BLOCK IV

Democratization

DEMOCRATIZATION

Democratization is a process leading to the introduction, institutionalization and consolidation of democracy in non-democratic societies. Democracy signifies rule of people and is a way to reconcile interests of various groups in politics through negotiation rather than violence. It is not only a form of government but also a social condition or a way of life. In a true democracy, there is a two way communication between the government or state and the citizens. The government is elected by the citizens based on their performance while the government is accountable to the people for its actions. Active participation from the citizens acts as a limitation on government's power and keeps authoritarian tendencies in check. As a process, democratization does not have a single defined path. It is a gradual process which takes time to consolidate.

The idea of democracy has played an important role in taking forward the world civilization. It has helped in transforming the world from power structures of monarchy, empire and conquest to rule by the people, self-determination and peaceful co-existence. Democracy ultimately leads to establishment of values like liberty, equality and justice leading to social cohesion through cooperation among citizens. At the international level, democracy plays an important role as reflected in democratic peace theory propounded by German philosopher Immanuel Kant. This theory believes that democratic states do not wage a war against each other and hence, ensure world peace. In comparative politics, it is important to analyze the process of democratization as it helps in drawing conclusions regarding different countries and the reasons which lead to this process. Such analysis helps us in understanding questions like – can a country become a democracy irrespective of its history, level of economic development or political culture? Are there some preconditions for democracy to take roots in a country and flourish? Why the process of democratization failed in some states while it succeeded in others? In the two units of this block we examine the challenges to the process of democratization in the newly emergent countries of the Global South and in states that transitioned from authoritarian structures during the Third wave of democratisation that began in the 1970s.

UNIT 11 PROCESS OF DEMOCATIZATION IN POST-COLONIAL COUNTRIES[*]

Structure

11.0 Objectives

11.1 Introduction

11.2 Conceptualising Democracy: Procedural and Substantive Democracy

11.3 Post-colonial Countries: Chequered Democratic Process

    11.3.1 Explaining Democratic Process in Post-colonial countries

11.4 Democratic Transition in Post-colonial Countries

11.5 Let Us Sum Up

11.6 References

11.7 Answers to Check Your Progress Exercises

11.0 OBJECTIVES

This unit will discuss the process of democratization in post-colonial countries. After going through this unit, you should be able to:

- Distinguish the procedural and substantive aspects of democracy
- Describe the process of democratization in post-colonial countries
- Identify the reasons for the chequered democratic process in post-colonial countries.

11.1 INTRODUCTION

While the world has witnessed crumbling of most of the old certitudes of politics, the 'idea of democracy' has survived and endured. The global acceptance of democracy both as an idea and as practice has been very much evident in the last three decades. Countries which for long were under the authoritarian regime have been undergoing the process of democratic transition / transformation over the last three decades. As a result, what had once been a small and homogenous group of democratic regimes until some decades ago, confined mostly to the West, has now become large and heterogeneous in the new millennium.

Samuel Huntington (1991) in one of his very influential work has surveyed democratic transitions happening over the past two centuries and has identified

---

[*]Prof. Ashutosh Kumar, Professor and Chairperson, Department of Political Science, Panjab University, Chandigarh, India

three distinctive 'waves' of democratization. The 'first wave', a long one, lasted from the American and French Revolution through World War I. As he observes, from 1826 to 1926 there was a gradual and an uneven spread of democracy through most of industrialising West European countries. However, the process got disrupted with the rise of authoritarian and totalitarian regimes cropping up in the inter-war period all over the world, includingin the West.

The 'second wave' of democratic transition happened after the ousting of authoritarian regimes in countries like Germany, Italy, Japan, among others. It lasted from World War II until the mid-1960s. Beginning 1943, it brought democracy to most of the Western Europe. The end of the Second World War also witnessed the liberation of the colonial countries and subsequent setting up of democratic regimes in these newly independent postcolonial countries such as India, Pakistan, Nigeria, Sri Lanka, among others. While a majority of postcolonial countries formally adopted democratic political systems, quite a number of them lapsed into authoritarianism in the first decade of their democratic career itself. There was the reversal in the democratization process as most of Asia, Africa, and Latin America quickly turned authoritarian in the reverse wave (Roskin*et al.*, 2003: 87). Even older post-colonial democracies like Chile and Uruguay were swept away in the 'reverse wave' (Almond *et al.*, 2004: 28).

The 'third wave of democratization' was ushered in the mid 1970s with the overthrow of dictators and formation of democratic regimes in Portugal, Greece and Spain. Despite this, only one-fourth of the independent states could be characterised as being under democratic rule (Diamond,1999: 24; Almond *et al*, 2004: 28-29). In 1973, only 45 out of 151 countries qualified as political/electoral democracies. It was with the fall of the Berlin wall in 1989 and the collapse of communist regimes in East European countries that democratization again became a global trend. Since the end of thetwentieth century, democratization process has continued unabated. The 'third wave of democracy' swept not only the post-communist countries but also the post-colonial countries of Africa, Latin America and Asia for whom it was once again going back to democratic institutions after experiencing authoritarian/ despotic rule for considerable period of time. In fact, by the end of the twentieth century, three-fourth of the countries in the world had already become democratic (Mair, 2013:86). In one informed estimate, by the year 2003, 63 per cent of states accounting for close to 70 per cent of the global population were under liberal-democratic regimes (Heywood, 2013:275). Thus, the last three decades have witnessed transitions to democracy all over the world at large scale, not being confined to any particular geographical-political region.

With the political, economic and cultural processes of globalization overwhelming the world in the new millennium, democracy as a form of 'good governance' received wider acceptance as the best form of governance for the countries across the world. As democratic transitions have continued unabated, democratisation along with modernisation has come to be regarded as 'a natural and inevitable process' and that 'all systems of rule are destined, sooner or later, to collapse and be remodelled on liberal-democratic lines' (Thoreau, 2013:276). Modernisation in a gradual manner eroded the legitimacy of the non-democratic

ideologies promoted by authoritarian regimes, while the development of citizens' skills and political resources made their claim to equal participation in policy making more plausible' (Almond *et al*, 2004:59) Przeworski (1991) has argued that democratization all over the world have generally involved either of the three processes which sometime may be unfolding simultaneously also. These are namely: a) the breakdown of the old regime b) construction of new liberal-democratic structures and processes in the form of democratic transition c) the overall acceptance of newly established democratic structures and processes in the minds of the political elites and the masses.

Democracy being globally accepted as the 'only game in the town' can be attributed to the emergent world capitalist economic system led by liberal developed democracies. The lending global institutions namely the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (IMF), dominated by the cash-rich developed countries, have put the adoption of democratic form of government as one of the conditions on the loan-seeking poorer countries of Asia and Africa. The collapse of erstwhile Soviet Union discredited the socialist system of economy and governance so there was also an ideological push towards democratisation in the post-communist countries. After the demise of communism, as Linz (2000) observed way back, there was no alternative to democracy as a principle of legitimacy. Thus, global and transnational influences led to the transplantation of democratic institutions in the various countries almost as much by coercive economic diplomacy as by ready acceptance of the idea of liberal democracy.

