

Initiatives in Liechtenstein - Safety Valve in a Complex System of Government

Wilfried Marxer

[Manuscript version]

Marxer, Wilfried (2012): Initiatives in Liechtenstein - Safety Valve in a Complex System of Government. In: Maija Setälä and Theo Schiller (eds.): Citizens' Initiatives in Europe. Procedures and Consequences of Agenda-Setting by Citizens. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, S. 37-52.

1. Historical and political background

Direct-democratic rights were introduced in the new constitution of Liechtenstein in 1921 as a consequence of World War I and its outcomes - including the political and economic decline of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy - and a growing movement for more democracy in Liechtenstein at that time. During this almost revolutionary period, the first political parties were founded in 1918 (Michalsky 1990; Quaderer-Vogt 1996). In addition, after the ruinous effects of WW I on Austria, the democratic elite in Liechtenstein favored both a stronger relationship with Switzerland rather than Austria and more democracy, demanding not only the election of the government and its Liechtenstein nationality but also direct-democratic rights. This impulse was very much inspired by the Swiss practices of direct democracy at the national level and, even more so, at the cantonal level. Ultimately, the monarchy was not abolished, as happened in Austria, but at all events a dualistic regime was formalized in the new constitution of 1921 by sharing the state power between the prince and people (Quaderer-Vogt 1994; Wille 1994).

This chapter will focus only on the popular initiative in Liechtenstein. But one should not forget that together with the initiative the new constitution of 1921 also established the right to trigger referendums against parliamentary decisions and the right of recall – namely the possibility to dismiss parliament by means of a popular initiative and the subsequent popular vote.¹ One must add, though, that the right to recall parliament has never been used so far. The referendum on international treaties was introduced much later, in 1992, and in 2003 a series of constitutional changes came into force after a popular vote initiated by the princely house. The Liechtenstein political system is very complex and can hardly be compared with the constitutional provisions of

¹ In greater detail: Marxer (forthcoming). Older books and articles, which do not include later developments: Ritter 1990; Batliner 1993; Waschkuhn 1994.

any other established democracy. In fact, it is said that Liechtenstein is a “constitutional, hereditary monarchy on a democratic and parliamentary basis”. It specifies a dualistic system where the power of the state is divided into the power of the prince and the princely house on the one side of the balance, and the power of the people and the parliament as the representative of the people on the other (Riklin 1987; Ignor 1987; Wille 1993). The government is elected in an initial step by parliament – which gives the rough impression of a parliamentary system. On the other hand, the prince has the right to appoint the government and thus a consensus on the government has to be reached between the prince and the parliament at the stage of establishing a cabinet. Once the government is confirmed, both the prince and the parliament have the right to dismiss the government at any time and for any reason, if either has lost confidence in it.

The prince also has the right to sign all laws, regardless of whether they have been decided by parliament or by a popular vote. If he does not sign a law it cannot enter into force. This holds for both ordinary laws and constitutional provisions. Thus the prince has a very prominent status in the political system with influence on legislation and on the government alike. For this reason, the political system of Liechtenstein exhibits more traits of a semi-presidential political system (Marxer 2010, 9-12; cf. Shugart/Carey 1992; Steffani 1979) than of a parliamentary system, which is more typical of the other parliamentary monarchies in Europe. In terms of veto players (cf. Tsebelis 2002) there are quite a number of them in the Liechtenstein political system, creating a complex equilibrium between the different powers in the state, the people with its direct-democratic rights being one of them. Although Liechtenstein receives a high ranking by the Initiative and Referendum Institute Europe (IRI 2004), direct democracy is not the main shaping factor. Rather it is representative democracy and the rule of law which mainly constitute the political system, with direct democracy showing some modifying effects leading to more consensus and moderation (Marxer/Pállinger 2007, 2009).

2. Legal framework

2.1 Instruments

In Liechtenstein initiatives can be triggered by the electorate or by municipalities. It is not necessary to go deeper to the right of the municipalities to trigger an initiative because this has never happened successfully since the provision was introduced in 1921. The procedure would demand an affirmative decision taken on a draft by the citizens of three or four out of all eleven

municipalities, depending on the issue. This procedure seems to be over-complicated compared with the popular initiative directly launched at the national level and, probably for this reason, has never become an important direct-democratic tool.

