

Chapter 1 : Democratic Revival - Wikipedia

Party of Democratic Revival of Ukraine (PDVU) was a political party in that was created as an offshoot of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. In along with number of other parties, it merged into the People's Democratic Party.

Well, the campaign has decided to turn off election night coverage at this event. They heard the calls of Pennsylvania and Florida and certainly the mood dampened from that, but immediately following that the coverage was turned off. We have received no reaction from the campaign to those calls or any of the calls made after them, it has been complete radio silence from all of our sources. We only have a few terse messages telling us to leave the campaign alone for a "strategy session". There are no members of the campaign visible in the crowd and we are not aware of any comments they have given to other media. The cheering here is intense, especially when North Carolina was called just a few minutes ago. The crowd is very aware of the great position that the Schweitzer campaign appears to be in. Our sources inside the campaign are telling us that the campaign remains cautious and they are not declaring victory until they actually reach electoral votes, but they are certainly very optimistic given the calls that have been made. They also believe that by the end of the night, there will be a democratic majority in the senate, and they are preparing a "convincing offer" to Independent Senator Greg Orman to get him to caucus with the democrats starting in January. Schweikert, your state is too close to call. What do you believe will happen? In what states did the fraud occur? At this point is just rumors that have been circulating on many social media channels, but I hope desperately that there is some validity. However, the primary avenue should be to convince electors to be faithless. I have every confidence that Schweitzer will be just barely over , giving us an easy avenue to find a few faithless electors to vote our side, or at least vote for some "liberal alternative" to Schweitzer and hold him below a majority. Why not just respect the will of the people as expressed by the popular vote in each state? The founders intended the electors to be able to override the populace when the populace is too stupid to make the right decision. We must fight on! The Schweitzer campaign lied and manipulated to no end, tricking the populace into believing that Schweitzer was good for the country. Furthermore, the secession of Alabama and Missississippi caused irreparable pain to our ticket. As a result, it is difficult for this country to realize that it needs Dardenne, especially if the Senate and House go democratic, and thus we must intervene by convincing enough electors to be faithless. This election is not over until the electors vote in December, and the republican party must realize it if it is to remain relevant in this country. No winner has been declared in the presidential election, and the media should never jump to conclusions. We may yet keep our senate majority and our house majority, and even the gubernatorial majority is not fully decided yet. But I remain hopeful that something will happen to get Dardenne barely over the top, and I believe the senate majority will stay in our hands, someday, somehow. I believe we can even get Angus King to caucus with the republicans if that is what is needed to keep the senate in republican hands. But no one should be giving up now, none of the majorities, or the presidential election winner, have been declared, and the media gloating here is extremely disappointing. Well, I ran a powerful campaign in which I sold myself as a check to a potential 2nd term of President Schweitzer. Thousands of Schweitzer voters clearly heard that message and backed my campaign. But the more important thing to focus on here is the fact that both major races in Georgia went for the republican candidate. And I will stop you there. There have been two more democratic pickups in the United States Senate.

Chapter 2 : Democratic Revival | Revolv

One of the most fascinating things, to me, about the current moment and the revival of socialism is how the whole question of democracy “not substantive or deep democracy, not participatory democracy, not economic democracy, but good old-fashioned liberal democratic proceduralism” plays out right now on the Left.

For nearly two decades, in fact, she had more or less abandoned the faith, disillusioned by what she saw as a constant focus on conservative social issues and pressing needs for more donations. But if politics helped drive her away, it is politics that, in some ways, is drawing her back to the fold. And on this sunny Sunday morning at Greenpoint Reformed Church, not too far from the Brooklyn artists collective where she lives, Ms. Rose is beaming as she joins the responsive call to prayer: Responding, the congregation says together: We are single and partnered, happy and sad, confused and inspired. We are street smart and college-educated. We are the body of Christ. Since the rise of Donald Trump to the US presidency, in fact, liberal enclaves have reported something of an awakening. Are you smarter than an atheist? The call to worship on this Palm Sunday embodied some of the reasons Rose decided to return to church last year. I was really happy that there was a place where that diversity could be celebrated. Already part of a community of politically-active artists, she is a regular presence at street protests. Liberal Christianity and mainline Protestantism have been contracting for decades, in fact, losing millions of members and the cultural influence it once was able to wield. Mainline Protestant churches, including those in Presbyterian, Lutheran, and Methodist denominations, have lost roughly 5 million adult members since , and now comprise about 15 percent of the US population, according to Pew Research. Up to then, the church had plateaued with about 35 adult members. On Sunday, there were more than 60, including children. Kansfield has been making contacts with consortiums of faith groups mobilizing for progressive causes. But how do we actually invest our energy and time and resources to where it will strategically matter? Get the Monitor Stories you care about delivered to your inbox. Now I want to give back to the family.