At the same time, the democratic transitions in such a vast number of countries over the last three decades have differed from each other in significant ways, drawing the scholarly focus on the quality of democracies in these countries. Of late, there has been 'a newer concern with explaining why some democracies seem 'better' than others' as the scholars undertake informed studies to assess the 'degree' of democracy in different countries (Mair, 2011: 99). In order to measure the quality of democracy, the 'democracy barometer' studies have been undertaken in comparative mode (Geissel, Brigitte, Marianne Kneuer and Hans-Joachim Lauth, 2016).

11.2 CONCEPTUALISING DEMOCRACY

Democracy as a form of government works with a set of rules/procedures and the representative institutions by which citizens can elect their representatives to govern and hold them accountable in free and fair elections periodically. The principle of taking a collective decision by a group of persons, organized as a polity, lies at the core of the concept of a representative democracy. It has been argued by the political theorists that in a democratic polity, the most plausible procedure for arriving at a commonly agreed upon decision is the principle of majority rule which is considered as the most practical and morally acceptable. The essential value of democracy thus lies in its being an ethical way of taking a collective decision that supposedly take everybody's interests in to account, and is equally binding on everyone. Taking a collective decision on unanimous basis is always impossible in any society howsoever homogenous it might be. Also due to the large population in the modern states, it is not possible for the citizens to gather together to make decisions by majority on every issue as was possible in

Athenian democracy, hence the need to bring in the concept of representative democracy. Taking decisions by majority in a representative democracy enjoys a moral superiority over any other procedure to arrive at a collective decision like on the basis of a minority or alternatively according to the wishes of an individual or a small group of people. Majority, however, is a fluid concept in a democratic polity in the sense that an individual or a group of people can be in majority or in minority on different occasions depending on their stand on any particular issue or set of issues. Majority in a democracy is never constituted/constructed on the basis of any fixed primordial identity like religion or caste.

The minimum sets of basic principles that underpin and justify a liberal democracy are the following: first, the acceptance of the idea of individual autonomy. It is assumed that individuals as autonomous beings are capable of rational thought and therefore capable of deciding what is good for them; second, all individuals have equal say in the determination of collective decisions, which affects them all equally.

To sum up this part of discussion, in political theory, there are two distinct ways of conceptualising democracy. The procedural definition of democracy refers to it primarily as a set of institutions and procedures that helps in arriving at collective decisions which are to be executed through the elected representatives that represent the majority. In this view, a modern state can be viewed as having a successful democratic regime if it has the following institutions and procedures therein: rule of law, independent election commission, electoral rules, free and fair elections, legislative assemblies, independent judiciary, autonomous non-elected offices, rational-legal bureaucracy, free press, rights, and constitutional governments. However, for many thinkers who invoke substantive definition of democracy, these institutions and procedures are essential but not sufficient for making a democratic polity successful. In their view, one can have a democracy in a real sense only if it is being peopled by truly equal citizens, who are politically engaged, tolerant of different opinions and ways of life and have an equal voice in electing their rulers and holding them accountable. In the limited procedural definition of democracy, as mentioned above, it is the electoral aspect of democracy which gets emphasised the most. The high level of electoral participation, frequency of elections, contestation and periodic change in political power are taken as indicators of the health of democracy. The ones prioritising the substantive notion of democracy would, however, raise the question mark about the narrowness in making electoral democracy as synonymous of true democracy. Their argument would be that if a particular political society has deep social and economic inequalities involving the ethno-cultural communities including the minorities and women then how these groups would be able to participate effectively in the electoral process. Their social and economic marginality would not allow them to act in an autonomous manner. Proponents of the substantive definition of democracy would thus argue that the democratic project remains incomplete until the equal rights of citizenship have been guaranteed to all in a political society. On this account, allowing political freedoms and equality to all the citizens are necessary, but by no means sufficient conditions for a democracy to be successful. The project of democracy is not accomplished merely by putting in place and securing legal-constitutional order.

The argument by the proponents of substantive notion of democracy is that freedom to exercise the democratic choices gets severely restricted by social and economic inequalities as they deny people to have a truly equal opportunity to influence government decisions.

The above discussion about the two notions of democracy namely procedural and substantive, leads us to a pertinent question. Do we have a perfectly substantive democracy anywhere in the world? Are there any democracies where one does not find inequalities of class, race and gender? Also, there has been presence of varying degrees of social and economic marginalities in almost all democracies more so in the post-colonial societies. The inference one can draw is that no democracy is a perfect one nor was even Athenian democracy. At the same time, however, there have been qualitative differences among all polities which claim to be democratic.

The excessive concern with the procedural and not the substantive aspect of democracy in the present globalised world raises uncomfortable questions about the tendency to undertake quantitative and not the qualitative assessment of democracies by comparative theorists. Globally particular attention is being given to the procedural aspects like mere presence of the democratic institutions (mainly elections) when it comes to 'certify' a country having a democratic regime. Not much attention is being paid on assessing the level of responsiveness or accountability factor involving various elected and non-elected institutions. Electoral participation and mere presence of more than one party in the fray is considered sufficient to consider/certify a country as a democratic one. The question whether the regime is rights-based or not no longer seems that important while classifying a regime as a democratic one.

Check Your Progress Exercise 1

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) See the end of the unit for tips for your answer.

1) What is meant by procedural democracy?

……………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………

………..…………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………

11.3 POST-COLONIAL COUNTRIES: CHEQUERED DEMOCRATIC PROCESS

It is remarkable that very few post-colonial states in the world were able to remain democratic despite starting as democratic ones after decolonisation. In a very short period, democratic regimes were overthrown and authoritarianism set in. Decolonisation had witnessed the transfer of the political power to the local

political elites by the imperial regimes in these former colonies. The post-colonial state elites had led the nationalist struggle in these states while holding out democratic promises to the masses. The state elites enjoyed a very high level of peoples' confidence and legitimacy due to their role in leading the anti-colonial resistance. They were also viewed as being capable of rising over and above the sectional interests. There was also wider acceptance of their key role even in the economic sector mainly because of the absence of any developed class which could mobilise resources for the developmental purposes and also because the state was also endowed with a prescience to know what was the best for the people. However, very soon the disenchantment set in as the state elites started dismantling the nascent democratic structure, subverting the democratic procedures and undermining the democratic institutions. Most of these democratic regimes turned into authoritarian ones by the same political elites under the pretext of bringing about radical social and economic changes swiftly without allowing themselves to be constrained by the democratic procedures and institutions. These leaders often credited to lead the anti-colonial movements in their respective countries like Yoweri Museveni (Uganda), Milton Obote (Uganda), Julius Nyerere (Tanzania), Jomo Kenyatta (Kenya), Robert Mugabe (Uganda), among many others, all turned into authoritarian figures. In India's neighbourhood, Pakistan also witnessed the bungling of the political elite which allowed the military to take over. In Bangladesh, Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, revered as the '*BangaBandhu*', took over as the prime minister of the country after secession from Pakistan. However, he also soon turned authoritarian resulting in his assassination and military takeover. Other Asian countries also like Pakistan, Malaysia, Singapore, Vietnam, Taiwan, Thailand, Sri Lanka and Afghanistan have had chequered democratic careers and even when they have had elected governments; there has been a question mark over their credentials as the governments have been dominated by authoritarian populist leaders. As AshutoshVarshney (2013: 10) points out, the post-colonial experiences show that the deepening of democracy and the presence of democracy are analytically separable. Democracy in any case has not been a constant variable in these countries. There have been times when these countries have been under democratic regimes and in other times it would be authoritarian regime in power. And even when they pass on as electoral democracies, they exhibit major flaws. As has been pointed out, among the post-colonial countries, very few countries like India, Mauritius, Belize, Jamaica, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu have managed to remain 'actually existing democracies' all these years (Varshney, 2013: 12). Even India, considered the signpost of liberal democracy among the post-colonial countries, experienced democratic backsliding during two years of emergency (1975-77) when the democratic freedoms were curtailed and the elected and non-elected institutions were subverted.