After 1921, there have been several amendments concerning direct-democratic rights, the most important of these being the referendum on international treaties in 1992, and several newly-established direct-democratic provisions introduced in 2003 through a popular vote initiated by the princely house. In order to preserve the exclusive focus on initiatives at the national level, we will mention only the right to abolish the monarchy. For such an initiative, as many signatures have to be collected as for other constitutional initiatives. If the popular vote ends with a majority in favor of the abolition of the monarchy, the parliament must draft a new, republican constitution. In a popular vote the voters then choose between the existing constitution, the republican draft, and possibly another draft by the prince which does not necessarily have to be a republican one. Obviously this instrument has never been used so far.

Other constitutional revisions related to initiatives concern the number of signatures that are necessary for an initiative. Throughout the whole period of the existing direct-democratic rights there has been a distinction made between initiatives for ordinary laws and initiatives for constitutional laws, the latter requiring fifty percent higher number of signatures than the former. The current requirements are 1000 and 1500 signatures respectively. In relation to the total electorate of around 18,500 voters at present – Liechtenstein citizens, residence in Liechtenstein, voting age of 18–, this amounts to 5.4 per cent of the electorate for ordinary laws and 8.1 per cent for constitutional amendments.

Initiatives can be either formulated or non-formulated. The formulated initiative proposes a precise text concerning an article – or articles – of an ordinary law or the constitution. It cannot be changed during the initiative process, which begins with the official launch and ends with the final decision taken by the electorate. Neither the initiators nor the government or the parliament are allowed to change anything in the draft. When successfully launched and completed with a sufficient number of valid voters' signatures, initiatives are binding on parliament. This means that the parliament cannot change or ignore the initiative. The draft can either be adopted by parliament or rejected, but if it is rejected there must be a ballot on the initiative. If the parliament adopts the initiative the procedure is either considered to be successfully completed, or the parliament can still decide to present the proposal to the people for a final decision in a popular vote.

The non-formulated initiative has no explicitly worded draft, but only a general proposal, and it is not binding on parliament. There has only been one non-formulated initiative so far (2008), and it was not successful.

Initiatives may aim at introducing, altering or abolishing ordinary laws or the constitution in whole or in part. By-laws enacted by the government, in contrast, may not be addressed by an initiative or a referendum. Initiatives are formally and materially checked by the government and the parliament before they are admitted to the collection of signatures. Formal requirements refer to the legitimacy of the initiators, but also to the unity and clearness of the proposal. Material criteria are conformity with the constitution and with international treaties (see below). It may be that the implementation of an initiative proposal would entail financial expense. In this case, and specifically if the expected expense is (at present) higher than 500,000 Swiss francs for a single expenditure or 250,000 Swiss francs for recurrent expenditure, the initiators have to submit a proposal on how to finance the measure since this affects the budgetary powers of the parliament.

2.2 Procedures

In any event, initiatives have to be compatible with the constitution and with international treaties, such as regulations deriving from the Agreement on the European Economic Area (EEA) or the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR). The law prescribes that before signatures can be collected, every initiative has to be registered at the office of the government. The government then checks whether the initiative is in line with the constitution and with international treaties and whether the initiative fulfills all the other formal and material conditions. The government's report on the registered initiative is then passed to the parliament which decides whether or not to admit the initiative. At this pre-checking stage, the government's report to the parliament can be supported by a formal opinion by the constitutional court if the government decides to ask for one. Shortly after the parliament has admitted the initiative – and this is almost always the case – the official launch of the initiative is publicly announced and the time period for collecting signatures begins. The most controversial draft was the initiative from the princely house on the amendment of the constitution, launched in 2002, decided in 2003. In the end, five of the 25 members of parliament refused to admit the initiative since there were concerns that it was not compatible with international treaties, mainly the European Convention on Human Rights and the Statute of the Council of Europe. The initiative was, however, finally admitted with a solid majority.

There are usually two more stages when initiatives are discussed in the parliament. It is when enough validated signatures have been collected for an initiative. The parliament can then adopt or reject the initiative. There will automatically be a ballot in the event of rejection. Where the initiative is adopted, a ballot will only take place if parliament decides so. Between 1999 and 2010, only one out of eight popular initiatives was adopted by the parliament without a popular vote following it. Thirdly, the parliament takes note of the governmental report on the result of an eventual ballot, possibly combined with an additional debate on the issue (which usually doesn't occur).

