influential author named TH. Marshall.

Dealing specifically with the British issue and not with a general theory, he understood that the development of citizenship was an evolutionary, historical and logical sequence and also a civil, political and social process. Bendix's view of citizenship was heavily influenced by Weber's thesis that societies combine three basic principles of social coordination - authority, solidarity, and market, which are historical options that that lead to consequences that tend to condition subsequent alternatives in each society. Thus, he opposes any differentiation from the simplest to the most complex, supporting the idea that social changes happen in an as well as interrelated and are widely or generally applicable.

Comparisons between the problems of legitimizing authority, articulating interests, and organizing solidarity in different societies allow Bendix[1] to interpret national construction as a process in which bureaucratization of public authority and the recognition of legal and fundamental rights for members of the political community are linked. In other words, authority and solidarity are variable but recurring principles of social coordination in relation to the legitimacy involved in the exercise of public authority and its complex relation to social structure. Thus, since the construction of the nation-state does not follow a single and systematic a priori model, there is more than one path to citizenship. In addition to establishing the relationship between nation state and statehood, Bendix's work contributes, from a broader theoretical point of view, to a nuanced definition of modernity and society. Rejecting both the notions of 'prerequisites' and 'typical-ideal' sequences for modernity, Bendix rejects belief in the universality of evolutionary stages, proposing instead the moment of past events and the diversity of society, structures leading to paths different development; the dichotomous view of tradition and modernity, instead proposing the meaning that each society builds elements of both; and the conception that change processes are intrinsic to each society, proposing instead to combine intrinsic constituents with responses to extrinsic stimuli, always including state intervention as important characteristic of these processes.

Charles Tilly[2], on the other hand, was concerned with the nation-state building on collective action, which also has direct consequences for the meaning of citizenship. Although he considers state-building as a process that is potentially independent of other social forces, Tilly analyzes it in relation to the historically changing dynamics of collective action, attempting to consider the myriad mobilizations and negotiations on the part of the common people to attack a greedy and centralized state. The available repertoire of collective action (as the author calls these mobilizations and negotiations) varies widely as the processes of state building; capitalist expansion, urbanization, and coercion (especially war) go forward. Thus, the nation state meant a major transformation in the way people acted together in pursuit of their interests: since there was a greater dependence on decisions made at the national (rather than the local) level, most notably the relevant levels of political power for the interests of the ordinary citizen shifted significantly, seeking new tools and new goals for collective action. In this respect, the extension of citizenship rights should be considered as possible outcomes of concrete conflicts between social groups.

In addition to proposing a model for understanding collective action, Tilly aims to overcome one of the deepest antinomies of social theory, the creativity of individuals in their mobilizations; and, in turn, the structural constraints that limit the possibilities - or, in his words, the repertoire - of collective action.

One of the major challenges of contemporary political sociology concerns the fate of the nation-state as a typical form of political community in modernity. We live in a context marked by the dramatic pulverization of not only 'traditional' security, but also of the values, practices and institutions associated with the political constellation of modern society, which appear to be "endangered" by the restructuring of social relations and processes that come from globalization.

In contemporary sociology, there have been countless debates on the issue of the empirical discipline. With the intensification of global processes at all levels, the idea that the favored field of study in sociology was 'closed societies', that is, self-controlled and territorialized, has been subject to much criticism. Thus, one of the consequences of the process of globalization has to do with the perception that the nation-state is not a universal experience or a 'natural'

[1] Bendix R (1962) Max Weber: An Intellectual Portrait Garden City, NY: Doubleday/Anchor Books
[2] Tilly C (1978) Contentious repertoires in Great Britain, 1758–1834. Social Science History 17.

result of social dynamics (Wagner, 1994)[3], but rather a very specific and conditional form of authority and solidarity in about.

Thus, Ulrich Beck (1992, 1996, 1999)[4], for example, claims that global processes produce a rift in modernity whose driving force (individualization) has profound consequences for the collective, identities such as the dissolution of patterns, codes, and rules laid down by a national society.

The second 'modernity' or 'modern reflexive modernity' that we claim to live in has fundamental implications for sociology, as the concepts are related to state territory. Therefore, the need to open up the idea of the nation-state "contributed to escape the" zombie categories "(categories based on outdated historical assumptions) and sociology, providing it with new conceptual, empirical and organizational foundations as a science. And one of the main consequences of this process is the fact that the political constellation of the national society of the first modernism is becoming "non-political", while what was once "non-political" in the field of the country is now becoming political.