11.3.1 Explaining Democratic Process in Post Colonial Countries

How can one explain the failure of the post-colonial countries to remain democratic consistently over the last seven decades? Shifting through the relevant academic literature, one comes across several factors that can be attributed to the chequered nature of the democratic career of these countries. While embarking upon their democratic journey, the post-colonial countries

almost lacked all the ingredients that have been accepted as essential to make a liberal democracy success in a country. Long colonial rule had distorted the social, economic, and political structures of the 'third world' countries. With hardly any exception, these post-colonial countries suffered from near absence or very low levels of literacy and industrialization, considered essential for the success of democracy. Long period of colonial dominance also did not allow the civil society to develop. Many of these countries did not experience even the anti-colonial movement as political power was handed over by the outgoing imperial countries to their former collaborating local elite. Even the countries which experienced anti-colonial movement, there were many countries where the nature of the movement was not democratic and democratisation was not on the agenda of the political leadership.

There were other obstacles in the form of traditional hierarchical social order which resisted the idea of political equality, an essential prerequisite of a liberal polity. The continued dominance of traditional values and institutions blocked the rise of a vibrant civil society. For instance, in east Asian post-colonial countries have justified their notions of 'guided democracy' on the basis of Asian values which are supposed to reflect the history, culture and religious backgrounds of these countries. Respect for authority, avoiding public conflict and accepting the primacy of the group are considered part of Asian values which legitimises the limited/illiberal democracies in the countries like South Korea, Singapore, Malaysia and Indonesia, among others. In these countries, state receives primacy over the civil society (Hague, Harrop, Breslin, 1998: 27). Influenced by Confucian ideas and values, it is the family and society that receive greater emphasis than the individuals. Even in Malaysia which is an Islamic country, despite having a paramount ruler serving as both religious leader and head of state, a form of 'guided democracy' existed within a multiparty framework reflecting some form of political pluralism. The claim to adhere to 'Asian values' has allowed these 'guided' democratic regimes in the East and South East Asian 'newly industrialised countries' like South Korea, Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand to focus on achieving faster economic growth and achieving general prosperity for the masses rather than being concerned with protecting individual rights and freedom like in the case of the liberal democracies of the West (Thoreau, 2013: 278). Hague, Harrop and Breslin (1998: 25-26) have characterised these democracies as 'semi-democracies' blending democratic and authoritarian elements. Critiquing the model of 'Asian democracy', Putzel (1997: 253) has argued that the 'claims for "indigenous forms of democracy" appear to be no more than justifications for authoritarian rule'.

Transfer of political power to the newly independent post-colonial countries also flared up pre-existing cultural and religious distinctions as there was competitive politics for greater share for political power. These distinctions were already accentuated greatly by the colonial regimes which without exceptions pursued the politics of 'divide and rule'. Social cleavages became the basis of intractable political divisions leading to political instabilities and struggle for power on ethnic lines. Language, region, tribe and religion became the bases for political mobilisation and collective claim making processes and thus acted as divisive factors bringing conflicts and instability. One can refer to the conflicts involving

different ethnic communities in different countries of Asia and Africa. Thus, conflicts involving Malay-Chinese (Malaysia), Sinhala-Tamil (Sri Lanka), Sindhi-Pashtu (Pakistan), Yoruba-Hausa-Igbo (Nigeria), Tutsi-Hutu (Rwandan) to name a few have proven detrimental to the democratic stability. Most recently, Ethiopia has witnessed civil war in Tigary region, raising question mark over the stability of its democratic regime. Centrally focused ethnic structures creating all-state divides along with dispersed and cross-cutting ethnic divides in most of these countries have consistently posed challenge to the long-term survival of the 'new' democracies.

Inherited weak institutional structure of the colonial state created problem of stability in the nascent post-colonial democracies. The politicisation and mobilisation of the masses in the aftermath of independence resulted into an upsurge of social and economic demands and aspirations among them. The lack of development and also weak institutional capacity of the newly independent state to fulfil these demands and aspiration resulted in crisis of governance. The resultant instability, protests and even violence provided an opportunity for the armed forces to either capture power or rule by proxy by putting up puppet civilian government like in case of post-1945 Brazil. The subversion of the democratic institutions and procedures by elected civilian government which result in the challenge to the legitimacy of the existing institutions and the ruling elite also provided opportunity to the military to intervene like in the case of Uganda or Nigeria. The military has often intervened in Latin American countries in the past with covert support and encouragement received from the US Central Intelligence Agency like in case of Chile.

The widespread poverty (both income and human) prevalent in these newly independent countries of Asia, Africa and Americas has also been a major obstacle to the long-term survival of democracy. It has remained so even in the present times making them 'improbable democracies'. Income is the best predictor of democracy as has been argued by Przeworski*et al.* (2000). These theorists of democracy find 'the probability of democracy dying decreases with income' as 'wealth does make democracies more stable, independently of education'. They tend to reiterate what Lipset (1960) had earlier argued: 'the more well-to-do a nation, the greater the chances that it will sustain democracy'. The argument shared by other comparative theorists also is that democracies tend to collapse in poorer countries whereas in the wealthier countries they tend to survive. Economic underdevelopment has been identified as one of the factors thathas led to military coups. As Thoreau (2013: 282) has observed, 'growing prosperity appears to be an antidote to military intervention, as demonstrated by the tendency in Latin America, since the 1970s, for the military to return to the barracks'

As Varshney (2013) has argued, democratic transitions in the western European countries took place only after they had achieved a certain degree of prosperity due to the industrial revolution well as due to their exploitation of the natural resources and cheap labour of the colonies. Also, the newfound prosperity allows them to adopt distributive policies of welfare. The countries of Asia, Africa and Americas which have managed to remain consistently democratic, are the ones which have all been middle-income countries with the exception of India which

until recently was considered a low-income country and even now is a lower-middle income country as per the World Bank estimate.

Check Your Progress Exercise 2

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) See the end of the unit for tips for your answer.

1) What are the reasons behind chequered democratic process in post-colonial countries?