Chapter 3 : Is it too late for a Lib Dem revival? - BBC News

But the overall pattern is clear, and it's not merely confined to last night: the Liberal Democrats are enjoying a mini-revival, particularly in the south-east. Of course, it doesn't appear to be making itself felt in the Liberal Democrats' poll share.

Before the Liberal Party had been an uneasy coalition of Whigs and radicals. The Whigs, led by some of the richest aristocratic magnates in the land, dominated Liberal cabinets and imposed a veto on radical legislation. The broadening of the suffrage in the boroughs in the Reform Act of strengthened the radicals and the Gladstone government of 1868 ranks as one of the great reforming administrations of modern times. Whig disquiet grew, especially during the second Gladstone government of 1875. The bill saw a mass defection of Whigs, or moderate Liberals, to the Conservatives. Ninety-three Liberal MPs voted against its second reading in June. Many of these rebels were Whigs for whom Home Rule afforded not only an incentive to leave the Liberal Party, but an excuse. The rebels, however, also included a contingent of radicals, led by Joseph Chamberlain, until then the most prominent and articulate of the radical leaders. Despite the loss of Chamberlain and his closest colleagues, the effect of the schism was to radicalize the Liberal Party. More important than the Whig secession was the change in the character of radicalism. Until radicalism was an individualist creed. Most radicals opposed armaments, belligerence in foreign affairs, and imperial expansion: The mid-century radicals were conspicuous champions of laissez-faire. The radical programme was negative in character. It called for the disestablishment of the Church of England and for the redress of other nonconformist grievances. It sought to limit the power of government and demanded that government should not intervene in economic and social affairs. After there was a gradual but major change in the nature of radicalism. Increasingly it was defined in collectivist terms. Radicals, perhaps seeking support from the now partly enfranchised working class, began to address the problems of industrial society. Thus, Joseph Chamberlain, while pressing the cause of disestablishment, as mayor of Birmingham embarked on a major programme of social reform in that city. Nationally, he declared for free and compulsory education and even, at one stage, urged redistributive taxation. The exodus of the Whigs from the party has tended to obscure the significance of the transformation that was taking place. By the 1880s it was largely complete. Radicalism was now collectivist radicalism. It stopped a long way short of socialism but, even if it had no blueprint for a new society, was prepared to use the power of the state in a positive way to help the poorest sections of the nation. All parties are institutionalized log-rolls, but the Liberal Party after set a new standard for factionalism. The Welsh insisted on the disestablishment of the Church of England in Wales; the temperance lobby on the strictest control of the liquor trade; the coal-miners wanted the eight-hour day; rural Liberals agitated for parish councils and smallholdings. In the 1880s a new cleavage developed. Individual radicals had been Little Englanders, hostile to the growth of empire and fervent for a pacific foreign policy. The Unionist Party, as the conservatives were now called, became the party of imperialism, of strong defence, and of realpolitik abroad. Many Liberals still clung to the anti-imperial prejudices of the past. But after Gladstone gave up the leadership, some of the most prominent Liberals, such as Rosebery, his successor as prime minister, demanded a reorientation of party attitudes. The Liberal Party must show that it could be trusted with the administration of a great empire. Liberal Imperialism ranged itself against Little Englandism. Asquith, Grey, and Haldane, all to hold high office in Liberal governments after, were among the leaders of the new organization, the Liberal League. The onset of the Boer War dramatized and made more acute the division of the party. Liberal critics of the war were called pro-Boers, and for a time the party seemed irrevocably split. Campbell-Bannerman, chosen in because there was no one else, strove to hold Liberals together. In the end, the mistakes of the Unionists restored the unity of the Liberal Party. Nonconformists were outraged and many of those who had deserted the party in came back. More important, in 1905, Chamberlain, now one of the leading figures in the Unionist government, repudiated free trade, an article of faith to both parties for over 50 years. A minority of Unionists still believed in free trade: Balfour, the prime minister, tried to trim by adhering to a qualified protectionism, but the bulk of the party followed Chamberlain and the tariff reformers, as the