During the whole process of an initiative, beginning with registration and concluding with the eventual entry into force of the proposed legislative amendment, there are many possibilities for different stakeholders to appeal to the constitutional court. After registration, government can ask the constitutional court for an opinion on the initiative regarding its compatibility with the constitution or international treaties. If, subsequently, an initiative is not admitted by the parliament, the initiators can appeal to the constitutional court. On the other hand, any individual voter can appeal to the court if he or she thinks that an initiative should not be allowed for any reason, either a formal reason such as the legitimacy of the initiators, or a material reason such as incompatibility with the constitution. During the ensuing stages of the initiative process, there are some other opportunities to make a complaint. There can be conflicts about the validation of the signatures, about the role and influence of designated neutral political actors like the government or the prince during a ballot campaign, about irregularities at the ballot and so on. Decisions of the constitutional court are binding and final. In an extreme situation which has not so far occurred, the constitutional court could invalidate a ballot and consequently force a new ballot.

If an initiative is successful after the collection of the required number of signatures, securing approval either by the parliament without a subsequent popular vote, or in a popular vote, the respective bill does not enter into force automatically. Prior to that, it must be signed by the prince. If the sanction by the prince does not take place within six months after the popular vote, the bill cannot enter into force. There is no legal way at all to overrule a refusal by the prince to sign a bill into law.

Time schedule and signature gathering

The time period for collecting signatures for an initiative is six weeks after the official launch. This is a very short period compared to Switzerland, for instance. But since Liechtenstein is a very small country, both geographically and socially tightly-knit, this does not seem to be a very prohibitive

obstacle for initiatives. In practice the typical passage of time from the date of registration until the ballot is not much more than half a year in total, sometimes even less than six months. There is some variation in the length of the pre-check period which can in some circumstances take several more weeks if expert opinions are necessary or if there are judicial complaints. As soon as an initiative proposal reaches the parliament, the law requires that there must be a debate at the very next session on whether to admit the initiative or not. If admitted, a public announcement follows immediately and the period of six weeks for collecting and validating the required signatures begins. After the handing in of the signatures to the government, a governmental report on the successfully launched initiative is sent to parliament within days, a debate on the approval or the rejection of the initiative takes place in the very next session of parliament, and the ballot date must be fixed not longer than three months after the parliamentary debate. Initiatives are thus decided very quickly by the electorate, just like decisions following a referendum.

The collection of signatures can happen in any place: by going from door to door, in private, in restaurants, public places, shopping areas, at meetings etc. There is no official document provided by government or the administration for the collection of signatures. The initiators themselves have to create their own paper form. Electronic signatures are not currently valid. The form has to contain the title, the exact wording of the initiative (in the case of a formulated initiative), and the name of the municipality in which the signatories reside. Those who wish to support the initiative must enter their first and last names, their address, the date of signing and their normal signature. A form can be signed by one or several voters. Before the handing in of all signatures (within the specified time period of six weeks), they have to be validated by the mayors of the respective municipalities. Double or multiple signatures are identified, the signatures of non-registered voters or people who are not allowed to vote in the respective municipality are crossed out, and potentially fake signatures are checked.

Handing over of signatures and debates in parliament

The initiators hand in the collected and validated signatures to the government. The government then reports to the parliament on the successful collection of signatures and on the number of valid and invalid signatures. The parliament is obliged by law to debate the initiative in its next session. It can either adopt the initiative proposal without a popular vote, or adopt the proposal and also decide to have a popular vote in addition to giving parliamentary approval, or it can reject the proposal, which automatically leads to a popular vote to be organized by the government. If the parliament rejects an initiative, it can decide to present its own counter-proposal to the initiative. A simple

parliamentary majority is sufficient for a counter-proposal concerning an ordinary law. Counter-proposals for constitutional amendments require a unanimous decision in a single session, or a qualified majority of three quarters in two consecutive sessions. At the ballot, both the initiative and the counter-proposal are voted on at the same time. It is also possible to have two initiatives dealing with the same issue voted at the same time. If both of them have secured enough signatures they are both decided by popular vote in the same ballot.