In other words, politics is not exclusively or principally found in institutions such as parliaments, parties and unions, but is at the center of private life. Thus, politics in nation-state structures is no longer the starting point for a new territory of political, geopolitical or global organization.

Another perspective defends the thesis of the 'secession' of state and nation, claiming that the state faces a paradox in the direction of its universalization: it becomes a major factor in the process of globalization, while its cultural unity (nation) is being undermined by two supranational and primary forms of solidarity or feelings of belonging that no longer coincide with national boundaries. What remains is a nation state without a nation. In this case, it is not about the disappearance of the nation state - the latter is even gaining space as a rational collective actor and a global interest group, but in such a way that it is detached from the national identity, which is now is challenged by other claims on identity. It is crucial to discover that the central functions exercised state and nation now are transcended beyond the borders. Briefly, we are analyzing the separation of the nation from the nation state. (Eder, 2003; Eder and Giesen, 2001)[5].

Other thinkers believe that, globalization can be tackled and can be seen in many perspectives but requires social solidarity and a public authority. The world is associated with globalization and still seems confused because it faces many challenges regarding the political identity derived from the nation state, or its political innovations such as participatory democracy and the idea of citizenship. Another essential fact is that the nation-state, despite the successful efforts in achieving the transnational integration is still the benchmark for exercising sovereignty and enforcing citizens' rights.

The media gives different perspectives and emphasizes the role the culture plays, how is articulated between the state and the nation. Nationalism and political culture as essential dimensions have given new impetus to research on these topics. Recognizing the contingency of the relationship between the nation-state and the society during the process of globalization was forcing political sociology to rethink the notion of nationalism.

Different perspectives given by (Delanty and Kumar, 2006)[6]; have emphasized the importance of nation and nationalism as social phenomena, the first one as a subjective community and the second one as the social force that informs theoretically and practically the ways of both social

[3]Wagner P (1994) Sociology of Modernity: Liberty and Discipline. London and New York: Routledge.
[4] Beck U (1996) The Reinvention of Politics: Rethinking Modernity in the Global Social Order. Cambridge: Polity Press.
[5]Eder K and Giesen B (eds) (2001) European Citizenship: National Legacies and Postnational Projects. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
[6]Delanty G and Kumar K (eds) (2006) The Sage Handbook of Nations and Nationalism. London: Sage.

movements and the political agendas of the states. These perspectives claim the necessity of considering the flexible and persistent quality of the nation's idea, which extends deeply into the imagined and true past, as well as its adaptive capacity for ever-changing realities (Smith, 2010; Young et al, 2007)[7].

In studies of political culture, the relationship between processes of socialization and political behavior also becomes central, based on the assertion that actors' responses to objective social situations are mediated through subjective orientations. The idea that political culture refers to the set of attitudes, beliefs and feelings that give order and meaning to a particular political process has shown the rules and assumptions on which its actors' behavior is based.

The concept of political culture is strongly associated with a concern for the conditions of the development of democratic political systems. In countries that have experienced authoritarian regimes, studies of political culture have led to analyzes of the presence and spread of democratic values in society. In the specific case of Latin America's transition to democracy, for example, many scholars have focused on two transitional political-institutional processes and on changing (or not) their attitudes about democracy.

They sought to investigate the presence of values and to bring them into line with the civilians and societal foundations of this system, in terms of the civic cultural traditions attributed to them: political, social and civic tolerance, confidence in the efficiency of political participation and adequate recognition. Citizenship and political rights (see Diamond, 1994)[8].

A study by Putnam created on 1993 about the changes in the performance of local and public institutions in Italy has give an important theory and presented an analysis of the conditions affecting the performance of larger or smaller democratic public institutions and efficiency in relation to the public interest.

The tensions generated by the nation state in the dynamics of social life are central to the field of empirical and theoretical questions that have been reformulated by various traditions of contemporary political sociology. Contemporary criticism focuses on the normative and teleological aspects of theories that presume that nation-state construction would be a universal model defined by certain European experiences which are, in fact, historically very diverse (Balakrishnan, 1996; Bhabha, 1990; Tilly, 1996)[9]; or that state-building can actually produce civil ties, thereby minimizing the persistence of more primary forms of solidarity in modern society such as kinship.

