

Information for citation:

Khudoley D. M. Klassifikatsiya izbiratel'nykh sistem [Classification of Electoral Systems]. *Vestnik Permskogo universiteta. Juridicheskie nauki* – Perm University Herald. Juridical Sciences. 2016. Issue 33. Pp. 258–267. (In Russ.). DOI: 10.17072/1995-4190-2016-33-258-267.

UDC 342.8

DOI: 10.17072/1995-4190-2016-33-258-267

CLASSIFICATION OF ELECTORAL SYSTEMS**D. M. Khudoley**

Perm State University

15, Bukireva st., Perm, 614990, Russia

ORCID: 0000-0001-5870-1537

ResearcherID: E-3184-2016

e-mail: dmitry-hudoley@yandex.ru

Introduction: the article analyzes classification of electoral systems. **Purpose:** to determine essential and minor features of various electoral systems. **Methods:** general scientific methods (dialectics, analysis and synthesis, abstraction and concretization) and specific scientific methods (formal legal, comparative law, technical legal) are used in the article, special attention being paid to the comparative law and system research methods. **Results:** the traditional approach to distinguishing between majority and proportional systems has lost its importance. As a result of the development of science and search for the fairest technique, many systems concurrently belong to both kinds. The modern world witnesses the emergence of a lot of hybrid systems possessing features of both majority and proportional systems. They include proportional systems with open lists and semi-proportional systems. Moreover, purely proportional systems are seldom applied. In many countries they are in fact disproportional because of various rules distorting representation of political parties (e.g. a threshold). Some majority systems prove to be minority ones. **Conclusions:** all electoral systems are subdivided into four groups. These are electoral systems in one-mandate territories, in multi-mandate territories, elections according to party lists and combined ones. The main criterion for their differentiation is a subject structure of elections. It is obvious that all electoral systems are subdivided depending on the person who fights for mandates: candidates individually; lists of candidates who are, as a rule, proposed by parties; candidates and de facto lists of candidates simultaneously; some techniques are used concurrently. Other criteria (mathematical criterion of defining a winner, maintenance of a voice) allow us to subdivide given systems into kinds, being evidence of their minor character.

Keywords: suffrage; electoral system; classification of electoral systems; kinds of electoral systems; majority systems; proportional systems; semi-proportional systems; mixed systems

Information in Russian**КЛАССИФИКАЦИЯ ИЗБИРАТЕЛЬНЫХ СИСТЕМ****Д. М. Худолей**

Кандидат юридических наук, доцент кафедры конституционного и финансового права

Пермский государственный национальный исследовательский университет

614990, Россия, г. Пермь, ул. Букирева, 15

ORCID: 0000-0001-5870-1537

ResearcherID: E-3184-2016

e-mail: dmitry-hudoley@yandex.ru

Введение: в статье анализируется классификация избирательных систем. **Цель:** определить существенные и второстепенные признаки различных избирательных систем. **Методы:** в статье использованы общенаучные (диалектика, анализ и синтез, абстрагирование и конкретизация) и частнонаучные методы исследования (формально-юридический, сравнительно-правовой, технико-юридический). В ходе научного поиска особое внимание уделялось сравнительному, системному методам исследования. **Результаты:** традиционный подход к делению на мажоритарные и пропорциональные системы утратил свое значение. Развитие научной мысли и поиски наиболее справедливой методики привели к тому, что многие системы являются такими одновременно. В современном мире появилась масса гибридных систем, имеющих признаки мажоритарных и пропорциональных систем. Такими являются пропорциональные системы с открытыми списками и полупропорциональные системы. Более того, в чистом виде пропорциональные системы редко применяются. Во многих странах они являются по сути диспропорциональными из-за всевозможных правил, искажающих представительство политических партий (заградительный барьер, например). Отдельные мажоритарные системы вообще являются миноритарными. **Выводы:** все избирательные системы подразделяются на четыре группы: системы выборов по одномандатным округам, по многомандатным округам, по партийным спискам, а также комбинированные. Главный критерий их разграничения – это субъектный состав выборов. Очевидно, что все избирательные системы подразделяются в зависимости от того, кто борется за мандаты: кандидаты персонально; кандидаты по спискам, которые, как правило, выдвинуты партиями; одновременно кандидаты персонально и де-факто кандидаты по спискам; используется несколько методик одновременно. Иные критерии (математический критерий определения победителя, содержание голоса) позволяют подразделить те или иные системы на подвиды, что говорит об их второстепенном характере.