The initiators have the right to append a withdrawal clause to their initiative proposal. This means that at any stage of the initiative process the original initiators can withdraw their initiative. Although this has not happened so far in Liechtenstein, the right could be exercised, for instance, if a counter-proposal by the parliament seems to be a better solution to the problem than the initiative proposal, if withdrawal makes sense for strategic reasons or if the circumstances have changed so much that the proposal is no longer necessary or useful. These are only some of the possible hypothetical reasons for the withdrawal of an initiative. An initiative can be withdrawn until the moment when the government has decided on the date for the ballot.

Initiative campaign and ballot

There are no specific legal rules for the initiative campaign. All stakeholders and individual citizens can participate in a campaign, something that is usually done with considerable energy. In recent decades campaigns have become more and more professional. Whereas in earlier times interpersonal communication was an important means of influencing attitudes and opinions, nowadays ballot campaigns are often designed by professionals and carried out rather through advertisements in newspapers, direct mailings, flyers and posters. All stakeholders and active citizens have to provide their own financial resources for campaigning. There is no public funding at all to support initiatives, initiators or initiative campaigns. The only public support is provided by the opportunity offered to the initiators to promote their proposal in the official ballot leaflet. It is sent to all voters. The official documents contain the individual voting card, the initiative proposal in its precise wording, maybe the proposal by a second initiative or a parliamentary counter-proposal, and a leaflet with basic information on the different proposals. There the existing legal framework and the aim(s) of the new proposal(s) are explained. The initiators are invited to promote their initiative in this leaflet. If the government or the parliament wishes to recommend either adoption or rejection of the initiative, they are free to use the leaflet to do so. Finally, the ballot leaflet contains information on the ballot procedure.

Regarding the media, there is a tight relationship between the two main parties and the print media. The newspapers are still the most important domestic channel of public and political communication in Liechtenstein. The television is unable to contribute very much to political communication in Liechtenstein since it is dominated by foreign channels – mainly German-speaking stations from Switzerland, Germany and Austria – and these channels do not report regularly and in-depth on Liechtenstein politics. Nevertheless, there is a great variety of information sources, such as the newspapers, interpersonal communication, ballot campaigns of different stakeholders, the official ballot information, and eventually controversial debates that are broadcasted on the public video channel which usually only shows public teletext information via cable television. The newspapers, although party newspapers, also provide important discussion forums, allowing their readers and different stakeholders to have their voices heard via letters to the editor and articles in the newspapers. (Marxer 2004a, 407f., 2004b, 220-232; Marcinkowski/Marxer 2006).

In most cases, initiatives and other direct-democratic procedures do not create a huge number of journalists' articles, letters to the editor, interviews, comments, official statements or advertisements in the media. Nevertheless, the newspapers are always an important platform for information and deliberation, open not only to the respective party representatives and the party-biased journalists, but also to the public and electorate at large. A media analysis which includes all popular votes up to 2007 reveals differences from one initiative to another (Marxer forthcoming). The range is from less than ten to more than 1000 articles in a single newspaper. However, most initiatives produce between 10 and 50 articles. An initiative in the 1930s on the introduction of a proportional electoral system generated 168 articles. The highest number was produced in connection with the initiatives on the amendment of the constitution in 2003 (cf. Marcinkowski/Marxer 2010). In this special case, however, two parallel initiatives were launched, and the time period for reporting and commenting was significantly longer than in any other case, running over many years. The other initiatives did not have comparably long periods of discussion and debate. Media attention usually begins only with the registration of an initiative, whereas the gestation of an initiative tends to take place away from the public eye and is therefore rarely reported in the newspapers.

The ballot was originally held only in the form of voters' direct participation at the ballot box in the respective municipality. Since 2004 postal voting has been allowed, and this method of voting is already reaching the very high level of 90 percent of all votes.

Result

The system for counting votes depends on the number of proposals on the specific issue. Simple majority is required if there is only one proposal. If exactly 50 percent of the votes are in favor of the new proposal and 50 percent against it, the existing legal regulation remains in place. Non-valid votes are registered but they do not count. There are no quorums, neither with respect to voter turnout, nor the number of approving constituencies or municipalities. A simple majority rule with equal weight for all valid votes holds for ballot decisions.

