Sizing up an appropriate electoral system

By Ole Tomquist

 estableished parties and certain indices. It might be added, however, that such a system is also likely to generate fervor conflicts between parties mobilized on the basis of ethnic and religious loyalties. Both to win the first seat after the election, groups may end up fighting each other rather than trying to cooperate. Furthermore, since the winner takes all and only large parties will benefit from the proportional distribution of additional seats, this system is likely to result in the exclusion of many of the weak groups that were excluded under the country's authoritarian system.

Even more important, the new vote of the game to be decided upon are likely to be supportive and of great importance for a long period of time. Most powerful groups will adjust their enmities to the new institutions and therefore the change will be difficult.

Hence, it may also be crucial to consider the effects of different electoral systems on the possibility of not only undermining the restraints of authoritarianism but also consolidating further developing democracy. For the future, then, I would argue, experiences from other relevant countries suggests that a proportional system in medium-large constituencies may be preferable, especially if combined with decentralization, local elections and democratization of parties. There are two major reasons for this. First, one-member constituencies are likely to promote personality-oriented politics and limit the role of economic and social issues. Second, as even more, such a system within a district system would also be extremely difficult for non-concerned groups in small societies to enter politics by gradually organizing new mass movements and democratic parties based on societal interests and ideas — thus complementing the less economic weaknesses and lack of base. They usually have little space to themselves to extra-parliamentary struggles, lobbying and being in the test seat position.

For instance, the above were the clear and frightening experiences of democracy in cases such as the Philippines after 1960. In conclusion, while no electoral system is ideal, it may be important to consider the effects beyond the undermining of authoritarianism — on the consolidation and development of democracy.

The writer is professor of politics and development, at the University of Oslo, Norway.

ASEAN's nonintervention policy put to the test

By Beth Duff-Brown

Indonesian President Soeharto took the unprecedented step of publicly reprimanding Malathur for the sinking and burning of his ship, the President's own ship, in the Gulf of Thailand in July 1986.

Asean leaders met in Phnom Penh in January 1986 to discuss the crisis in Cambodia. At the meeting, the leaders agreed to support the Cambodian government and to help the Cambodian people to build a new society.

Indonesia has been a member of Asean since its inception in 1967. Indonesia is a large country with a population of over 200 million people. It is located in Southeast Asia, between Thailand and the Philippines.

Asean's nonintervention policy was put to the test when Cambodia sought assistance from Asean countries.

President Soeharto said that Indonesia would not intervene in Cambodia's affairs.

President Soeharto also said that Indonesia would support the Cambodian government and help the Cambodian people to build a new society.

Indonesia's stance was viewed as a significant departure from its previous policy of nonintervention.
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