Ключевые слова: избирательное право; избирательная система; классификация избирательных систем; разновидности избирательных систем; мажоритарные системы; пропорциональные системы; полупропорциональные системы; смешанные системы

Introduction

In modern domestic and foreign science of the suffrage there is no uniform classification of electoral systems. Most of domestic scientists allocate three versions: majority, proportional and mixed [8, p. 219]. Therefore, in domestic science authors at the heart of division use the mathematical principle of definition of the winner (winners) on elections as the main thing [3, p. 13]. Abroad there was other idea of criteria of differentiation of electoral systems. So, American scientists R. Taagepera, M. Shugart, K. Bawn allocate three factors: maintenance of a voice, order of summation of voices and order of definition of winners [9, p. 114–136; 11, p. 967]. Domestic scientists A.E. Lyubarev, A.V. Ivanchenko, A.V. Kynev add the fourth criterion: how the voter votes (for the candidate or per lot, i.e. for the party list votes) [5, page 11–16]. S. A. Belov, B. Grofman and A. Lijphart allocate also other components of an electoral system (a nomination

procedure, terms of pre-election campaign and so forth) . [1, p. 88–100; 12, p. 2–3]. In fact, in this case the category "electoral system" is identified with all suffrage and process. In general, it is possible to note that certain domestic and foreign authors refused traditional classification of electoral systems and allocate other numerous versions [5, p. 11–16; 17, p. 162–173]. Moreover, we will also not find the specified terms in the Russian federal electoral laws. Instead the legislator uses the categories "elections on one-mandatory districts", "elections on multimandatory districts", "elections by party lists". Let's make a hypothesis that division of systems on majority, proportional and mixed really became invalid. Let's carry out the analysis of electoral systems according to the classification established in the federal legislation and we will try to reveal the main and minor criteria differentiating these or those versions.

Election Systems on One–Mandatory Districts

On the elections held on this system candidates participate in individual quality. The candidate who received a majority of votes appears the winner. These techniques many authors are called as majority systems in one–mandatory districts.

A. Systems differ depending on the maintenance of a voice:

1. Categorical vote (in the majority of the countries).

2. Preferential vote. In this case the voter specifies the preferences in favor of several candidates, ranging in a certain order. There is a mass of kinds of such vote:

a) As a rule, number of preferences equally to number of candidates. However it can be limited to a certain number. So, on elections to the House of Representatives of Australia the voter specifies three most preferred candidates.

b) Other difference of preferential systems consists in an order of the solution of a question of election of the candidate if nobody gathered necessary absolute majority of voices. The first option – summation of the preferences given for each candidate. So, according to Bucklin's method, in this case the second preferences, then the third etc. join the first preferences. Bucklin's method only once was used on primary elections in Oklahoma in 1925 and p was recognized unconstitutional [20, p. 204].

The second option – an exception of the candidate (candidates) with the smallest poll, and transfer of these voices to other candidates according to preferences (IRV or AV system). Such exceptions of candidates will proceed before election of some candidate (it is applied in Australia).

The third option – an exception of the candidate (candidates) with the smallest poll and cancellation of all preferences given for it (them). Nanson's method demanding a vote recount after the candidate's exception on this rule [15, p. 369–385]. Owing to this fact the second preference can become the first, and the third – the second. Such exceptions will be made before election of some candidate (it was used in the State of Michigan at the beginning of the twentieth century).

The fourth option – a combination of the above methods. So, on elections of the mayor of London the system of an additional vote is used. The voter

has the right to specify two candidates since at the bulletin there are two columns for the first and second voice respectively. If none of candidates did not gather a necessary poll, all candidates, except the first two are eliminated. In this case the first and second votes given for these candidates are summarized [4, p. 80].

3. A preferential vote with possibility of a categorical vote. In Australia on regional elections in some states the voter may not define preferences, and it is simple to vote for the certain candidate.

4. Approving vote. It historically first type of an electoral system. The voter possesses several voices (usually their number equally to number of the standing candidates). The voter can vote for all candidates, for several candidates or for anybody. Now it is applied when electing party leaders and so forth.

B. The considered systems differ depending on how the majority of votes necessary for election is defined:

1. From number of the registered voters (elections of deputies Supreme Councils of RSFSR for the law of 1988 were such);

2. From number of the voters who took part in vote (in the Russian Federation);

3. From number of the voted voters, whose ballots were recognized valid (presidential elections in Armenia) [6, p. 177].

C. Depending on what poll the candidate needs to receive for election, allocate the following kinds of system:

1. System of the relative majority. According to this technique, the winner for election it is necessary to receive at least one voice more, than any of his competitors (the principle of "first past the post", i.e. "the winner – the first, come to the finish" therefore such systems abroad briefly call FPTP is used). The FPTP system is applied at parliamentary elections in Great Britain, the USA. When some candidates gain absolutely equal number of votes, draw can be carried out (to Germany); the mandate can be transferred to the candidate as a seniority (in France); the mandate can be transferred to the candidate registered earlier (it is applied in the majority of the CIS countries).