If there is more than one proposal on the same issue at the same ballot, voters are first asked whether they will accept or refuse proposal A or proposal B. Then they are asked whether they prefer proposal A or proposal B in case they vote for both of them. The second question only becomes relevant if both proposals receive a majority of valid votes. The preference vote then is only attributed to the regarding proposal. If a proposal has been rejected by a popular vote, a blocking period of two years begins. During these two years no initiative dealing the same issue can be registered.

3. Popular initiatives between 1921 and 2010

The instrument of the popular initiative has been used regularly since its introduction in 1921. From 1919 up to the present – even before direct-democratic rights were formally introduced in the 1921 constitution – there have been popular votes on 100 proposals, divided into 34 popular initiatives, 24 popular referendums and 42 administrative referendums, six of the administrative referendums being counter-proposals to popular initiatives. One can observe a slight increase in the use of the initiative over time. The maximum number of initiatives per one year has been three (1985 and 1989), but there are also many years and even longer periods when there have been no popular initiatives. Most initiatives proceed to a popular vote without a parliamentary counter-proposal.

Table 1: Number and success rate of different popular votes (1921-2010)

	Administrative referendum	Popular initiative	Popular referendum	Total
Total	42	34	24	100
Draft approved at ballot	22	13	10	45
Percent approved at ballot	52 %	38 %	42 %	45 %

There has been only one non-formulated initiative until now, all the others being fully formulated initiatives. The only non-formulated initiative was launched in 2008 and was aimed at changing the system for retirement pension insurance of the employees of the national public administration. The parliament, though, decided to revise the system differently and also decided not to have a popular vote on the non-formulated proposal, so the initiative was terminated.

Topics and makers of initiatives

A great variety of topics have been covered by popular initiatives in Liechtenstein, not least due to the fact that initiatives may refer not only to constitutional laws, but also to ordinary laws. This opens up a broad field of single-issue concerns. Among the rather important issues, there are, for instance, popular initiatives on equal rights for men and women (1985), the introduction of the right of referendum on international treaties (1989), and the fundamental revision of the constitution (2003), whereas the initiatives on fishing and hunting (1954, 1961), alcohol tax (1968) or the trade initiative (1964) rather serve special interest groups.

Political parties are very actively using the instrument of the popular initiative. 17 of the total of 34 popular initiatives (50 per cent) were launched by one or more political party, in a few cases together with other stakeholders. Ten out of the 34 initiatives were triggered by a committee, sometimes composed of active citizens, but even more usually in a cooperation of different interest groups and associations, such as the trade association or other business organizations, the fishing club, or other NGOs. Six initiatives were carried mainly by individuals with joint interests and goals, sometimes even by only one person at the beginning. Finally, there is the special case of an initiative by the prince and his heir, formally also a popular initiative.

Success and impact of initiatives

It was until after World War II when the first successful initiative occurred. Before this there had been five unsuccessful initiatives, with a maximum of 47.3 per cent approval at the ballot. During the 1950s and 1960s, though, several initiatives succeeded and only a few failed. In recent times, about a half of all initiatives have been successful.

If we wish to ascertain what, if any, effect (and the size of the effect) individual initiatives have had in a direct or indirect way, every single case must be examined in greater detail. It demonstrates that there is a broad variety of histories and effects. An initiative can be the starting point, a stepping stone, or the end of a development. Whether an initiative can be interpreted as successful or not is not always a simple question of gaining the majority of votes at the ballot. It can be that the

initiative kick-starts a political process which results later in confirmatory decisions in parliament, or inspires succeeding initiatives, which, in a long-term perspective, steer the original initiative to a late and indirect success.

There is indeed a considerable spectrum of initiatives, with different background histories, evolutions, effects, and from short- to long-term consequences. Some are unsuccessful initiatives which achieved success in the long-term via a parliamentary decision (proportional electoral system in 1930s), others are voted on twice, initially being unsuccessful, but with a late success in a second ballot (treaty referendum 1989 and 1992), and there are competing popular initiatives at the same ballot with the “double yes” voting system applied (constitutional amendment 2003 with one draft adopted).