……………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………

………..……………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………

11.4 DEMOCRATIC TRANSITIONS IN POST-COLONIAL COUNTRIES

Most of Asia, Africa and Latin American countries have remained democratic in the new millennium. How to explain the relative success of the 'second wave' of democratisation for the post post-colonial countries? Roskin*et. al* (2003:89) refers to four causal factors. First, the relative economic growth based on commerce/industries in urban sectors led to the emergence and expansion of the middle class in these countries. These newly emergent middle classes have remained strong votaries of liberal democratic system of governance in their respective countries. Second, spread of modern education among wider masses especially the youth has also contributed to the longevity of the 'new' democracies. Third, there has been greater awareness among the wider masses that their interests would be better served under a pluralist competitive political system rather than by 'cruel, corrupt, or inefficient governments' led by populist authoritarian parties and their leaders who treated them like 'small children' (Roskin*et al.* 2003: 89). Fourth, the spread of market economy and the related liberal values has gradually led the authoritarian regimes to gradually open up the democratic spaces, permit a critical press and formation of political parties, and finally free elections. Apart from the post-colonial countries, one can also refer to the post-communist countries where there has been greater mass involvement in favour of democratisation.

Here, a fifth factor can be additionally mentioned which has contributed to governments in post-colonial countries staying democratic, at least, in electoral terms, namely the coercive economic diplomacy. As mentioned in the preceding segments, the indebted poorer countries face enormous pressure from the money lending international institutions like the World Bank to introduce structural reforms as part of the deal. Reforms include the introduction of transparent and accountable democratic governance. Likewise, economic assistance seeking countries are asked to democratise their systems, respect citizens' rights, allow

the opposition to contest and hold free elections. Democratization has indeed been closely related to marketization which leads to acceptance of market laws to govern the economy and questioning the stranglehold of the political regimes over the economy which gave them undue control over the peoples' lives. One can give the example of the Asian 'tigers' (like Singapore) in this regard where there has of late been great popular urge and demand to further democratise their political regimes.

However, there is still a question mark about the long-term success of democratization process. Whether the onset of new wave of democratisation has brought in what Almond and Verba (1963) referred to the participant/civic culture in the 'new democracies' that came up after the Second World War remains a debatable question. The answer in the Sixties when the post-colonial countries experienced their 'first wave' of democratic transformation was in negative as most of them still had subject culture, a mix of parochial and participant culture (Almond and Verba, 1963). What they argued remains true even now for the 'second wave' of democratic transition. The difference however, is that now most of the post-colonial countries have a mix of subject and participant culture, that is, they feel that they consider political participation as both valuable and desirable and they feel that through their participation they can influence politics of their countries. Also, the political awareness has increased tremendously due to the technology which has brought in what is being called the 'Information Age'.

A fair assessment of the level of democracy in post-colonial countries reveals that most of these democracies would qualify as electoral democracies, thoughwith many flaws. Many of these democracies remain highly restrictive for their citizens when it comes to their civil liberties and efforts are made to stifle the dissenting voices. Draconian laws, the legacies of the colonial era remain in force in most of these democracies in the name of national security and integrity. Also, the parties in power not only try to cultivate a committed bureaucracy but also even undermine the independence of the judiciary. The global money-lending institutions and also self-proclaimed champions of the 'free democratic world' like the US have remained happy to certify any regime as democratic if that country fulfils the minimum criteria like having multi-party system and periodically held reasonably free elections. Many of these states remain 'democratic' only on paper and use democracy as a façade. The reality is that an oligarchy or a strong leader heading a monopolistic party rules over the country. Of late, some shaky democratic regimes- asin Peru, Venezuela, and Zimbabwe- have slid back towards authoritarianism. Earlier, the democratic electoral regime was established in Nigeria in 1979. It was overthrown by a military coup in 1983. Then again in 1999, a democratic-leaning civilian regime was re-established. These experiences of post-colonial countries show that democratic transition can move in either direction, towards or away from democracy (Almond *et al.* 2004: 28-30). So even now despite the presence of many parties on paper, many countries have remained under single party dominance and an authoritarian ruler. Bangladesh and Pakistan are two pertinent examples of such post-colonial countries. These two countries have transitioned from civilian to military rule more than once. Even now, despite the presence of many parties on paper, many

countries have remained under single party dominance. In Bangladesh, for instance, the Awami League has won three consecutive elections in a row with massive majority thus establishing virtually 'one-party rule' under its leader Sheikh Hasina Wajed. The leaders of the Bangladesh Nationalist Party, the main opposition party, have been either in jail or in exile and the fairness of the electoral process has been vitiated. There are many other post-colonial countries where there has always been a lurking danger about the survival of democratic regime.

The recent rise of strident nationalism and anti-globalisation forces have resulted in the rise of 'strong' leaders. This poses a grave challenge to the future of post-colonial democracies. The global pandemic crisis in 2020-2021 has strengthened the authoritarian forces as even the democratic governments acquired centralising overriding powers on the pretext of combating the pandemic.

11.5 LET US SUM UP

This unit refers to the three phases of democratization that have taken place in the world with focus on the two phases of democratic transformations /transitions that took place in the post-colonial countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. It argues that democracy is a form of government to which most people in the post-colonial states sincerely aspire. Most of post-colonial political regimes more or less avowedly favour greater democratisation and protection of democratic rights and liberties. Elections, competitive political parties, independent judiciary, free mass media and representative law- making bodies have allowed effective peoples participation to some extent. However there has been too much emphasis on the procedural aspect of democracy whereas the substantive aspects have been neglected like the prevalent social, spatial and economic inequalities that have increased with the dominance of the neo-liberal market economy. Thus, the democratic upsurge is visible more in terms of the widening and not the deepening of post-colonial democracies.

11.6 REFERENCES

Almond, Gabriel and Sidney Verba (1963).*The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations.*Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Almond, Gabriel, *et al.* (2004).*Comparative Politics Today: A World View*. New Delhi: Pearson Education.

Geissel, Brigitte, Marianne Kneuer and Hans-Joachim Lauth. (2016). 'Measuring the Quality of Democracy: Introduction', *International Political Science Review / Revue Internationale de science politique*, 37 (5): 571-579, November.

Hague, Rod, Martin Harrop and Shaun Breslin. (1998). *Comparative Government and Politics: An Introduction.* London: Macmillan.

Huntington, P. Samuel. (1991). *The Third Wave: Democratisation in the Late Twentieth Century.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Linz, Juan (2000). *Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes.*Boulder: Lynne Reinner.

Lipset, Seymour. (1960). *Political Man: The Social Bases of Politics*. New York: Doubleday.

Mair, Peter.(2011). 'Democracies'.In Daniele Caramani, ed., *Comparative Politics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Przeworski, Adam, *et al*. (2000). *Democracy and Development: Political Institution and Well-Being in the World, 1950-1990*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Putzel, J. (1997). 'Why has Democratization been a weaker Impulse in Indonesia and Malaysia than in Philippines:' in D. Potteret*et al*., ed., *Democratization*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Roskin, Michael G., et al. (2002). *Political Science:An Introduction.*New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Varshney, Ashutosh. (2013). *Battles Half Won: India's Improbable Democracy*. New Delhi: Penguin Viking.