2. System of absolute majority. On the elections held on this system, the candidate who will receive absolute majority of votes admits to the elite

(i.e. 50% plus one voice). Usually, it is used when electing presidents as categorial vote in many countries of the world. As a rule, systems of a preferential vote is also systems of absolute majority.

3. System of the qualified majority. On the elections held on this system, the candidate for election needs to receive a poll, which not less certain quota. Actually, it is modification of systems of relative or absolute majority. So, at an election of the president of Argentina the candidate has to receive not less than 45% of votes or not less than 40% provided that he was ahead of the second candidate not less, than by 10% (the qualified relative majority). In some cases the quota can be much more a half (the qualified absolute majority). So, the president of Sierra Leone is chosen in the first round by the majority in 55% of voices [17, p. 162–173].

D. Depending on, whether repeated vote is required, all majority systems are subdivided on one-round and two-round systems.

1. One-round systems are, as a rule, FPTP systems. However it is not excluded, as systems of absolute majority will be one-round. So, on elections of People's Deputies of RSFSR for election the candidate needed to receive more than a half of votes from number of the registered voters, otherwise repeated elections were appointed. Preferential systems also are one-round.

2. Two-round systems are, as a rule, systems of the absolute or qualified majority which are applied in many countries when electing presidents as categorial vote. The second round can sometimes be held and on the elections held on system of the relative majority when some candidates gather an equal poll (in Karelia on local elections).

In pure form three – and more round systems are not used on national elections. When electing party leaders in some countries of the world (for example, in Great Britain) multi-round systems with an elimination when the candidate with the smallest poll leaves after the first round are applied and the second ballot on the remained candidates is carried out. Such second ballot will be carried out again and again until the candidate is chosen by the absolute or qualified majority.

As a rule, in the second round there are two candidates who received a majority of votes in the

first round. However in some countries in the second round there can be also a bigger number of candidates. So, the candidates who collected not less than 12,5% of votes in the first round take part in France at parliamentary elections in the second round (i.e. as much as possible 8 candidates can take part). In Russia the situation when only one candidate if all other candidates refused to stand takes part in the second round of presidential elections is admissible.

In the certain countries in the second round the winner is defined by the relative majority, as, for example, in France at parliamentary elections. When carrying out the second round of presidential elections in the Russian Federation on the only candidate the winner has to collect 50% of votes, i.e. the qualified majority. However in many countries of the world when carrying out the second round the principle of absolute majority is used.

E. The specified systems are used for vote in the uniform district (for example, when electing presidents) or in several (as a rule, at parliamentary elections).

F. As a rule, the considered systems – systems with one voice, but happen and to a plural (multiple) vote. Systems with an approving vote and some preferential systems are such. A striking example is Borda's method (position vote). According to this technique, the first preference corresponds to the poll equal to number of the standing candidates. The second – is less than first on one voice, the third – on two voices etc. In pure form this technique was not applied. However in the past its modifications were used (Nanson's method, for example). Now the parliament of Nauru is elected on other its version (Dowdall's method). On these elections the first preference means 1 voice, the second – a half of a voice, the third – a third of a voice. All voices are counted, and the winner is defined relative by a majority vote [16, p. 355–372].

G. Additional provisions to which there has to correspond the elected candidate are in some cases entered. So, in France at presidential elections the candidate has to gather absolute majority of voices, but not less than 25% of total number of the registered voters. In this case we observe use of two majority criteria: absolute and qualified. Also we have to carry to similar systems

and in what the turnout of voters is considered. So, at presidential elections in Belarus the turnout of voters has to exceed 50% of total number of the registered voters, otherwise repeated elections are held. It is worth carrying to such versions also those systems considering a separation between candidates (Argentina), vote against all candidates (on local elections in the Republic of Karelia) providing quoting of places for representatives of ethnic minorities and so forth.

Election Systems According to Party Lists

On the elections held on these electoral systems lists of candidates (as a rule, they are nominated by parties), between which mandates are distributed participate. Usually such systems authors are called proportional.

A. At the first stage, systems differ according to the maintenance of a voice:

1. Categorical vote for the list of candidates of party (block) – is applied in the majority of the countries.

2. Categorical vote for the list of candidates of party and for all consolidated list at the same time. There is a speech about blocking of lists (it is applied in Italy) when parties as a part of one coalition put forward separate lists, but their voices are summarized among themselves. Blocking is possible and in the party consolidated list. So, in Argentina on regional elections the system of a double simultaneous voice is applied ("ley de lemas"). The voter votes for the regional list, but voices of all regional lists of one party are summarized among themselves [9, p. 114–136].

