

By having recently entered the straight line to their accession to NATO and the EU, South-eastern European countries are objectively determined to re-examine their evolution after 1989, to change and to change their governance type.

Democratic populism slowed down transition in South-eastern European countries. In Romania it was also used in the 2000 election campaign, but it has become more and more obvious that – in order to avoid the aggravation of already existing crises – it should be replaced by a **pluralist and functional democracy**. My thesis is that **efficient reforms are not possible in South-eastern European countries unless democratic populism is replaced by a pluralist democracy, in the least.**

In a general, but nevertheless indicative description, transition from democratic populism to pluralist democracy means: transition from a language metaphorically called, without taking into consideration all the implications, *langue du bois* – a language with rather vague concepts, with impaired critical function, reminding of codes of behaviour specific of institutions left without people (a language organised around such terms as “democratic system“, “kind person“, “political dialogue“ etc. even after such terms have become depoliticised and neutralised) – to a differentiated language that defines its terms and preserves them at a critical distance from reality, taking over the inevitably political substance of social reality; giving up such general outlook on nature, society and human being that focuses on “the general laws of nature and society“, “historical destiny“, “spiritual value of the individual“ in favour of **views that allow for the dependence of nature on history, of history on the context created by human initiative, of the individual on the cultural environment**; substitution of the interpretation of history from the viewpoint of “the national spirit“, of “the international conjuration“ or of “tradition“ and “geographical position“ with an interpretation which takes into consideration the **cultural and actional genesis of historical events**; replacement of the decision-making framework in which decisions are imposed by aleatory forces in society (interest and pressure groups, violence of private groups, “the public eye“ and “the voice of the citizen“ in its elementary and false form, “democratic popular forces“ etc.) with a **decision-making framework in which the public sphere and the state are deliniated, the public sphere encourages a debate which is not distorted by tacit structures of the power, and the legislative, executive and juridical bodies are sufficiently separated**; reduction of political commitment in the basic institutions of the state – presidency, public officers, law and order, defence, foreign office – by establishing the **civil structure of the state, based on defining the public interest as something different comparing to the multitude of private interests and on promoting it.**

4

What needs to be done in order that the transition from democratic populism to pluralist democracy should gain the required speed? The answer should consider the new geography of alliances on the global scene and the fact that **the home policy of every country, defined in relation to its own interests and drives, is the decisive factor**. With regard to reconstruction in the countries of transition from eastern socialism to open society in South-eastern Europe, I consider that the change in governance can be catalysed by **multilateral action** which should include: improvement of the **mass media system** towards promoting pluralism of approaches and cultivating comparative thinking; support for re-launching research in **social sciences with reference to the particular environment** and development of local **self-reflection, analytical capacity** and of commitment to his own problems; encouraging transition from decision-making systems based exclusively on vote to systems which include double legitimacy (vote and examination performed by specialised bodies) for the decisions made; development of the capacity of issuing and adopting laws and legal regulations; the effective **separation of the powers in the state** and the immediate establishment of **depoliticised public officers**; giving up, once and for all, the recruitment procedures for leaders and institution managers on