11.7 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS EXERCISES

Check Your Progress Exercise 1

1) Your answer should highlight following points: i) Focuses more on procedures instead of outcomes, and ii) Procedures and institutions include rule of law, independent election commission, independent judiciary, free press etc.

Check Your Progress Exercise 2

1) Your answer should highlight following points: i) Lack of vibrant civil society, ii Weak institutions, and iii) Widespread poverty

UNIT 12 DEMOCRATIZATION IN POST-AUTHORITARIAN AND POST-COMMUNIST COUNTRIES[*]

Structure

12.0 OBJECTIVES

The aim of this unit is to familiarise you with the concept of democratization, trends and approaches in democratization and some of the shortcomings of this concept. After studying this unit, you should be able to:

- Know the meaning of democratization

- Understand causes of democratization

- Discuss various approaches to democratization

- Know the reasons behind democratization in post-authoritarian and post-communist countries

---

[*] Dr Raj Kumar Sharma, Assistant Professor, Rashtriya Raksha University, Gujarat

12.1 INTRODUCTION

From being called as a 'perversion' by Greek philosopher Aristotle to being described as the 'final form of human government' by Francis Fukuyama, democracy has come a long way. Aristotle believed that self-serving of many (democracy) would be the result when the majority in a constitutional government substituted its particular interest for the general interest of the community. He even specified processes that promote a majority's pursuit of its narrow interest in a democracy, like the rise of demagogues who garner popular support by appealing to desires and prejudices of ordinary people at the cost of rationality. On the other hand, Fukuyama argued that free-market liberal democracy had defeated communism and that democracy would become a universal value aided by globalization. As this has not happened since he made this prediction, Fukuyama has updated his thesis and has argued that democracy can even go backwards, in what is called, democratic backsliding. In *Identity: The Demand for Dignity and the Politics of Resentment* (2018), Fukuyama has said that demand for recognition and identity, like Brexit and rising tide of nationalism, is the master concept that explains contemporary dissatisfaction with liberal democracies around the world. He even sees the recent spurt in the emergence of populist leaders (what Aristotle would call demagogues) as a threat to democracy and its institutions. This signals that history has come full circle since Aristotle gave his views on democracy and its side effects.

The world has already entered a stage where the US and China would be slogging it out for supremacy and the US has been framing it as a battle between democracies and the largest authoritarian system (China) in the world. During the COVID-19 pandemic, some democracies seem to have fared better than authoritarian systems in tackling the Coronavirus due to a number of factors – more transparency, rule abiding citizens and accountability towards the electorate. Generations to come would not forget the fact that the COVID-19 was an epidemic that began in China's Wuhan province but it turned into a pandemic due to Chinese authoritarian government's muddled response to its initial outbreak. In coming years, academic research is likely to focus on how democracies and authoritarian governments have dealt with epidemic outbreaks. China's behaviour during the COVID-19 pandemic could be a shot in the arm for supporters of democracy and new ideological alliances to check China's aggression may come up. It is, therefore, important to study the concept of democratization, its approaches and its current trajectories.

12.2 DEMOCRATIZATION: MEANING AND CONCEPT

Modern political philosophy has been trying to find out the finest form of government to rule human communities. Rousseau argued that popular sovereignty would not be a reality without participation. James Madison argued for institutional limits on popular sovereignty so that minority rights could be safeguarded against the collective will of the majority. De Tocqueville and Montesquieu suggested about the connection between political culture and

political regime of a country. Democracy is widely accepted as the best form of government in the West. Democracy leads to institutionalization of people's power and thus, democratization is the process through which this happens. In simple words, democratization is the process through which a political regime transforms from non-democratic into a democratic one. Former Secretary General of the United Nations, Boutros Boutros-Ghali in his speech to UN General Assembly on December 20, 1996 defined democratization as a process which leads to more open, more participatory and less authoritarian society. A closer look at Ghali's definition highlights that democracy is not only a form of government and state, but it is also a social condition or a way of life. It must be mentioned that democratization is a multidimensional and multifaceted concept. As an idea, it does not belong to any particular discipline of academics and includes areas like political science, sociology, economics, international relations, cultural studies and political economy. This would also indicate that there may be more than one way to understand democratization.

As a process, democratization could be understood in three phases, introduction, transition and consolidation of democracy in a non-democratic regime. In the first phase, democracy is introduced in a non-democratic regime due to breakdown of the non-democratic government which could be linked to loss of legitimacy. This loss of legitimacy may be a result of an economic crisis or lack of loyalty of coercive arms of a state – police and the army. Second, in the transition phase, the democratic features of the given state deepen as new structures and institutions come up. Existing authoritarian structures and agencies are abolished and negotiations over a new constitution, rules and regulations for establishing competitive politics are taken up during this phase. A transition happens when the opposition desirous of democracy becomes strong enough to challenge the authoritarian regime, which is divided or weak to either co-opt for democracy or use force against the opposition. There are three general types of democratic transitions. **First, there is a transition based on a pact or** agreement between the moderate members of an authoritarian regime and moderate faction in the pro-democracy opposition. As there is power sharing between both the factions, the new arrangement contains the elements of both, the old and the new government. Chile in 1990 and Spain in 1977 are illustrative of this type of transition. Second, we have the **Bottom-Up** transition in societies where the authoritarian regime is weakened by popular movements and loses complete legitimacy. Democratic transitions in countries like Hungary and Poland after the fall of Soviet Union are examples of bottom-up transition. Finally, there is the t**op-Down transition**: Here the authoritarian regime initiates democratic reforms since it sees them as a necessary tool for survival of its rule.

The ruling elite may favour democracy over other forms of government due to adverse historical experience (example, post-Second World War Germany, Japan and Italy), pressures from external powers on whom they have come to depend (as in Afghanistan and Iraq) or to gain international recognition and financial assistance. Former Soviet republic, Tajikistan in Central Asia could be cited as one such example of opportunistic democratization.

Third, in the consolidation phase, democratic values become firmly embedded in the state and their reversal becomes unthinkable. Democracy is fully

institutionalized when there is dissemination of democratic values in the system. It, however, should be remembered that there is no guarantee of a democratic transition leading to democratic consolidation. There is no way to measure democratic consolidation. Huntington in his 1991 book, *The Third Wave*: *Democratization in the Late 20th Century*; had set the benchmark of 'two-turnover test' where a democracy is consolidated if it sees through two turnovers of power. Consolidation leads to shift in political culture of a society as democracy becomes a common and routine affair.

12.2.1 Minimalist and Maximalist Democratization

Democratization has two facets procedural (minimalist) and substantive (maximalist). The procedural dimension merely focuses on procedures or means in place to attain democracy. It argues that measures like regular competitive elections on the basis of universal adult franchise and plural political participation would produce a democratically elected government.