4. Categorical vote for the list of candidates of party (block) and additional preferable categorical vote for the candidate. In this case the voter, voting for the party, can specify the preferences in favor of one candidate (it is used in Sweden) [14, p. 481–496].

5. Categorical vote for the list of candidates of party (block) and additional preferable vote in various patterns for candidates of this party. In this case candidate can be applied approving (for example, in Slovakia), preferential (earlier in Kalmykia on regional elections position vote in lists was taken) or cumulative vote (i.e. the voter can give to the candidate at once some voices, it is used in Ecuador) [17, p. 162–173].

6. Categorical vote for the candidate and for the list of candidates of its party (block) at the same time. So, in Estonia the voter enters a name of the

candidate in the bulletin, thus voices of party candidates are summarized within the district, and then places are distributed between lists on D'Hondt's method [10, p. 104].

7. Vote for candidates in various patterns and for lists of candidates of their parties (blocks) at the same time. In this case the voter, possessing several voices, approvingly, preferential or cumulatively votes for several candidates, at the same time transferring voices to their parties (blocks). Also it takes place at a panachage (for example, in Switzerland).

B. Depending on a technique of definition of a selective quota of system are subdivided on in what:

1. Hare's quota is taken up, it is determined by a formula $q=x/y$, i.e. division of total number of votes into number of places (Russian Federation), and its various modifications (Philippines);

2. Hagenbach–Bichoff's quota ($q=x / (y+1)$, Slovakia) is taken up;

3. Droop's quota is taken up ($q = (x / (y+1)) + 1$, the Republic of South Africa);

4. Imperiali's quota ($(q=x / (y+2))$, Ecuador) is taken up;

5. The method of dividers is used (greatest average). Voices of parties share on a number of the increasing dividers; then all private are ranged in decreasing order; that private, whose serial number is equal to number of mandates, and is a quota. Depending on dividers allocate the following modifications – D'Hondt's method (dividers 1–2–3 etc., it is applied in Argentina), Imperiali's method (dividers 2–3–4 etc., will be applied in many territorial subjects of the Russian Federation on regional elections), the Danish method (dividers 1–4–7 etc., earlier it was applied in Denmark), Sainte–Laguè's method (dividers 1–3–5 etc., is at the moment applied in Denmark) modified by Sainte–Laguè (dividers 1,4–3–5 etc., will be applied in Norway) [13, p. 171–179].

C. Systems can be subdivided depending on, whether the uniform quota for distribution of mandates is taken up. As a rule, if elections are held in several districts, in each district the quota (Algeria) is defined that quite often results in disproportionality of results of elections. A number of techniques of a uniform quota is developed for elimination of this shortcoming (for example, the biproportional system is applied in the certain cantons of Switzerland).

D. Depending on features of replacement of the unallotted remains it is possible

to allocate in what the method of the greatest fractional remains is applied (it is used in the majority of the countries), greatest average and so forth.

E. As a rule, elections are held in one round. However in Italy carrying out the second round between two most successful parties is allowed. Elections can be held in the uniform district (elections in the Russian Federation), in several districts (elections to the Senate of Italy).

F. Systems differ depending on the established "protecting barrier". Barriers can be established both at the nation-wide level (Germany), and on regional (elections to the Senate of Italy). Moreover, two barriers at the same time can be established (nationwide and regional) and the party has to overcome at least one of them (Sweden) or both at the same time (Kazakhstan). The barrier usually is established in the form of percent of votes. In rare instances it can be defined by a poll, equal to one mandate (i.e. one quota, as in Brazil). The barrier can be "floating", i.e. it can decrease or not be applied in certain cases. So, in Germany the party which received not less than 3 places on one-mandatory districts is anyway allowed to distribution of mandates according to party lists even if she collected less than 5% of votes. Barriers can differ depending on participants of elections. Establishment of barriers to parties (5% at parliamentary elections in the Russian Federation), barriers to parties and the coalitions (5 and 7% respectively at parliamentary elections in Armenia), barriers to parties, the coalitions and parties in the coalition (8%, 20% and 3% respectively on elections to the Senate of Italy), barriers to parties, the coalitions and independent candidates (6%, 9% and 3% respectively at parliamentary elections in Moldova) [17, p. 88; 19, p. 36–37].