4. Political significance of initiatives

The prominent role of parties in the initiative process demonstrates that initiatives offer the parties another mode of politics, away from the formal procedures in government and parliament. In fact, initiatives are launched by parties if there is no longer any hope that an issue will be passed by parliament. This holds not only for parties which are at the time without a mandate in parliament and therefore can only choose a strategy outside the parliamentary decision-making process; it is the same for the minority parties in the parliament, and, furthermore, it applies even to parties with a majority in parliament at a time when a revision of an article of the constitution is being considered. In this case, a qualified majority of votes in the parliament is required, which for most of the past was far beyond the capacity of any single party. Initiatives therefore can deblock political standoffs and activate processes effectively.

Direct-democratic rights are broadly accepted in Liechtenstein by citizens, interest groups, parties, and all the constitutional bodies such as the government, parliament, and explicitly also the prince. Since their introduction with the constitution of 1921, direct-democratic rights have not been reduced in any way. On the contrary, the citizens’ direct involvement in politics – with binding outcomes – has even expanded substantially. The palette of direct-democratic tools has been extended with the addition of the referendum on international treaties. More direct-democratic instruments were adopted also in the course of a revision of the constitution in 2003 including the right to abolish the monarchy in a legal way. In addition, the relative number of signatures required for a popular vote has been steadily sinking over the decades as a consequence of the increase in the

size of the electorate. This has not been accompanied by a commensurate increase in the signature quorum. Thus, it should actually be easier today to trigger an initiative than it was in the past. But we must also take into consideration that society has become more anonymous than before and thus the collection of signatures might now be somewhat more demanding.

The high level of public acceptance of direct-democratic rights in Liechtenstein is also expressed in the high voter turnout. Although it has significantly decreased on average over the decades from the high level of participation of around 90 per cent of the voters in the 1920s and 1930s, it is still remarkably high with an average of 60.6 per cent at 10 ballots from 1990 to 2010. In addition, the introduction of absentee voting for all registered voters in 2004 helped to stabilize participation as this option substantially lowers the hurdle for casting a vote. Voter turnout thus remains rather high and presents no cause for concern. Yet it is striking that participation is selective, depending on the salience of an issue and the intensity of public debate and media coverage. It ranges from over 90 per cent to not much more than 50 per cent. The average turnout amounts to 75 per cent from 1921 to 2010, and to 72 per cent between 1980 and 2010. The last peak with 87.7 per cent resulted at the ballot on the constitutional amendment in 2003.

Concluding remarks: ‘Safety valve’ and ‘emergency brake’

In comparison with Switzerland it is remarkable that in Liechtenstein significantly more initiatives pass the hurdle of a popular vote. The difference can be explained mainly by the differing targets for the use of an initiative in Switzerland and Liechtenstein. In Switzerland, initiatives to amend the constitution are in most cases not launched with a real perspective of being successful at the ballot, but in order to put an issue on the political and publicly debated agenda. In many cases, this is a first step or stepping-stone towards a final provision or another measure, perhaps ultimately taken by the parliament long afterwards. In Liechtenstein, initiatives (and referendums), regarding the constitution and ordinary laws as well, usually have a considerable chance of being successful. They are not usually triggered in order to send out a political signal, but in order to promote an issue successfully and in a direct and binding way.

Indeed, 13 of the total of 34 initiatives since 1921 have been successful – that is to say 38 per cent. Initiatives are therefore not mainly instruments of political communication, but a direct way of pursuing political goals. But this is rather the exception, whereas normally the representative bodies – the parliament and the government – take the decisions without direct-democratic interventions.

Initiatives are triggered infrequently, but when they are, the aim is more than mere policy agenda-setting. The same with the referendum: when it is launched, more than half of all parliamentary drafts are actually rejected in a final popular vote. Initiatives and referendums, therefore, have the character of a safety valve (initiative) or an emergency brake (referendum). They are not triggered routinely and expansively as in Switzerland, but only if there is enough power, pressure, and perhaps also anger and emotion to be mobilized.