protectionists were called. The Education Act and tariff reform healed the rift in the Liberal Party which, in 1885, won a landslide victory. Liberal hegemony lasted until 1894. During those nine years the party largely completed the unfinished agenda of Victorian radicalism, restricting the powers of the Lords, introducing Irish Home Rule in 1886, and disestablishing the Church of England in Wales. At the same time it looked forward, with the introduction of old-age pensions in 1908, the Trade Boards Act of 1909, and the National Insurance Act of 1911, to the collectivist agenda of the 20th cent. There were two general elections in 1892, both bound up with the problem of the House of Lords. The Liberals, now led by Asquith, lost their overall majority and their continuance in office depended on the recently founded Labour Party and on the Irish nationalists. The next few years were a period of bitter political conflict over Irish Home Rule and a dangerous division between the two main parties was averted only by the outbreak of the First World War in 1914. Asquith, still party leader, went into opposition, with the Conservatives and a section of the Liberals following Lloyd George. This alignment was a paradox: Lloyd George had been one of the leaders of the radical wing of the party before the war, while Asquith had been a prominent Liberal Imperialist. The election saw a huge increase in the suffrage, with the right to vote given to women over 30 and many more male voters on the register. Many of these new voters may have had no firm party allegiance. The result was a triumph for Lloyd George and a disaster for the Liberals. Even the two wings added together could muster only 100 MPs. The early post-war years provided the most encouraging backcloth that Labour could have had. Heavy unemployment contributed to the unpopularity of the governing coalition which Labour, with more MPs than the Asquithians, could exploit. In 1922 the Conservatives broke with Lloyd George: The Liberals fought as rival sections, sometimes standing against each other. Their combined total fell to 40 while Labour more than doubled its representation to 100. This was a decisive victory, for Labour now became the official opposition in Parliament and henceforth the alternative to the Conservatives. Two years and two elections later, the reshaping of the party system was confirmed. In 1924 the Liberals, though reunited, were reduced to 40 MPs. The independent Liberals soldiered on but elected only nineteen MPs at the general election of 1929. There then began the first of the post-war Liberal revivals. Those of 1931 and 1935 soon petered out; but another revival in the early 1940s was followed by a remarkable Liberal performance in the two elections of 1945, when in October, for example, the party polled one-fifth of the votes and elected 13 members. Strains within the alliance led to a merger of the two parties in 1948 under the name Liberal Democrats. Liberals to constitutional reform and the devolution of power. It, and its predecessor the Liberal Party, has been the most consistently pro-European of all three parties. The Liberal party continued to do well in the 1950s. It maintained a strong showing in local government and, after devolution in 1979, it shared government in Scotland and Wales with Labour. At the general election, 46 Westminster seats went to the Liberals and in 1983, under the new leadership of Charles Kennedy, it increased its total to 22. In 1997 it raised its numbers of MPs to 22. Hugh Berrington Cook, C. Basingstoke, ; Douglas, R. Triumph and Disintegration, 1997; Vincent, J. Cite this article Pick a style below, and copy the text for your bibliography.

Chapter 4 : All That Is Solid No Sign of the Liberal Democrat Revival

Politics The Liberal Democrats Are Pinning Their Hopes For A Revival On Remainers In May's Elections. Senior Tories are nervous about the Lib Dems' chances in London, as they target EU.