G. Depending on distribution of places of candidates in the list it is allocated:

1. The closed (tough) lists – places are distributed in the order specified in the list. They are applied in the majority of the countries;

2. Open (flexible) lists – the voter himself defines an order of candidates in the list by means of vote. Earlier in Chile the binomial system was applied. In the two-mandatory district the voter voted for the candidate entering the party list. Voices of

party candidates were summarized and used for distribution of mandates. Two won parties were received under one mandate (places were transferred to candidates with the greatest poll). If the party collected twice more votes, than any of her competitors (as a rule, 2/3 voices in case of participation of only 2 parties), it got all two mandates [18, p. 189–225].

3. Semifixed lists – the voter has the right to specify preferences in the list, but they are considered together with serial number of the candidate (earlier it was applied in the Yamalo–Nenets Autonomous Area on regional elections).

H. Electoral systems can differ depending on, whether the list is subdivided into parts. It is possible to allocate systems with uniform lists (the majority of the countries of the world), with regional parts (it is applied on many regional elections in Russia, for example, in the Arkhangelsk region), with national and regional parts (it is used at federal parliamentary elections in Russia).

I. As a rule, lists of candidates include some candidates. In the certain countries so-called local lists or quasilists – the lists consisting of the unique candidate (it is used on regional elections in Italy) are formed [9, p. 114–136].

K. In the certain countries are provided bonuses. It can be bonuses for minority (earlier it was applied in Russia to the parties which did not break a 7 percent barrier which acquired the right for one or two mandates), and bonuses for the majority (the additional mandates received by winner party). For example, in Greece the winner party at parliamentary elections receives in addition 50 places. It is necessary to carry so-called systems of party block vote (PBV) or system with a jackpot to this version. For example, in Italy on regional elections the party list receives all places in the district if it gathered absolute majority of voices [17, p. 162–173].

L. As a rule, the considered systems are used when electing deputies. There is one exception – system of a simultaneous double voice. It is applied in Latin America at the regional level when electing governors, but earlier was used and on national elections. So, quite recently the candidate from the party, gathered a majority of votes became the president of Uruguay (each party proposed several candidates; the voter directly voted for one candidate;

voices of party candidates were summarized among themselves; the winner party got a post of the president which was transferred to the candidate with the greatest poll). Usually this system was applied at the same time to election of deputies and heads of states [9, p. 114–136].

M. Sometimes the law independent candidates are allowed to participate in elections. They can form the collective independent list (Algeria) or individually participate, i.e. put forward the quasi-list from one candidate (Estonia). It is sometimes allowed both that, and another (Lithuania) [10, p. 104].

N. In case of elections according to open lists rules of majority systems at distribution of places in the list can be applied. As a rule, the principle of the relative majority is applied, but also the principle of the qualified majority can practice. So, in Estonia the candidate from the party has to receive the one tenth part of a quota. Systems can also differ by criterion of additional conditions for election (the accounting of protest voters, for example) as it took place in the Russian Federation.

Election Systems on Multimandatory Districts

Most of domestic scientists these systems call majority in multimandatory districts. Abroad they are carried to separate group of semi-proportional or disproportionate systems. On these elections candidates participate in individual quality, between them mandates are distributed, however de facto party lists exist. Moreover, in many countries the voter is granted the right to vote directly for the party list (the block of candidates). In spite of the fact that the specified techniques are based on the principle of the majority for definition of winners, these systems are capable to provide approximate proportional representation of parties in a varying degree. So, the highest accounting of voters is provided at elections on system of the uniform transferred voice which abroad even call proportional [7, p. 113–137]. The smallest accounting of voters is provided by system of block vote (or an unlimited vote). In general, the voting procedure on such elections reminds vote on proportional system with open lists.

A. Being based on the majority principle, they can differ how the majority is defined. Certainly, has value and an appearance of the majority. As a rule, it relative, but can be absolute (systems with an unlimited vote are applied on local elections in

France) or qualified (systems with the uniform transferred voice are applied in Ireland). As a rule, on system of absolute majority elections are held in two rounds. It is obvious that the majority of the considered systems are one-round systems.

B. Systems can differ depending on the maintenance of a voice:

1. Categorical vote (for example, system of a uniform inexpressible voice). The voter votes for one candidate in the multimandatory district, it is applied at parliamentary elections in Japan [6].

2. Approving vote. So, according to system of an unlimited vote, the voter is allocated with a poll, which not less number of mandates (it is applied in many countries, including in Russia at the local level). On the contrary, in systems of a limited vote the poll is always less, than number of mandates (it is used in Spain on elections to the Senate). In fact, it is majority systems with panachage [17, p. 162–173].

3. A cumulative vote (the voter is allocated with several voices, it can give them to one candidate or distribute between several). The modified method still is applied on elections to assembly of Norfolk Island (to choose can transfer to one candidate no more than 2 voices) [7, p. 90].