This theoretical assessment of the tensions that the nation-state brings to the dynamics of social life is important not only for a review of the European situation but also for research into other empirical realities and the (false) problem of their absence, such as adaptation with another hegemonic model of national formation.

Another favorite topic of political sociology is the examination of the social movements which directly articulates the theoretical issue of social change with the state and society concerning. At least three main theoretical lines explaining social movements that had to be adapted to meet contemporary challenges, such as collective mobilization reaching global scale, including violence and inclination, that focus on identity issues are identified. The first theoretical line is expressed in the so-called resource mobilization theory (McCarthy and Zald, 1977)[10], which assesses rationality over collective explanations, mobilizations in terms of collective emotions.

---

[7] Young M, Zuelow E and Sturm A (2007) Nationalism in a Global Era: The Persistence of Nations. New York: Routledge.
[8] Diamond L (1994) Political Culture and Democracy in Developing Countries. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
[9]Bhabha HK (ed.) (1990) Nation and Narration. London: Routledge.
[10]McCarthy JD and Zald MN (1977) Resource mobilization and social movements: A partial theory. American Journal of Sociology 82(6).

There are two main theoretical lines - the theory of the associated political process and the new society, the theory of movements, stemming from Marxist weakness for the possibilities of revolution. While the former is devoted to a theory of political mobilization while the other one is based on an approach to cultural change, both stand against the determinism and economic perspectives on collective action or the idea of a universal historical subject, preferring macro-history, and which analytically combines politics and culture in explaining social movements.

With reference to the perspective of the political process, Sidney Tarrow (1998)[11] argues that there are no changes in the "structure of political opportunity", that is, in the formal and informal dimensions of the political environment. This can be seen through the political and administrative institutions, which in response to the claims of civil society, caused by some crises in the ruling political coalition; from changes in political interaction between state and society, particularly reduced suppression of protest; and by the presence of potential allies.Mobilization is based on a conflict between different parts, one occupying the state and the other one speaking on behalf of society. Since such positions are variable, so far as actors move from one to the other, the analysis must overcome the conventional barriers which define 'state' and 'society' as two coherent and separate entities. Rather than defining the equation for social movements against the state, this perspective opposes power holders (members of politics) who have control and access to government, the governance of a population (which includes the means of oppression), and 'challengers' trying to gain influence over government and gain access to policy-controlled resources (Tilly, 1993).

For his part, though not considered a homogeneous perspective, endowed with a lasting unity, one can distinguish a common postulate among the main theorists of so-called new social movements. If, on one hand, they each preserve the macro-historical approach and the association between social change and forms of conflict, on the other hand, each also consists in elaborating an effective cultural interpretation of social movements. Despite the fact that many sciences have their own theory of modernity, they more or less share the same central argument that, throughout the 20th century, a macro-structural change would modify the nature of capitalism; whose center would not it was industrial production and labor. Labor conflicts would have been mitigated, either through democratic institutions, such as expanding rights of organization, or capitalist institutions such as wage increases, and would have become extremely cultural, exercised through the control of information by a technocrat.

Furthermore, the change would have blurred distinctions between the public and the private, provoking a shift in subjectivity and originating from a new area of conflict, moving claims of redistribution, from the world of work, calling for democratizing its structures and asserting new identities and values and there will be movements as feminism, pacifism, environmental and student movements.

The improvement of global processes and the crisis associated with nation-states also presents an inspiring challenge for the political sociology of social movements. It is necessary to cope with the shift in the scale of activities, from the national/ local level to the transnational / global level, as well as its professionalization, in order to notice the fact that in various Western countries bureaucratic social movements have become parties, requiring the administration of public and state services.

Moreover, the contemporary protests include activists and themes which are often directed towards multilateral institutions or transnational public opinion. It is of a great importance the weakness of the link between new social movements and post materialist agendas triggered by the latest ethnic, religious, communist and conservative wave of mobilizations.