In his 1942 book, *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy,* Joseph Schumpeter has said that democracy is "institutional arrangement for arriving at political decisions in which individuals acquire the power to decide by means of a competitive struggle for the people's vote". Samuel P Huntington has also echoed similar views saying, "The central procedure of democracy is the selection of leaders through competitive elections by the people they govern." However, people are perceived as passive in this view, which only take part in regular elections and are governed by their representatives. In the absence of checks and balances in a political system, the elected leaders could manipulate procedures and power for their own benefit leading to concealed authoritarianism. The government could work for the elites who hold power instead of the people who hold ultimate authority in a democratic set up. Such instances have existed in Argentina and Brazil between 1980s and 1990s. Terry Karl has pointed that minimalist view could also lead to '*fallacy of electoralism*', a situation where electoral process is given priority over other dimensions of democracy. Fareed Zakaria calls it '*illiberal democracy*', a case where governments are democratically elected but ignore constitutional limits on their power and deprive their citizens of basic rights and freedoms.

Substantive democratization, on the other hand, focuses on the social and economic aspects that hamper people's participation in the democratic process. It focuses on outcomes like social equality and in a sense; calls for 'common good' rather than benefit of limited individuals. Substantive democracy focuses on the creation of conditions for the participation of all sections of the society in the democratic processes. It therefore emphasises on the rights, especially those of the marginalized sections like women and the poor. This perspective can be seen the writings of political thinkers like John Locke, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Immanuel Kant and John Stuart Mill. Rousseau argued that a formal democracy is equivalent to slavery and it is only egalitarian democracies which have political legitimacy.

Check Your Progress Exercise 1

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) See the end of the unit for tips for your answer.

1) Describe the three phases in the process of democratization.

…………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………

………..…………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………

12.3 TRENDS IN DEMOCRATIZATION

Aristotle gave two reasons why democracy replaces an authoritarian regime in a city state. *First*, the people can revolt against the ruler citing injustice and *second*, internal divisions may arise among the governing oligarchies and one of the factions may ally with the masses to bring own the government. Democratization, throughout its history, has not been a uniform process having varied across time and space. For instance, in Great Britain there has been a gradual and slow change from absolute monarchy to democracy over centuries. It is also an example of bottom-up approach to democratization where lower classes and the non-governing elites demanded rights and voting power. In contrast, the American and French revolutions produced democracy through force and a sharp break from the past. There are other examples of governing elites favouring democratic change as was the case in South America. Such top-down process of democratization generally produces unstable democracies. Colonization (especially by Great Britain) also sowed the seeds of democracy in a number of countries, like India, Australia and Canada. External powers have also contributed to democratic institutions. For instance, the US took the help of pro-democracy Japanese intellectuals and politicians to reconstruct government of Japan and write its constitution (sometimes also called MacArthur constitution) after the Second World War. Thus, while there is no single defined process leading to democratization, there exist certain conditions for creation and success of democracy and many paths to democracy may exist at the same time.

Transition towards democracy and away from it tends to occur in waves throughout the globe. A democratization wave covers a group of countries making transition from non-democratic to democratic regime within a specified time period. These transitions outnumber transitions in other direction, i.e., from democratic to non-democratic regime. A reverse wave is one in which number of democratic countries collapsing is more than countries experiencing transition towards democracy. Samuel P Huntington (*The Third Wave,* 1991) has identified the global trend towards democratization since the 1970s as the third wave of democratization. We have discussed the three waves of democracy in some detail in Unit 11. Huntington's model has been criticised for its narrow understanding of democracy (electoral democracy) and for giving more importance to international dimension of democratization. Although Huntington has not said

anything about a third reverse wave, a number of scholars have noted the decline in democratic attributes in regimes like Brazil, Turkey, Hungary, Russia and Serbia. Anna Luhrmann and Staffan I Lindberg (2019) have argued that the world is witnessing a third wave of autocratization. Political leaders are using legal and gradual strategies to undermine democracy to strengthen their grip over power. In such cases, a decline in quality of democracy may be noticed, also called democratic backsliding or de-democratization by elected leaders who incrementally degrade the essential character of a democracy instead of doing it through a revolution.

12.4 APPROACHES TO DEMOCRATIZATION

The various approaches dealing with democratization are explained as below.

12.4.1 Modernization Approach

Seymour Martin Lipset, inspired by the modernization theory that gained prominence in the late 1950s, agreed with German sociologist, Max Weber that capitalism helps growth of a modern democracy (Some Social Requisites of Democracy, 1959). Lipset claimed that a wealthy nation has better chances to sustain democracy. He has drawn attention to mechanisms like education level which increases with prosperity. Social and political tolerance is promoted by access to higher education and it also reduces myths and misinformation. Socio-economic development also strengthens civil society and middle class, who generally are promoters of democratic values. Presence of a large middle class is often seen as a stabilizing force as it is assumed that large economic inequality leads to class conflict. Lipset had quoted Alexis de Tocqueville saying only those who have nothing to lose ever revolt. Middle class pressures have been an important factor for democratization in different places like the UK, South Korea, the US, the Philippines and Latin America. However, middle class can also support authoritarianism if it suits their interests, like in countries such as China, Germany in 1930s and Chile in 1970s. Another argument is that experience with capitalism creates space for democratization as economic freedom creates pressure on state for political freedom. Capitalism gives rise to a business class who want more say in areas like taxation and property rights and would push for an accountable government. On the other hand, absence of economic freedom would reduce the scope of political freedom making authoritarianism more likely. In countries like the US and the UK, democratization was the result of industrialization. However, it led to authoritarian regimes in countries like Russia, Japan and Germany. A hybrid regime model also emerged in countries like China, Singapore, Mexico, Chile, Argentina and the Philippines where the business class threw its weight behind authoritarian leaders who supported private enterprise. During the Cold War, democracy could not survive and collapsed in Latin American countries like Argentine, Chile and Uruguay, even though these countries had high levels of development. China has raced on to become world's second largest economy by allowing private enterprise and economic freedom even while retaining strict control and regulation of political freedom. Opening up of economy has not been followed up with political

liberalization in China. In Singapore, the ruling party, People's Action Party has been governing the country since independence in 1965 largely due to impressive economic growth experienced by Singapore. However, in the last decade, there have been some gains for the opposition and in the July 2020 general election, the Worker's Party secured ten seats, the best result for any opposition party in the country. The achievement of high levels of economic growth without political freedoms in prominent Southeast Asian nations has been explained by the Asian Values argument. According to this argument, in Asian cultural tradition, community is valued over the individual and stable leadership over political pluralism. However, as Amartya Sen has pointed out, there is a general agreement on policies that help economic growth – competitive market, high literacy and school education level, successful land reforms, state support for investment and industrialisation. None of these factors requires presence of an authoritarian government and they are not incompatible with democracy and human rights. Sen has further argued that the so-called Asian values often invoked to justify authoritarianism are not Asian in any sense as Asia is culturally diverse. He has highlighted that to achieve universal freedom of choice, capabilities like education are necessary.