4. Preferential vote (the system with the uniform transferred voice, is used in Ireland). In fact, it is AV system in the multimandatory district. In the district the quota is defined (as a rule, Droop's quota), candidates with surplus of the first preferences give votes to other candidates according to the second preferences. If all mandates in the district are not replaced and did not remain candidates with surplus of voices, the least successful candidate is excluded, and his voices are transferred to other participants of elections (as well as in AV system). The specified system has a number of modifications depending on type of a quota, an order of distribution of surplus and so forth (Hare, Gregory, Mick, Warren, Wright's methods etc.). So, Gregory's method is based on transfer of voices not by casual selection (Hare's method, is used in Ireland), and by means of definition of a formula of the transferred value $(s/t * p)$ where s – number of surplus, – total number of the second voices, p – number of the second votes given for the specific candidate, this algorithm is applied in Northern Ireland). This technique in Australia was repeatedly modified for definition of the transferred voices which were formed already during the previous transfer of voices. Mick's algorithm is so difficult that occupies in language Pascal some pages therefore the electoral

law of New Zealand contains only sending to scientific work [2, p. 168–174]. Methods of Warren and Wright are modifications of this algorithm therefore they in the real work will also not be considered.

5. Vote for candidates in various patterns with possibility of vote for the list in general. So, on elections to the Senate of Australia the voter has the right to expose preferences between candidates or to vote for some list in general (in this case its preferences will coincide with order of candidates in this party list).

C. Elections can be held in several districts (Ireland) or in one (Monaco). In some cases additional conditions for election of the candidate (the accounting of a turnout of voters and so forth) [17, p. 162–173].

The Combined Election Systems

When carrying out such elections some techniques at the same time are used. Therefore, in advance established part of deputies is chosen by one rules, the rest – on another. In Russia these systems usually call mixed electoral systems.

A. Depending on coherence of components systems are allocated coexisting (in the USA at congressional elections in the majority of states the system of the relative majority, but in the State of Georgia – absolute majority in two rounds is used), parallel (elections on different systems are held in the uniform territory, votes are not connected among themselves, as at State Duma elections of the Russian Federation) and the related systems (it is applied in Germany, New Zealand, Hungary and so forth) [12, p. 162–170]. In the latter case the compensation (equalizing) deputies who are elected on proportional system according to (equalizing) voices which are especially defined compensatory always take place, than the proportional representation of parties [17, p. 162–173].

B. They can differ depending on quantity of its components. As a rule, they have two components. But can have three and more elements. So, on elections to assembly of Hong Kong 4 methods at the same time (proportional system, FPTP, block vote, AV) [17, p. 162–173].

C. The considered systems can differ depending on what components are used. As a rule, it is election systems on one–mandatory districts and according to party lists (the majority of the countries). Also other

options – elections on multimandatory districts and according to party lists (Monaco), elections on one – and to multimandatory districts (Cayman Islands) and so forth are possible. The situation when all components of system belong to one general version is possible. So, in Denmark the connected election system according to party lists is applied. The voter, possessing one voice, elects at the same time 135 deputies on D'Hondt's method in several regional districts, 40 more equalizing deputies are elected on the uniform district on Saint–Laguë's method. In this case both components – election systems according to party lists [17, p. 162–173].

D. The majority of the specified systems – systems with several voices. Usually their two – voices for the candidate and per lot. Earlier in Italy and Mexico the related systems with a single voice were applied.

Results

As it became clear, traditional division into the majority, proportional and mixed systems lost the value. Development of scientific thought and searches of the most fair technique led to that many systems are such at the same time. In the modern world there was a mass of hybrid systems (proportional systems with open lists and so-called semi-proportional systems). The striking example is the Chilean binomial system. It can be called and majority (the principle of the qualified majority is used), and proportional (in fact, it is based on D'Hondt's method in the two–mandatory district though the quota directly is not determined by the inexpediency reason). Systems of party block vote can be also carried to this or that version at the same time since the selective quota too is not defined owing to inexpediency (all places the winner party will receive). The system of a double simultaneous voice which was applied when electing presidents of the countries of Latin America, is too an example of simultaneous existence of the majority and proportional principles.

Moreover, purely proportional systems are seldom applied. In many countries they are in fact disproportional because of the various rules distorting proportional representation of parties (protecting barriers, artificial quotas, bonuses and so forth). By the way, the majority system of the relative majority (FPTP) in general is not majority, but

minority (the winner often represents not the majority, but minority of voters). The name of the category "the mixed system" also does not correspond to the contents. So, proportional system with open lists and system of one transferred voice are hybrid, and, owing to this fact, mixed since at distribution of mandates both the proportional, and majority principles at the same time are applied. Also mixture of various techniques is observed and when electing the President of France. Strictly speaking, the coexisting and parallel systems, unlike connected, are not mixed at all, these are various, but not uniform systems.