[11]Tarrow S (1998) Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

It should be noted that the analysis of the movements of the new society were gradually transformed into a theory of civil society. Critics along with the empirical evidence of bureaucratic activism deepened the crisis of the distinction between new and old social movements. The theoretical trend has ceased to link innovation with an actor, and has begun to link it to a locus which is the civil society. To a large extent it is negatively defined - civil society is neither state nor market nor would private, but civil society demand autonomy referring not only to political-institutional powers, or to material benefits, or self-interest.

Rediscovering the concept of civil society turns it into a privileged place for the specific reflection of the state / society relationship from the perspective of the effects presented at both poles, either from the autonomous dynamics of private interests developed at the center of society itself, or by the possibility of its harmonious or conflicting union.

Throughout the revival of the debate over this concept over the past few decades, new ideas have been refined and incorporated into the contemporary lexicon. In response to market dominance, the image of civil society has strengthened as an expression of community solidarity or a kind of economic counterattack, seen as a place for the realization of the individual's political potential.

By doing so, civil society was depoliticized, and began to be considered either as a refuge for the individual and voluntary associations against the state, or as an environment capable of rebuilding the citizen from market-shattered traditions.

On the other hand, as a representation of participatory democracy, credibility has added to the image of civil society as a multitude of interests which, by means of enhancing merit-based social action, would lead to a general atoning will, to a program that seeks to represent the values and interests of social autonomy vis-à-vis both the modern state and the capitalist economy, without embarking on a new traditionalism (Cohen and Arato, 1992: 54)[12].

Similar challenges are significant in the other field, in which state / society relations are examined in political sociology: the "public sphere" and "civil society" theories. Such is the case with Latin America, for example, whose societies are historically structured around the state or market, and about which civil society is at the same time a theoretical marker that would help perceive the boundaries of fashionable political proposals and a third arena to be strengthened.

On the other hand, if we agree with the argument about the different links between authority, solidarity and interests in each society and their consequences for its historical course, then the legacy of traditional concepts of citizenship will not be without consequences for strengthening "civil society", or "public sphere", in these societies. This is evidenced by the comparative analysis of the contexts marked by economic scarcity and the diminution of the legitimacy and effective capacity of the state, such as the cases of Latin America and Eastern Europe. Thus, the more organic and holistic the traditional conceptions of collective identities, the more likely it is nowadays to find feelings of alienation, and the more reason people have to shelter in their private networks of relationships, making the narrower and more non-discriminatory public sphere and further reduced democratic participation (Reis, 1996b: 91-110)[13].

The reappearance of the idea of "civil society", and the greater value attributed to the debates about the "public sphere" that go along with it, may represent relevant theoretical alternatives to the more historical orientations of political sociology that have largely focused on the problem of the nation-state. Not coincidentally, there are attempts to provide greater historical support and latitude for these alternatives (Cohen and Arato, 1992), although their Eurocentrism is still criticized (Hann and Dunn, 1996).

In any case, it is true that these alternatives may seem 'minimalist' from the point of view of the problem of nation-state-related collective identity, insofar as they suggest that people

[12]Cohen J and Arato A (1992) Civil Society and Political Theory. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
[13]Reis EP (1996) Political sociology in Brazil: Making sense of history. Current Sociology 44(3): 81–107.

should essentially accept the rules of procedure of open and fair debate, equal among the individuals who share the same interests.

It is important to note that this reassessment of the ideas of "civil society" and "public sphere" led to essential redefinitions of the relationship between the state and society from that perspective, that in some cases can lead to the return of disjunctive views of the state and society and therefore, in extreme cases, to the compromise of the specificity of political sociology as a research tradition.

The political system is one of the systems of global society which, besides the political aspects also includes the economic, cultural, demographic and social structure. It means that it is a kind of social system (there are also non-social systems such as biological system, ecological system, personality system, etc.) which possesses specific characteristics that separate it from other social systems. Generally speaking, any state of affairs defined between the holders of power and society in the form of permanent institutions can be called a political system[14].

Essentially, the political system encompasses a set of political relationships and activities, political institutions and organizations, and political culture. Based on a more concrete definition, we can say that on one hand, there is the system of institutionalized holders of political power in a social community, the way they are constituted, the organization and action, and on the other, the totality of these institutions and relationships the way in which the organized link between the political power holders and the social forces on whose behalf they lead is put.