12.4.2 Structuralism

The main proponent of structuralism also called historical sociology or social forces approach was Barrington Moore who in 1966 wrote *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*. He was writing at a time when modernization theory and the idea of unilinear path of development was still popular. Moore argued that there are many paths to modernization and that the path taken by an individual nation was influenced by the nature of relationships between different classes that existed. Since this approach gives importance to structures, it is also called structuralism. Structuralists see democracy as state transformation and they analyze state through conflict between different classes over a period of time. It also contains features of political economy as it highlights how economic evolution affects class or social conflict. Moore analyzed eight big countries in comparative perspective (India, China, Japan, Russia, Germany, the US, France and the UK) through the 19th century into the 20th century. The outcome (whether a country became a democracy or not) depended on relationship between three classes – the bourgeoisie, the peasantry and the landed upper class. Democracy was the result when:

- The peasant question was solved by gradually eliminating peasant agriculture accompanied by transformation of peasants into urban workers by expanding towns and employment in industrial sector.
- The rising bourgeoisie defeats the landed class and transforms it in its struggles for state control.

Structuralism has a good understanding of grass root level and is explanatory but it has its share of shortcomings. Post-modernists, for instance, argue that power is too diffused a concept to be understood in a static way. Structuralism gives importance to historical change in the long-term but it has been unable to explain the onset of sudden democratization in former Communist countries in East and

Central Europe and the former Soviet republics where there was little evidence of class struggle or agitation for democracy. External factors have played an important role in these regions. Under Mikhail Gorbachev, the Soviet Union changed its regional policy and abandoned the Brezhnev doctrine of limited sovereignty under which Soviet Union had claimed veto power over policies of states that were allied with it. The economic (*Perestroika*) and political reforms (*Glasnost*) introduced by Gorbachev opened space for autonomous policies and acted as a catalyst for democratization in Central and Eastern Europe. Soviet Union lost the desire to maintain socialist system in Central and Eastern Europe and the regional governments were helpless against domestic demands for democratization. Juan Linz and Alfred Stepan (1996) have argued that there was 'domino like collapse' of communism in Central and Eastern Europe and in some countries like Bulgaria, Romania and Czechoslovakia, the transition towards democratization was simply driven by regional effect. Civil society also played a crucial role in democratization in Central and Eastern Europe. After being suppressed during the communist period, civil society reappeared in the region during the 1980s and played an important role in the democratization process. Here, it is important to mention that not all civil societies promote democratic values. Organizations like Ku Klux Klan have shown that citizen groups do not always organize people around harmless pursuits. Civil society can also as easily destabilize a democratic government as an authoritarian one. Hitler had come to power in Germany in 1920s through support and mobilization of civil society of that time. Role of social media has also come under scanner for promoting democratization. The role of information technology and social media in igniting and sustaining anti- government movements was very much evident during the Arab Spring in early 2010s when a series of anti-government protests, uprisings, and armed rebellions spread across much of the Arab world. It is too early to say anything definite about the contribution of social media networks towards consolidation of democracy as longitudinal research is needed.

12.4.3 Transition Approach

Transition approach, also called transitology or agency approach means study of process of change from a non-democratic to democratic regime. The transition approach argues that democracy is a creation of committed and conscious actors, provided that they have some degree of luck and are willing to compromise. The advocates of transition approach say that both, modernization and structuralists give more than due importance to economic, historic and developmental factors in determining political outcomes. According to agency perspective, democracy can be created irrespective of structural context. It believes that if elites can learn right way to proceed, there can be successful outcome of democracy. D A Rustow's 1970 article, *Transitions to Democracy*: *Toward* a *Dynamic Model* could be treated as the starting point of this approach. In opposition to structuralist conditions for democracy, Rustow narrowly focused on the process of transition itself. He has argued that a unified nation-state is the only condition for democracy where the citizens should not have any mental reservations about their belonging to their political community. He further argues that democracy creation is a dynamic process which has three stages – a preparatory phase, a decision phase (negotiation between small number of important leaders is

decisive) and a habituation phase where the leaders and the citizens come to terms with the new system and adapt to its working. Towards the end of 1970s, Juan Linz and Alfred Stepan (1978) published their four-volume work, *The Breakdown of Democratic Regimes*. Contrary to prevailing consensus at that time, they did not agree that democratic collapse in Europe between the two world wars and in Latin America after the Second World War was unavoidable. Linz and Stepan argued that more than the structural circumstances, it was the choices that the main players or leaders made which determined the result of tussle between democracy and autocracy. O'Donnell, Schmitter and Whitehead edited a seminal work (*Transitions from Authoritarian Rule*, 1986) in which they examined interactions, pacts and bargains struck between democratic opposition and authoritarian leaders. Successful transition would depend on agreements between elites from both sides. It concluded that efficient leadership, supported by luck, was important for establishment of democracy. This approach has been criticised for being overly elitist. There is an attempt by transition approach advocates to apply theories born out of experiences and instances from South Europe and Latin America to regions which are diverse in terms of culture, politics and economy like Central Europe, Africa and countries that were part of the former Soviet Union.

12.4.4 Multivariate Model

As the name itself suggests, this approach argues that there are many factors contributing towards democratization in a country. In his later works, Lipset has himself argued in favour of this approach. In his 1994 paper, *The Social Requisites of Democracy Revisited*, Lipset refers to economic prosperity, de Tocqueville's concept of social equality, centrality of political culture, Weber's idea of legitimacy and significance of strong civil society as the multiple factors helping democratization. Robert Dahl in his 1998 book, *On Democracy*, has given three essential factors for democracy. They are – civilian control of police and military forces, political culture and democratic beliefs and no strong foreign control hostile to democracy. Larry Diamond & others have done an extensive study of politics in developing countries and according to them, the factors which lead to democratization include – performance and legitimacy, political culture and leadership, socio-economic development and social structure, civil society, state and society, regional and ethnic conflict, political institutions, the military and international factors. He has also highlighted role of political culture as being the key to democratic consolidation since democracy requires a number of values from its citizens like civility, tolerance, efficacy and participation. Diamond was not enthusiastic about the fourth wave of democratization as he argued that all the countries which had suitable conditions for democracy had already undergone democratization. The problem with this model is that on the basis of undefined factors, it is not possible to test a hypothesis. It is very difficult to pinpoint a common factor that plays an important role in democratization process in countries with so much diversity in their political, social, cultural and economic conditions.

12.4.5 International Factors

It is difficult to argue that domestic factors leading to democratization exist in isolation from the international factors. There are linkages between domestic and international factors which ultimately lead to democratization. Georg Sorensen in his 1993 book, *Democracy and Democratization: Processes and Prospects in a Changing World* has argued that external factors can help or hinder democracy and the process of democratization in specific countries. He identified three domestic conditions that determine success of democracy promotion from outside.

- Vibrant civil society that can hold rulers accountable
- Political leaders committed to democratization
- Merit-based and autonomous bureaucracy

Christian Welzel (2009) has asserted that domestic elites would truly respect all aspects of liberal democracy only when there is pressure from below (from society). Hence, external factors interact with domestic factors and lead to democratization. Laurence Whitehead has given three types of international factors.

- **Contagion.** Regimes are changed in a contagion in neighbouring clusters through transfer of information about the developments in the neighbouring nations with which the people and often, the elites relate to. Contagion was seen during the third wave of democratization, first in south Europe, followed by Latin America, former Communist countries in Central and East Europe and finally in Sub-Saharan Africa.
- **Control.** Here, the external powers can engineer a regime change by relying on power politics. It was evident in case of Germany and Japan after the Second World War and recently, in Iraq and Afghanistan where democracy is facing many problems.
- **Consent.** When consent operates, there is understanding between domestic and external actors; which contributes to democratization.