Bullish coming off the back of a steadily increasing tally of councillors picked up from local authority by-elections, buoyed by a yellow wave of new members that has taken them to over 1,000 members, and their triumph in Richmond, everyone was expecting great things. It might be that Labour are squeezing their vote as the more progressive-minded LibDem voters who returned to the Liberals over the course of the last year have doubled back. Whatever is going on, the LibDems are in trouble. And this is the context in which their manifesto launched this evening. In its treatment by the media, the document has been trailed as a young-oriented programme with promises to sort apprenticeships out, dicker with the housing market through help-to-rent and rent-to-buy initiatives, and the like. On pay and particularly low pay, which young people disproportionately are on the sharp end of, all we get is a commitment to set up a review that would consult on the level of the living wage. What has particularly caught the eye is a promise to reintroduce grants for students in Higher Education. Which, you may recall, were taken away by the LibDems and Tories when they shared a bed. Still, not to worry, the decriminalisation of cannabis is sure to get the young voters in. Here, there is nothing too objectionable. Their idea of developing a workforce strategy, working toward a more joined up health service, taking mental health very seriously by starting to match resources to need and what have you is absolutely fine. Though there are two big problems here. Rightly, they attack the Tories for their funding crisis and take a lazy sideswipe at Labour for not having the solutions to deal with it. But Labour does have a solution, and it directly involves a key Liberal Democrat "achievement": Yes, the NHS is underfunded. It also wastes billions on the added costs of a thoroughly marketised health economy underpinned by the taxpayer. Apparently, tinkering here and there would sort the NHS out while the glaring structural flaw remains invisible to their eyes. Another, not unrelated, problem is the proposal for a dedicated health and care tax. This, if you will remember, was a wheeze conjured up by George Osborne. His thinking was that specifying a NHS tax as part of PAYE would encourage a desire among tax payers to see that tax reduced, giving the Tories a further hook to run it down even further. How about this on page 10 You can take that one back. Or, more specifically, the Scottish Conservatives. The LibDems, in their introduction, are asking people to vote for them in order to provide an effective opposition. Just like Ruth Davidson did in Scotland. Unhappily for them, the same trick is not going to repeat. Is any of this going to be help? The problem is pitching yourselves as hard remainers in local and parliamentary by-elections is one thing. You can easily mobilise a vote motivated by this issue to pull off stunning wins on low turn outs. In a general election when the Tories are explicitly pitching as the guardians of Brexit against the "wreckers" and other such stupidity, that hardcore remain vote is spread too thinly to make a difference in all but a very small number of seats. And with that, the LibDem revival, much hyped, much vaunted, looks all set to come to nothing on 8th June. Posted by Phil at

Chapter 5 : 'Morale is really high': Lib Dems scent revival in south-west | Politics | The Guardian

If this is true, then the prospects for liberal democracy are far less bright than the liberal narrative stretching from the Enlightenment to the s allows. The autocratic revival thesis holds that deep political incompatibilities between states will persist alongside the ongoing spread of capitalism, dashing hopes for the transformation of international politics into a universal liberal peace.

In lieu of an abstract, here is a brief excerpt of the content: Plattner bio Today the most liberal regimes in the world, those of the advanced Western countries, are typically referred to either as liberal democracies or, more often, simply as democracies. This reflects one of the most striking ways in which twentieth-century liberalism differs from the older liberalism that emerged in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Today, wherever one finds liberalism understood as constitutional and limited government, the rule of law, and the protection of individual rights , it is almost invariably coupled with democracy understood as the selection of government officials by universal suffrage. The converse proposition, however, has in recent decades been becoming less and less true. With the downfall since of scores of authoritarian regimes and their replacement by more or less freely elected governments, there are now many regimes that can plausibly be called democratic but not liberal. As a result, the relationship between liberalism and democracy has once again become a subject of intense intellectual and policy debate. Even among those regimes that have succeeded in holding genuinely free elections, many have compiled a poor record in terms of such criteria [End Page] of liberalism as the rule of law and the protection of individual rights. Zakaria, however, concludes that the liberal deficit of these regimes has emerged not in spite of, but in some measure because of, their adoption of the democratic mechanism of popular elections. He thus questions the wisdom of encouraging countries to elect their rulers before the foundations of liberalism are firmly in place. Zakaria puts heavy emphasis on the distinction between liberalism and democracy. Making it clear that he views the former as more important than the latter, he argues for the superiority of liberal autocracy over illiberal democracy. This in turn has prompted discussion of the viability of liberal autocracy or, more generically, nondemocratic liberalism in the contemporary world, for the only explicit twentieth-century example of liberal autocracy that Zakaria provides is Hong Kong under British colonial rule. His primary example is the constitutional monarchies of nineteenth-century Europe, which certainly did have many of the elements of liberalism in place before they adopted universal manhood suffrage. But it is also noteworthy that all of these pre-twentieth-century liberal nondemocracies have now become democratic. This raises the question of why liberal regimes have all tended to evolve in a democratic direction. Is it due merely to adventitious circumstances or extraneous factors, or is it somehow related to the intrinsic principles of liberalism? That is the issue I wish to explore. Liberalism and Equality Liberalism is essentially a doctrine devoted to protecting the rights of the individual to life, liberty, property, and the pursuit of happiness. Government is needed to protect those rights, but it can threaten them as well, so it is also essential to guard against their infringement by government. Thus liberalism entails a government that is limited by a constitution and by the rule of law. At first sight, however, there does not seem to be any reason in principle why such a government must be chosen by the people. A constitutional government of one man or of a few could rule in such a way as to protect the rights of individuals. Indeed, there is reason to fear that a government responsive to popular majorities will be tempted to violate the rights of unpopular individuals or minorities. Accordingly, many liberals in past centuries opposed the extension of the suffrage, fearing precisely such an outcome. Yet everywhere efforts to forestall the extension of the suffrage failed, and liberalism turned into liberal democracy. And far from being destroyed by its democratization, liberalism on the whole has [End Page] flourished You are not currently authenticated. View freely available titles:

Chapter 6 : Church revival? More liberals are filling Protestant pews. - www.nxgvision.com

The Democratic Revival (Greek: Δημοκρατική Αναγέννηση, Dimokratiki Anagenissi) is a political party in Greece, initially founded in by Stelios Papathemelis. It was deactivated after its leader participated in the legislative elections of with New Democracy and was elected MP.

Democratically elected governments were routinely flouting liberal principles, openly violating the rule of law, and depriving their citizens of basic rights and liberties. Today, many believe that we stand on the precipice of an existential crisis. In a bracing new book, the former secretary of state Madeleine Albright even warns of a revival of fascism. There is a growing consensus that American democracy itself is at risk. There is a danger within: Americans are becoming complacent about democracy, losing interest in their traditional ideals. Liberalism has failed, writes Patrick Deneen. A spate of books, articles and opinion pieces talk about its demise, but their authors speak past each other or around in circles, because they are using different definitions of the term. How can we have a proper discussion about liberal democracy when we are not speaking about the same thing? The problem concerns more than semantics. The confusion of terms leads to confused thinking. Their opponents easily exploit the verbal ambiguities. For this we need to understand its history. One common mistake is to conflate liberalism with democracy. The two concepts are not synonyms. For most of their history, they have not even been compatible. Some have interpreted this to mean direct political participation by all male citizens. Others have taken it to mean a representative system based on the suffrage of all male citizens. Either way, however, well into the 19th century, the majority of liberals were hostile to the very idea of democracy, which they associated with chaos and mob rule. Indeed, it would not be wrong to say that liberalism was originally invented to contain democracy. Certainly, the founders of liberalism were no democrats. Benjamin Constant stood for strict property qualifications for both voting and officeholding. The French revolution proved to liberals like him that the public was utterly unprepared for political rights. People were ignorant, irrational and prone to violence. The most democratic phase of the revolution had also been the most bloody. New words were invented to name his pseudo-democratic regime. They form alliances with religious authorities to prop up their regimes. They take their countries into useless wars to distract people from their treachery, while they enhance their own power, line their own pockets and enrich their friends. Worst of all, they corrupt their people by tricking them into participating in their lies. Alexis de Tocqueville also had deep misgivings about democracy. Two additional French revolutions, one in and the other in , followed by another Napoleon, depressed him greatly. It proved once again that the masses were easy prey for demagogues and would-be dictators catering to their lowest instincts. Early liberals like Constant and Tocqueville spent much time thinking about how to counter the perils of democracy. Limits had to be placed on the sovereignty of the people, the rule of law and individual rights guaranteed. But good laws would never be enough, since a popular strongman could easily pervert or simply ignore them. The survival of liberal democracies required a politically educated citizenry. Constant travelled around France instructing French citizens about the principles of their constitution, their rights and their duties. He published articles and delivered speeches for the same purpose. He fought valiantly for the freedom of the press. Across the world, democracy is in crisis. It required public spiritedness and a sense of community. Constant agonized over the political complacency, moral apathy, and selfishness that he saw all around him. Only dictators profited from such vices. How to counter the moral degradation? They thought about this as well. The commitment of public-spirited elites was essential. They must redouble their efforts to counter the cynicism that was turning people away from the public good. It is a sad sign of the times that such statements sound so naive or ring hollow today. The truth is that we still have much to learn from the founding fathers of liberalism, who lived through an existential crisis of their own. They knew about the tendency that democracies have to become illiberal. Let us heed their lessons. She is the author of the forthcoming book, *The Lost History of Liberalism*:

Chapter 7 : Liberal Democratic Party of Japan

According to party literature, Democratic Revival characterizes itself as "democratic, progressive, patriotic, and social". Party leader Papathelemis has defined the party as belonging "politically to the center."