It is precisely the relationship between leaders and the leaders of the political system that is one of the most sensitive areas of scientific research. History shows that all forms of leadership and all political systems are based on a belief system (imaginings and prejudices) that justifies power and the existing way of governing. Thus, medieval rulers were called upon the God, and the bourgeoisie proclaiming "freedom, equality and brotherhood" were called upon the people. The purpose of the ideological mystification is quite clear: the power to gain the necessary legitimacy. What has been said so far is one of the reasons why there is no general consensus among political scientists and sociologists on the subject of research. Authors whose views align with the traditional, and who apply the institutional approach in political analysis, place the state at the center of their interests. This approach has its roots in the 21st century in which the role of the state is manifested in an extreme manner, and there are no visible and legalizing opportunities for the influence of society on the holders of public power. A typical example is Austro-Hungarian and Germany, countries where state science was formally taught, and the notion of a political system based on the notion of state.

Psychologists Rodi, Anderson and Kristol in their book Introduction to Political Science propose that political science needs to be defined as "science of the state", or "branch of social science concerned with the theory, organization and operation of the state". This concept cannot be accounted as inclusive, because it has only one part of the political system as the object of research. In reaction to the formalization and static of the institutional approach to political analysis, at the beginning of the 20th the so-called group theory is affirmed, a different view on that matter which argues that the state counts as one of the many organizations through which society resolves conflict situations.

The basic unit of analysis of this theory is the human group which, by joining multiple organizations, exerts influence on the directions of social development. As the founder of this theory, Arthur Bentley, puts it like this: "society itself is nothing but the complex of the groups that comprise it", and an explanation of the whole social system as well as the political system

---

[14]John Stuart Mill, ;On Liberty:, i The tilitarians, Garden Citz, NY, Dolphin Books, 1961, s. 435.

must be sought in the "mosaic of groups ". Continuing the trend affirmed by group theory, a large number of political scientists place the individual at the center of their analysis.

2. Conclusion

Politics is defined as an aspect of human behavior in a given environment. Power is the object of the political science. The political scientists focus their interests on the struggle for power relations. The political system is defined as a system of authoritative views of values. In a given society there are certain values regarding the notions and the relation with (power, authority, prosperity, wealth), and the mechanism by which those values are distributed is the political system.

Political science during the last two centuries has a particular interest on political systems, during the 19th century dealt mainly with the English society and the two facets of civil and political systems. A dominant work in this period it is given by Voltarie such as the English Constitution. This work is taken as an example of a formalist approach to the study of politics and the political system, for the descriptive of the institutions of the political system of England is the center of his interest. {It is very interesting to note that it is precisely in the work of Bexhi that the first attempts were made to show that the constitution in the books is not the same as the constitution in practice. To put this thought in a different way focusing on the constitutional formation on the division and balance of power between the kings, the lords and the citizen he points out the necessity of analyzing the "living reality". According to him, the living reality is that the political structure is made up of two main parts - the dignified or theoretical part. The former consists of the monarchy and the aristocracy, and the second consists of the cabinet that emerges from the ordinary room, which in turn draws strength (moral and material) from the middle classes, according to him in this sense lies the authority and power of the political system.

James Bryce, is without a doubt a very famous scholar who appeared and was dominant with his thoughts during the late 19th century and early 20th century. Despite occasional calls for the need to build a theoretical framework for the study of politics and the political system, Bryce attempts to give a theory an empirical orientation. According to him political science, is not deductive science, as it is not a branch of speculative philosophy. Criticizing those who treat this science as a collection of abstractions, Bryce tries to put efforts in creating a mental map regarding the definition of some important concepts such as: sovereignty, the state, the genesis of political rights, the basics of political duties, following metaphysical methods and keeping as far away from the concrete as possible. Bryce is a product of old century's positivism view, which as a methodological movement that attempted to collect positive information as the tool for scientific creation. Focusing his studies on this methodology, Bryce in the book "The American Commonwealth" published in 1893, writes that his purpose is to photograph American institutions and people as they are.