Conclusions

Thus, we oppose expansion of the category "electoral system" and its identification with all suffrage and process. In our opinion, the electoral system is a technique of distribution of mandates. It is quite obvious that all electoral systems first of all are subdivided depending on between whom mandates are distributed: between candidates in individual quality (election systems on one-mandatory districts); between lists of candidates who are, as a rule, proposed parties (election systems according to party lists); at the same time between candidates and, actually, lists of candidates (an election system on multimandatory districts); at the same time between the specified subjects by various rules (the combined systems). This criterion influences other signs (mathematical criterion, the maintenance of a voice, number of rounds, type of constituencies and so forth). Additional criteria allow us to subdivide these or those systems into subspecies that speaks about their minor character.

References

1. *Belov S. A. Sistemnoe pravovoe regulirovanie izbiratel'noy sistemy* [System Legal Regulation of Electoral System]. *Rossiyskiy yuridicheskij zhurnal – Russian Juridical Journal*. 2011. Issue 1. Pp. 88–100. (In Russ.).
2. *Vol'skij V. I., Karpov A. V. Primenenie razlichnykh variantov pravila peredachi golosov* [Application of Different Versions of Single Transferable Vote System]. *Politiya – Politeia*. 2011. Issue 2. Pp. 162–174. (In Russ.).
3. *Ershov V. A. Osnovy izbiratel'nogo prava Rossiyskoy Federatsii: ucheb. posobie dlya stud. vuzov*. [Fundamentals of the Suffrage of the Russian Federation: Manual for Students of Higher Educational Institutions]. Moscow, 2008. 192 p. (In Russ.).
4. *Zarubezhnoe izbiratel'noe pravo: ucheb. posobie; pod red. V. V. Maklakova*. [Foreign Suffrage: textbook; ed. by V. V. Maklakov]. Moscow, 2003. 288 p. (In Russ.).
5. *Ivanchenko A. A., Kynev A. V., Lyubarev A. E. Proportsional'naya izbiratel'naya sistema v Rossii: Istoriya, sovremennoe sostoyanie, perspektivy*. [Proportional Electoral System in Russia: History, Current State, Prospects]. Moscow, 2005. 333 p. (In Russ.).
6. *Konstitutsionnoe (gosudarstvennoe) pravo zarubezhnykh stran: Chast' obshchaya; pod red. B. A. Strashuna* [Constitutional (State) Law of Foreign Countries: General part; ed. by B. A. Strashun]. Moscow, 2000. Vol. 1–2. 784 p. (In Russ.).
7. *Lakeman E., Lambert J. D. Issledovanie majoritarnoy i proportsional'noy izbiratel'nykh sistem* [A Study of Majority and Proportional Electoral Systems]. Moscow, 1958. 366 p. (In Russ.).
8. *Sravnitel'noe konstitutsionnoe pravo: ucheb. posobie; pod red. V. E. Chirkina*. [Comparative Constitutional Law: textbook; ed. by V. E. Chirkin]. Moscow, 2002. 448 p. (In Russ.).
9. *Taagepera R., Shugart M.S. Opisaniye izbiratel'nykh sistem* [Description of Electoral Systems]. *POLIS – Polis. Political Studies*. 1997. Issue 3. Pp. 114–136. (In Russ.).
10. *Khudoley K. M. Konstitutsionnoe pravo zarubezhnykh stran SNG i Baltii: ucheb. posobie* [Constitutional Law of Foreign Countries of the CIS and the Baltic States: textbook]. Perm, 2009. 240 p. (In Russ.).
11. *Bawn K. The Logic of Institution Preferences: German Electoral Law as a Social Choice Outcome*. *American Journal of Political Science*. 1993. Vol. 37. Issue 4. Pp. 965–989. DOI: 10.2307/2111539. (In Eng.).
12. *Benoit K. Hungary's "Two-Vote" Electoral System. Representation*. 1996. Vol. 33. Issue 4. Pp. 162–170. DOI: 10.1080/00344899608522977. (In Eng.).
13. *Electoral Laws and their Political Consequences*; ed. by B. Grofman, A. Lijphart. New York, 1986. 335 p. (In Eng.).
14. *Lijphart A. The Political Consequences of Electoral Laws, 1945–1985*. *The American Political Science Review*. 1990. Vol. 84. Issue 2. Pp. 481–496. DOI: 10.2307/1963530. (In Eng.).
15. *McLean I. E.J. Nanson, Social Choice and Electoral Reform*. *Australian Journal of Political Science*. 1996. Vol. 31. Issue 3. Pp. 369–385. DOI: 10.1080/10361149651102. (In Eng.).
16. *Reilly B. Social Choice in the South Seas: Electoral Innovation and the Borda Count in the Pacific Islands Countries*. *Political Science Re-*