As Hillary Clinton and Bernie Sanders battle for the Democratic presidential nomination this year, the contest is unfolding on the field of liberalism. It would have been unimaginable in that a self-proclaimed democratic socialist would be a serious contender for the Democratic presidential nomination—or that a candidate named Clinton would seek to position herself close to him on the issues. To answer this question, we must go further back than , all the way back to the s. Two momentous occurrences in that decade reshaped the Democratic Party in an enduring fashion: Propelled by the remarkable mass movement for civil rights, Presidents John F. Embracing the civil rights cause and sponsoring landmark civil rights legislation, these Democratic presidents and their congressional allies won the loyalty of African Americans for the long run. At the same time, fully aware of the profound political cost, they initiated a process whereby the white South, the secure base of the Democratic Party in presidential elections since the Civil War, began to shift to the Republican side. Once African Americans opened the door toward fuller recognition of equal rights, other movements for equality soon followed. The other momentous issue rocking the Democratic Party in the s was the war in Vietnam. Kennedy in , George McGovern in —mobilized millions of Democrats against the war and the mentality that had shaped its conduct. The mass base of the Democratic Party was transformed through these crusades, increasingly becoming opponents of interventionism and advocates of peace in international affairs. In the aftermath of the civil rights revolution and the war in Vietnam, the base of the Democratic Party had become more liberal, not only through new adherents among people of color, women, gays and lesbians, and peace activists, but through the departure from the party of southern conservatives, northern white workers, and Cold War hawks. Yet in the near term, the new electoral alignment was unfavorable for Democrats in presidential elections. From to , the party only held the White House for twelve years. People of color were still a relatively small slice of the electorate, the issues about which feminists and LGBT activists cared were not popular according to the polls, and the Democratic Party was saddled with the reputation, happily bestowed on it by Republicans, as weak on national security. At the top of the Democratic Party during this era, among its presidential candidates, there was an understandable—but also opportunistic—incentive to distance the party from its increasingly liberal base. Jimmy Carter was the original New Democrat positioned in the center; Walter Mondale pushed for reduction of the federal deficit; Michael Dukakis claimed that he offered competence rather than ideology; Bill Clinton called himself a Third Way Democrat, neither liberal nor conservative; Al Gore concealed his passionate environmentalism; and John Kerry portrayed himself as a decorated veteran in Vietnam rather than an antiwar activist returning home. Repeatedly, to the dismay of rank-and-file liberals, Democratic candidates evaded or denied the liberal label, even as Republican candidates enthusiastically embraced its conservative counterpart. It was President George W. Bush who put an end to the era of Democratic equivocation. Further, the same political factors that had cut against Democratic candidates for decades had begun to shift in their favor. Racial minorities were now a significantly larger slice of the electorate, while public opinion was becoming more favorable toward cultural positions previously shunned, especially on same-sex marriage. In the contest for the Democratic presidential nomination of , the three leading candidates, Barack Obama, Hillary Clinton, and John Edwards, all adopted the language of liberalism again. Although many left-leaning Democrats would dispute it, President Barack Obama arguably has governed as the most liberal Democrat at home since Lyndon Johnson and the most liberal abroad since Franklin D. The alternatives presented to Democratic voters in have been limited to the liberal end of the political spectrum: No longer can Democratic presidential candidates emulate Bill Clinton and seek political shelter in the center. The top of the party, its presidential nominee this fall, will be closely aligned with its base. Leaders in Action and What They Face forthcoming in summer Recent Stories on Constitution Daily.

Chapter 8 : Japan Revival Vision (Provisional Translation) | Liberal Democratic Party of Japan

Re: The Democratic Revival??? Â«Reply # on: August 24, , amÂ» The former senators were not given a role in the new governments of Alabama and Mississippi.