References

- Batliner, Martin (1993): Die politischen Volksrechte im Fürstentum Liechtenstein. Fribourg: Institut du Fédéralisme Fribourg Suisse (Diss. iur. Publikationen des Instituts für Föderalismus, 8).
- Ignor, Alexander (1987): Monarchisches und demokratisches Prinzip in der liechtensteinischen Verfassung. In: Press, Volker; Willoweit, Dietmar (ed.): Liechtenstein – Fürstliches Haus und staatliche Ordnung. Vaduz/München/Wien: Verlag der Liechtensteinischen Akademischen Gesellschaft/Oldenbourg, pp. 465–485.
- Initiative & Referendum Institute Europe; Kaufmann, Bruno (eds.) (2004): Initiative & Referendum Monitor 2004/05. The IRI Europe Toolkit for Free and Fair Referendums and Citizens' Initiatives (cooperation: Andreas Gross, Paul Carline, Juri Ruus et al.). Amsterdam.
- Marcinkowski, Frank; Marxer, Wilfried (2006): Die Medien im Dienste der Politik. Politische Kommunikationskultur im Fürstentum Liechtenstein. In: Blum, Roger; Meier, Peter; Gysin, Nicole (eds.): Wes Land ich bin, des Lied ich sing? Bern: Haupt (Berner Texte zur Kommunikations- und Medienwissenschaft, 10), pp. 109–125.
- Marcinkowski, Frank; Marxer, Wilfried (2010): Öffentlichkeit, öffentliche Meinung und direkte Demokratie. Eine Fallstudie zur Verfassungsreform in Liechtenstein. Schaan: Verlag der Liechtensteinischen Akademischen Gesellschaft (Liechtenstein Politische Schriften, 47).
- Marxer, Wilfried (forthcoming): Direkte Demokratie in Liechtenstein. Schaan: Verlag der Liechtensteinischen Akademischen Gesellschaft.
- Marxer, Wilfried (2004a): Darstellung der Mediensysteme - Liechtenstein. In: Hans-Bredow-Institut für Medienforschung der Universität Hamburg (ed.): Internationales Handbuch Medien. Baden-Baden: Nomos, pp. 403–412.

- Marxer, Wilfried (2004b): Medien in Liechtenstein. Strukturanalyse des Mediensystems in einem Kleinstaat. Schaan: Verlag der Liechtensteinischen Akademischen Gesellschaft (Liechtenstein Politische Schriften, 37).
- Marxer, Wilfried (2006): Das Parteiensystem Liechtensteins. In: Niedermayer, Oskar; Haas, Melanie; Stöss, Richard (eds.): Die Parteiensysteme Westeuropas. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften/GWV Fachverlage GmbH Wiesbaden, pp. 299–320.
- Marxer, Wilfried (2010): Notizen zur Direktwahl der Regierung in Liechtenstein. Bendern (Arbeitspapiere Liechtenstein-Institut, 27).
- Marxer, Wilfried; Pállinger, Zoltán Tibor (2007): System contexts and system effects of direct democracy – direct democracy in Liechtenstein and Switzerland compared. In: Pállinger, Zoltán Tibor; Kaufmann, Bruno; Marxer, Wilfried; Schiller, Theo (eds.): Direct Democracy in Europe. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften (Direct Democracy in Modern Europe, 1), pp. 12–29.
- Marxer, Wilfried; Pállinger, Zoltán Tibor (2009): Stabilizing or destabilizing? Direct-democratic instruments in different political systems. In: Setälä, Maija; Schiller, Theo (eds.): Referendums and Representative Democracy. Responsiveness, accountability and deliberation. London/New York: Routledge (ECPR Studies in European Political Science, 62), pp. 34–55.
- Michalsky, Helga (1990): Die Entstehung der liechtensteinischen Parteien im mitteleuropäischen Demokratisierungsprozess. In: Geiger, Peter; Waschkuhn, Arno (eds.): Liechtenstein. Kleinheit und Interdependenz. Vaduz: Verlag der Liechtensteinischen Akademischen Gesellschaft (Liechtenstein Politische Schriften, 14), pp. 221–256.
- Quaderer-Vogt, Rupert (1994): Der historische Hintergrund der Verfassungsdiskussion von 1921. In: Batliner, Gerard (ed.): Die Verfassung von 1921. Elemente der staatlichen Organisation. Vaduz: Verlag der Liechtensteinischen Akademischen Gesellschaft (Liechtenstein Politische Schriften, 21), pp. 105–140.
- Quaderer-Vogt, Rupert (1996): Wege und Umwege zu den Parteigründungen in Liechtenstein. Vaterländische Union. In: Vaterländische Union (ed.): Die Schlossabmachungen vom September 1920. Vaduz: Vaterländische Union, pp. 20–57.
- Riklin, Alois (1987): Liechtensteins politische Ordnung als Mischverfassung. Vaduz: Verlag der Liechtensteinischen Akademischen Gesellschaft (Kleine Schriften, 11).
- Ritter, Michael (1990): Besonderheiten der direkten Demokratie Liechtensteins im Vergleich zur Schweiz. In: Liechtensteinische Juristen-Zeitschrift, Jg. 11, H. 1, pp. 2–8.