The American influence in Latin America offers a good example in role of external factors in democratization process. During the Cold War, the US intervened directly or indirectly in Latin American countries if its economic or political interests were threatened by the Cold War politics. Washington even supported authoritarian regimes to protect its own interests as in cases of Guatemala (1954), El Salvador (1960), Chile (1973) and Uruguay (1973). After the Cold War, the US practice shifted towards promotion of liberal democracy. Western donors attach strings to their aid and promote democracy and human rights through their developmental model in countries ranging from Asia, Africa to Latin America. The US, during the Cold War, used its democratic values as soft power to undermine the influence of Soviet Union. It has successfully used soft power in democracy promotion in post-Communist states in Eastern Europe. Democratization has been a sore point in the US-Russia geopolitical rivalry starting with the 21st century. There have been various civil society inspired movements in some former Soviet republics to overthrow authoritarian and

corrupt leaders. Also called colour revolutions, these movements aspired for democracy in countries like Ukraine (Orange Revolution, 2004), Georgia (Rose Revolution, 2003) and Kyrgyzstan (Tulip Revolution, 2005). Russia has accused the Americans of using the civil society as a tool to topple pro-Russian leaders and increase their influence in former Soviet republics. Democratization in post-Soviet countries is seen with suspicion by Russia due to American and European Union's influence. For example, in Central Asia (Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan and Turkmenistan), democratic institutions exist but opposition is largely marginalized and single-leaders dominate their political scene. It is for this reason that some describe the regimes in Central Asian countries as facade democracies. The ruling elites in the region know that their survival would be at stake if they loosen their grip over power. They very well remember failure of Gorbachev's political and economic reforms which were an important factor in disintegration of Soviet Union. The ruling elites are supported by Russia and China who are against any West-inspired attempts to install democracy in the region.

Check Your Progress Exercise 2

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) See the end of the unit for tips for your answer.

1) Which factors led to democratization in former Communist countries in East and Central Europe and the former Soviet republics?

…………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………
…………………..………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………

12.5 FACTORS HAMPERING DEMOCRATIZATION PROCESS

There are a number of factors that impede the process of democratization. *First*, there may be problems of nationality (sub-state nationalism) that would challenge democracy. Violence is against democratic value of negotiation and peace. *Second,* is diminished sovereignty. For example, in many countries of Africa, the state is new and fragile. Many states are recognized as independent states but cannot perform their basic duties like raising revenue and administering public goods. Their fragility makes them vulnerable to challenges from within. Liberia, Rwanda, Somalia and Sierra Leone are well known fragile states. *Third*, authoritarian legacy also acts as a hindrance towards democratization. The past continues to play an important part in culture and ideology of a state. Latin America offers a good example in this regard. Despite democratization, there is undemocratic executive and low level of popular participation in Latin American

democracies. The region also has the tradition of a 'strong man', which means the promotion of personality cult and the rise of populist presidents. Now, it seems very tough to change the culture of governance and political tradition that gives importance to populism, clientelism, and macho depiction of leaders. Former authoritarian and military ruled states like Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Paraguay are facing issues in consolidation of democracy due to issues like income inequality, corruption, weak rule of law and high levels of violence and crime. Earlier, the authoritarian and military rule in Latin American countries lost its legitimacy due to economic failure, disaffection of military's business allies and factions and loss of professionalism in the military. And finally, democratization also gets affected by the political impact of economic reforms and globalization. Economic reforms can weaken the legitimacy of ruling elites, especially in those cases where these reforms are monitored by international agencies. They can also lead to loss of faith in state and resurgence in private solutions to economic and social problems. Economic reforms may end up weakening democratization as governments may try to bypass opposition by avoiding discussion in parliaments and use methods like presidential decree to govern.

12.6 LET US SUM UP

Democratization is the process through which a political regime transforms from non-democratic into a democratic one within a sovereign state. Democratization is a multidimensional concept that covers areas like political science, sociology, economics, international relations, political economy and cultural studies. This indicates that there may be more than just one way to understand the process of democratization. It is also reflected in various approaches to study democratization – modernization, structuralism, transition, multivariate model and the international factors. Democratization has never been a uniform process throughout history and has varied across time and space. In the former Soviet states, a number of factors led to democratization like Soviet Union's disinterest in maintaining control over its republics, Gorbachev's reforms which hastened the process of democratization and also presence of civil society which helped democratization. In Latin American countries like Brazil, Chile, Peru and Ecuador, military ruled authoritarian regimes lost their legitimacy due to economic failures opening avenues for democratization. However, democratic consolidation in many Latin American countries has suffered due to income inequality, corruption and weak rule of law.

12.7 REFERENCES

Burnell, P. (2013). *Democratization Through the Looking-glass*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Dahl, R. A. (1998). *On Democracy*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Diamond, L. (2009). *The Spirit of Democracy*: *The Struggle to Build Free Societies Throughout the World*. New York: St. Martin's Griffin.

Dix, Robert H. (1994). Military Coups and Military Rule in Latin America. *Armed Forces and Society*. Vol 20. Issue 3.

Fukuyama, F. (1992). *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: Penguin.

Grugel, J. (2002). *Democratization –A Critical Introduction*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Huntington, S.P. (1968). *Political Order in Changing Societies*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Huntington, S. P. (1991). *The Third Wave*: *Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*. Norman: Univ. Okla.

Linz, J. J. & Stepan, A. (1996). *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation.* Baltimore MD: John Hopkins University Press.

_____. (1978). *The Breakdown of Democratic Regimes*. Baltimore MD: John Hopkins University Press.

Lipset, S. M. (1959). Some Social Requisites of Democracy: Economic Development and Political Legitimacy. *American Political Science Review* 53 (1): 69-105.

Lipset, S. M. (1960). *Political Man*: *The Social Bases of Politics*. New York: Doubleday.

Moore, B. Jr. (1966). *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World.* Boston: Beacon.

Moller, Jorgen & Skaaning, S. E. (2013). *Democracy and Democratization in Comparative Perspective: Concepts, Conjectures, Causes and Consequences.* Oxon: Routledge.

Welzel, C. (2009). *Theories of Democratization*, in Christian, W. H. et. al. (eds), *Democratization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

12.8   ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS EXERCISES

Check Your Progress Exercise 1

1) Your answer should highlight following points:

- Three phases - In the first phase, democracy is introduced in a non-democratic regime due to its breakdown which could be linked to loss of legitimacy
- Second, in the transition phase, the democratic qualities of the given state deepen as new structures and institutions come up
- In third phase, there is democratic consolidation as democratic values become firmly embedded in the state and their reversal becomes unthinkable

Check Your Progress Exercise 2

1) Your answer should highlight following points:

- External factors have played an important role in these regions
- USSR abandoned the Brezhnev doctrine of limited sovereignty
- Gorbachev's reforms opened space for autonomous policies and acted as a catalyst for democratization in Central and Eastern Europe
- Civil society also played a crucial role in democratization in Central and Eastern Europe