Eventually it turned out that all the hopes of improving the situation in the Communist Party are useless therefore most of the Demplatform in the Communist Party of Ukraine decided to create its party that would be "not a communist and not anti-communist". Former leaders of "Demplatform" became the basis for the formation of the Party of Democratic Revival of Ukraine. They often were accused of being "repainted" communists. But those people, like Myroslav Popovych already were struggling with the party apparatus from the beginning perestroika process. Those were people with certain experience, intellectual baggage. Immediately within the party were formed two factions: Social Democratic and Liberal Democratic. But the organizational committee decided that at this difficult time democrats should not disperse their forces. Both factions set out to transform Ukraine into a "democratic independent state with an effective market economy and social protection of citizens" defended "priority of human rights over the rights of any social and national community and the priority of people rights over the rights of the state". Almost one in five of the deputies of the Congress was a member of this or that level. Co-chairmen of the Coordinating Council were elected M. Popovych one of the founders of the Rukh , V. Khmelko vice president of the Sociological Association of Ukraine , S. Lylyk Lviv historian and O. Bazylyuk professor of Donetsk. This structure, which had to meet all current party carried the negative. In particular, different approaches to a number of problems, such as a national issue. Hriniov, who considered himself a liberal- bourgeois politician, argued that "the role of the mother, we did not perform a geographical place, and administrative- command system The chance to fight it we get only when it does not oppose the national and wider democratic idea "because" administrative system This is especially manifested August 24, , when V. Hriniov his associates refused to support the Act of Independence of Ukraine to ban the Communist Party. At the end of in Kiev hosted the conference of social and political organization " New Ukraine ". The main goal of creating a "University" was a combination of political influence of party leaders and financial capital businesses. Among the business organizations - the Confederation of Ukraine, the Ukrainian League of enterprises with foreign capital and Ukrbank et al. Reform projects to that time was already prepared by the then Deputy Prime Minister V. But to implement the program V. Scared of radicalism, Vitold Fokin "removed" V. Apparent heterogeneity of the whole " New Ukraine ": The tension between them nearly led to a split in the Congress I, which won the "Independents" and liberals. These events have shown that the primary intent of the " New Ukraine " - to focus on the economy, abstracting from politics - could not be made. Kuchma, becoming prime minister, came out of parliamentary faction " New Ukraine ". His government did not accept V. Lanovyi program, supported by the majority Novoukrainka 3. Within six months after the Congress in the " New Ukraine " sharp disagreement between the "Independents" and "Grand statesmen". The leader of the " New Ukraine " Filenko union tried to turn on the mobile and efficient batch socially liberal for electoral success , but because of the many obstacles tsomu failed. Save sole leader without the threat of schism and without transformation into a political party was impossible. Therefore, the " New Ukraine " became the coalition parties and other public associations, and regional organizations. Its central authorities are not elected by the Congress and formed by the delegation of representatives of the member organizations of the coalition. Each of the regional organizations, institutions, corporate members create their own parliament. The biggest controversy started around the election of governing bodies. Hriniov been chosen, which indicated the rise of "velykoderzhavnykiv. Immediately after the Congress of " N. Hriniov dissatisfied with the President of the Association and who " puts the Ukrainian national interests in the foundation of their activity ," 4. Summer of V. Hriniov resigned as Vice-Chairman, disagreeing with government policy. Speaking on this occasion, V. Coming in the " single fist " Novoukrainka failed, V. While the post-election crisis in, PDVU and "New Ukraine " looking out of this situation because many observers predicted the decline of both organizations, especially after the departure of ICBMs. The congress took place correction program association. Congress showed that the association supports the

decentralized unitary state and a bicameral parliament. Was solved and the language problem. Association recognizes the Ukrainian language, the status of international language and medium of official public communication. Combining emphasizing their involvement in the President, took the position very loyal to the executive. The congress was held on LSPU even scandal, because traditionally the governing bodies of the "New Ukraine " elected party leaders, members of the association. But during the election Filenko protested against the election V. Klymchuka leader LSPU to governing bodies. At the head of the Association elected a prominent politician, mayor of Kharkiv , Yevhen Kushnaryov. Was elected Vice- Anatoliy Matviyenko and Filenko. Congress also noted that the union stands for the Social Liberal democracies 5. Governing bodies are divided into full PDVU meetings, conferences, conventions and functional all other governing bodies. At the highest level governing bodies are PDVU Coordinating Council RC and the Arbitration and audit committee, as well as scientific and editorial and publishing board. Organizes work parties KR, Presidium Secretariat. Chairman of the Presidium is also chairman of the CD.

Chapter 9 : Party of Democratic Revival of Ukraine - Wikipedia

Can the Lib Dems revive? Jump to media player Sir Vince Cable says the Liberal Democrats need to revamp to stay relevant. But is it too late for a Lib Dem revival?