The same methodological approach is found in his work called "Contemporary Democracies" which was published in 1921. The publication of Arthur Bentley's work, "The Process of Power" marks the beginning of a radical departure from the formalist approach to the study of politics and the political system in another perspective. The political thought of 20th century gave a detail study of the organization of political systems, especially the English and Anglo-Saxon model, is without a doubt indisputable. However, there are weaknesses that have surfaced when applying this method. In other words, the questions posed politically are not something that can be found in the constitutions. The match between norm and reality is a rapport that thinkers tried to elaborate since the beginning of the 20th century, they tried to look through this rapport and research what really stands behind those constitutional principles such as: people's leadership, democracy, sharing power, freedom and political reality, in this

direction Bentley writes that there are three layers: the formal structure, the action of individuals organized into the power structure, and the activity of individuals whom political scientists pay little attention to.

The term political party is widely used both in scientific literature and in everyday life. It is logical if we start from the fact that political parties nowadays are the main providers and organizers of political life in almost every country in the world. It is therefore not accidental that political party researchers are extremely serious about explaining the origin of the notion of "political party", defining it as substantially as possible, as well as providing accurate data on its form and manner. However, it does appear that there are slight differences in the scientific and practical use of this notion. The term "party" is derived from the Latin word "pars-partis" which means part separated from any whole. Radozh Smiljkovic concludes that the notion of "party" has double meaning.

According to him, parties must be understood as part of a whole, and second they are considered as part that cannot be divided they within the organizational terms. Neumann (S. Neuman)[15] points out that the term "party" means identification with a group, cooperation and partnership. Finally, the term party itself means the inclusion of particular organizations in a broader view. Vladimir Goati, expressing reservations about Nojman's position, holds that the author in question associates the term party with the English word (co-operation), however the same term may be associated with the word "partaking" which also means division.[16]

Radomir Lukic believes that the term political party "does not provoke great terminological disagreement ..." This is because most terminologists and scholars agree that in ordinary life and scientific speech the political parties are almost the same.

It is scientifically inconsistent from etymological point of view to come into conclusions about political parties; however, it is wrong to think that the notion of party it's a strict notion, indeed it has evolved throughout history.

It is noteworthy that some well-known authors indirectly refer to the class element, but not as something decisive. Max Weber, for example, emphasizes the possibility of parties fighting for class interests while A. Leserman stands firmly in the positions of protecting the class dimension in political parties, which according to him: "the modern party is an informal, intermediate, indirect representative of social groups and classes[17]."

References

[1]. Bendix R (1962) Max Weber: An Intellectual Portrait. Garden City, NY: *Doubleday/Anchor Books*

[2]. Tilly C (1978) Contentious repertoires in Great Britain, 1758–1834.*Social Science History* 17.

[3]. Wagner P (1994) Sociology of Modernity: Liberty and Discipline. London and New York: Routledge.

[4]. Beck U (1996) The Reinvention of Politics: Rethinking Modernity in the Global Social Order. *Cambridge: Polity Press.*

[5]. Eder K and Giesen B (eds) (2001) European Citizenship: National Legacies and Postnational Projects. Oxford: *Oxford University Press.*

[6]. Delanty G and Kumar K (eds) (2006) The Sage Handbook of Nations and Nationalism. London: Sage.

[7]. Young M, Zuelow E and Sturm A (2007) Nationalism in a Global Era: The Persistence of Nations. *New York: Routledge.*

[8]. Diamond L (1994) Political Culture and Democracy in Developing Countries. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

[9]. Cohen J and Arato A (1992) Civil Society and Political Theory. *Cambridge*, MA: MIT Press.

[10]. Reis EP (1996) Political sociology in Brazil: Making sense of history. Current Sociology 44(3): 81–107.

[11]. John Stuart Mill, ;On Liberty:, i The tilitarians, Garden Citz, NY*, Dolphin Books*, 1961, s. 435.

[12]. Radosh Smiljkoviq; "*Stranke i politika*"; *Beograd*; 1976; page 11.

[13]. Vladimir Goati: "*Savremene politicke partie*"; *Beograd*; 1984; page 22.

[14]. Radomir Lukiq: "*Politicke stranke*": Beograd; 1981; page19.

[15] Radosh Smiljkoviq; *Stranke i politika*; Beograd; 1976; page 11

[16] Vladimir Goati: *Savremene politicke partie*; Beograd; 1984; page 22

[17] Radosh Smilikovio: *Stranke i politicke*: Beograd 1976; page 20