- view. 2002. Vol. 23. Issue 4. Pp. 355–372. DOI: 10.1177/0192512102023004002. (In Eng.).
17. *Reynolds A., Reilly B., Ellis A.* Electoral System Design: The New International IDEA Handbook. Stockholm, 2008. 237 p. (In Eng.).
 18. *Siavelis P. M.* La Lógica Oculta de la Selección de Candidatos en las Elecciones Parlamentarias Chilenas. Estudios Públicos. 2005. Issue 98. Pp. 189–225. (In Spa.).
 19. *Taagepera R., Shugart M. S.* Seats and Votes: The Effects and Determinants of Electoral Systems. Yale, 1989. 292 p. (In Eng.).
 20. *Tideman N.* Collective Decisions and Voting: The Potential for Public Choice. Burlington, 2006. 337 p. (In Eng.).
- References in Russian**
1. *Белов С. А.* Системное правовое регулирование избирательной системы // Российский юридический журнал. 2011. № 1. С. 88–100.
 2. *Вольский В. И., Карпов А. В.* Применение различных вариантов правила передачи голосов // Полития. 2011. № 2. С. 162–174.
 3. *Ершов В. А.* Основы избирательного права Российской Федерации: учеб. пособие для студ. вузов. М.: ГроссМедия, РОСБУХ, 2008. 192 с.
 4. *Зарубежное избирательное право: учеб. пособие / под ред. В. В. Маклакова.* М.: Норма, 2003. 288 с.
 5. *Иванченко А. А., Кынев А. В., Любарев А. Е.* Пропорциональная избирательная система в России: история, современное состояние, перспективы. М.: Аспект Пресс, 2005. 333 с.
 6. *Конституционное (государственное) право зарубежных стран. Часть общая / под ред. Б. А. Страшуна.* М.: БЕК, 2000. Т. 1, 2. 784 с.
 7. *Лейкман Э., Ламберт Д. Д.* Исследование мажоритарной и пропорциональной избирательных систем. М.: Изд-во иностр. лит., 1958. 366 с.
 8. *Сравнительное конституционное право: учеб. пособие / под ред. В. Е. Чиркина.* М.: Междунар. отношения, 2002. 448 с.
 9. *Таагепера Р., Шузарм М. С.* Описание избирательных систем // ПОЛИС. 1997. № 3. С. 114–136.
 10. *Худолей К. М.* Конституционное право зарубежных стран СНГ и Балтии: учеб. пособие. / Перм. гос. ун-т. Пермь, 2009. 240 с.
 11. *Bawn K.* The Logic of Institution Preferences: German Electoral Law as a Social Choice Outcome // American Journal of Political Science. 1993. Vol. 37. Issue 4. Pp. 965–989. DOI: 10.2307/2111539.
 12. *Benoit K.* Hungary's Two-Vote' Electoral System // Representation. 1996. Vol. 33, issue 4. Pp. 162–170.
 13. *Electoral Laws and their Political Consequences / ed. by B. Grofman, A. Lijphart.* N. Y., 1986. 335 p. DOI: 10.1080/00344899608522977.
 14. *Lijphart A.* The Political Consequences of Electoral Laws, 1945–1985 // The American Political Science Review. 1990. Vol. 84, issue 2. Pp. 481–496. DOI: 10.2307/1963530.
 15. *McLean I., Nanson E. J.* Social Choice and Electoral Reform // Australian Journal of Political Science. 1996. Vol. 31, issue 3. Pp. 369–385. DOI: 10.1080/10361149651102.
 16. *Reilly B.* Social Choice in the South Seas: Electoral Innovation and the Borda Count in the Pacific Islands Countries // Political Science Review. 2002. Vol. 23, issue 4. Pp. 355–372. DOI: 10.1177/0192512102023004002
 17. *Reynolds A., Reilly B., Ellis A.* Electoral System Design: The New International IDEA Handbook. Stockholm, 2008. 237 p.
 18. *Siavelis P. M.* La Lógica Oculta de la Selección de Candidatos en las Elecciones Parlamentarias Chilenas // Estudios Públicos. 2005. Issue 98. Pp. 189–225.
 19. *Taagepera R., Shugart M. S.* Seats and Votes: The Effects and Determinants of Electoral Systems. Yale, 1989. 292 p. (In Eng.).
 20. *Tideman N.* Collective Decisions and Voting: The Potential for Public Choice. Burlington, 2006. 337 p.