- Shugart, Matthew Soberg; Carey, John M. (1992): Presidents and Assemblies. Constitutional Design and Electoral Dynamics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Steffani, Winfried (1979): Parlamentarische und präsidentielle Demokratie. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Tsebelis, George (2002): Veto Players. How Political Institutions Work. New York: Russell Sage.
- Wille Herbert (1993): Verfassungsgerichtsbarkeit und duale Staatsordnung im Fürstentum Liechtenstein. In: Riklin, Alois; Wildhaber, Luzius; Wille, Herbert (eds.): Kleinstaat und Menschenrechte. Festgabe für Gerard Batliner zum 65. Geburtstag. Basel/Frankfurt a.M.: Helbing & Lichtenhahn, pp. 95–116.
- Wille, Herbert (1994): Monarchie und Demokratie als Kontroversfragen der Verfassung 1921. In: Batliner, Gerard (ed.): Die liechtensteinische Verfassung von 1921. Elemente der staatlichen Organisation. Vaduz: Verlag der Liechtensteinischen Akademischen Gesellschaft (Liechtenstein Politische Schriften, 21), pp. 141–199.
- Waschkuhn, Arno (1994): Politisches System Liechtensteins. Kontinuität und Wandel. Vaduz: Verlag der Liechtensteinischen Akademischen Gesellschaft (Liechtenstein Politische Schriften, 18).

Table: Initiatives in Liechtenstein 1921-2010 (bold = successful)

Year	Title	Voter turnout (%)	Yes votes (%)
1925	Civil process order	85.8	9.9
1927	Liberalization of building industry	83.3	44.2
1930	Proportional representation system	90.5	39.3
1930	Proportional representation system	90.5	39.3
1935	Proportional representation system	95.6	47.3
1947	Reduction of rate of taxation	83.8	58.7
1954	Fishing licences	75.7	61.1
1961	Law on land surveying	74.6	60.9
1961	Hunting law	80.4	51.0
1964	Trade initiative	83	37.5
1965	Family grants	76.8	63.4
1968	Abolition of alcohol tax	70.8	43.7
1970	Tax adjustment among the communities	79.3	67.6
1975	Allocation of seats in parliament	86.5	49.7
1981	Allocation of seats in parliament	89.7	47.1
1985	Equal rights for men and women	70.9	23.3
1985	Increase in number of members of parliament	71.5	43.6
1985	Increase in number of members of parliament	71.5	39.0
1987	Introduction of double "Yes" in referendums	54.1	62.9
1989	Introduction of referendum on treaties	64.9	43.2
1989	Controlling of administration of justice	52.4	56.5
1989	Minority right of control	52.4	58.8
1991	Five day week in schools	69.2	34.7
1992	Ban on discrimination	53.6	24.6
1992	Introduction of referendum on treaties	64.8	71.4

1992	Abolition of 8% barring clause	53.6	32.3
1999	Law on health insurance	82.1	34.0
2002	Sustainable traffic policy	64.6	45.5
2003	Amendment of constitution I	87.7	64.3
2003	Amendment of constitution II	87.7	16.6
2005	Against abortion and euthanasia	64.5	18.7
2008	Liberalization of anti-smoking in restaurants	no ballot	adopted by parliament
2008	Retirement pension insurance for public administration (non-formulated initiative)	no ballot	rejected by parliament
2009	Liberalization of mobile communications	66.3	57.0