

## SUMMARY

### **The Effect of Electoral Coalitions on the Distribution of Seats in the Finnish Parliament**

Pertti Pesonen

The 200 Members of Finland's Parliament are elected in 15 constituencies. One member represents Aaland, and the other 199 mandates are distributed among the constituencies in relation to their population. Each constituency now holds from nine to twenty mandates. The maximum number of candidates to form an «electoral union» (ordinarily a party list) equals the number of seats to be filled in that constituency. The votes count first for the electoral unions according to d'Hondt's method of proportional representation. The mandates gained by each electoral union are then filled according to the votes cast for their individual candidates.

In each election, some parties co-operate in some constituencies and establish joint electoral unions in order to strengthen their mutual position in the count of seat distributions, because large unions are likely to utilize their votes more effectively than small ones. This paper first analyzes the actual effect of such coalitions on the distribution of seats in the elections of 1954, 1958 and 1962. Although relatively few, such coalitions transferred four mandates in 1954 and one mandate in 1958 from one party to another. In 1962, when new splinter parties appeared on the scene, electoral coalitions changed the distribution of seats in no less than ten constituencies.

However, the potentiality of manipulating the election outcome was far greater. In 1954, the ratio of Left Wing and non-Socialist representation would have been 100 to 100 had not the co-operation of the Finnish People's Party and the Conservatives changed it to a 97 to 103 non-Socialist-majority. A large scale non-Socialist co-operation could have created a 92 to 108 ratio. In 1958, the actual Left Wing majority of 101 to 99 might have been changed to a non-Socialist majority of 91 to 109. In 1962, the split of the Social Democrats increased such potentialities. The present distribution is an 87 to 113 non-Socialist majority. Without electoral coalitions it would have remained 93 to 107. But considering the additional possibilities of non-Socialist coalitions as well as co-operation between the two groups of Social Democrats and still keeping the actual votes constant, the present Parliament might have any number of Left Wing Members ranging from 84 to 99.

Only the non-Socialist parties have been actually engaged in such electoral coalitions. One partner in most coalitions has been the Progressive Party (since 1951 the Finnish People's Party). In 1962 this party gained only eight seats alone, but won five more due to its electoral coalitions. The Communists

and the Social Democrats have not formed such coalitions between themselves (with the exception of one constituency in 1924) nor with the non-Socialist parties. Should they, too, adopt these tactics, there would be a further increase in the range of possible seat distributions with constant party votes.

## The Study of Administration — Communal Administration in Perspective

Paavo Hoikka

History of the study of public administration is for the most part unwritten history. Until the advent of industrialism society was comparatively stable. Public administration had enough time to adjust itself to the slowly proceeding development. The study of it was individualistic, and the accumulating experience was passed on as inheritance from one generation to the next. Only industrialism meant a challenge strong enough to give rise to active research. Nevertheless, the work that must be regarded as the first systematic treatise on administration — *Die Verwaltungslehre* by Lorenz v. Stein — was not published until 1869. Today the development of the theory of administration amounts to furtherance of political theory formation as well. The conception emphasizing the possibilities of the study of administration as an independent «applied science», entirely separate from the study of politics in general, must apparently be regarded as inadequate from the standpoint of both, theory and practice. This «independent science of administration» approach, which has gained foothold at least in the United States, embodies very strong assumptions concerning the interrelationship between the study of practical politics and that of public administration and, also, between the political science and the study of politics.

The study of administration has been considered to provide an escape from the methodological difficulties marring the social sciences in general and the study of politics in particular. It has been claimed to furnish a useful point of departure: starting from the study of administration it will be possible to create coherence within the study of politics, often blamed for incoherence and lack of system. What is concerned is a search for a starting point most useful for scientific research. The study of administration has been considered to offer a natural and concrete point of departure: the study of politics should in its entirety be founded on it, rather than on the previously employed flimsy conceptual frameworks or the sketchy and speculative theories.

In Finland the study of communal administration has, in a sense, already come to occupy the most central position among the social sciences dealing with the commune. Moreover, there is a tendency to term this discipline, rather than any other, the communal science.

Is discussion — that is, methodological analysis — or the practice of research a more powerful tool for solving the problems of social sciences? This is a question which will continue to occupy the scholars in the field. The increasing interest in the comparative study of administration — comprising inter-cultural as well as inter-national comparisons — is likely to be an indication of a search for a universal theory of administration.

## National Defence as part of Democratic Society

Aimo Pajunen

In essential features, democracy and military system can be considered to be contradictory. In the former, power is based on the consent of those governed, whilst in the latter it is based on the orders given by the commanders.

The President of the Republic of Finland is the Supreme Commander of the Defence Forces, and the Minister of Defence, responsible to the Parliament, is the highest administrative authority of national defence. The Defence Forces are under the command of the C-in-C of the Defence Forces, who is directly subordinated to the President of the Republic. The C-in-C as well as all other officers can be removed from office by the President without the decision of the court. In addition, the President can, outside normal administrative channels, assume direct command of any unit of the Defence Forces.

The possible of the State to control the Defence Forces are thus rather efficient. However, before and during the wars, separation of the Defence Forces from the political command could be noted. To eliminate this disadvantage the Defence Council was established in 1957. It is composed of six ministers, the C-in-C of the Defence Forces and the Chief of the General Staff. The Prime Minister acts as chairman of the Council and the Minister of Defence as vice-chairman. The President of the Republic has also taken part in the meetings of the Council.

It can be considered that the work of the Defence Council has activated the defence policy of the Government. This is shown, among others, by the increase of the defence appropriations. At the same time, the supreme command of the Defence Forces has come in closer contact with the members of the Government, which has decisively modified the separation that could be noted in the past.

Within the Defence Forces there has also been an increasing tendency to replace the old authoritative system by a modern human relations and education system. The information service of the Defence Forces has become more and more open. This is harmony with the principle of publicity that is essential in democracy.