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

Structure

- 12.0 Objectives
- 12.1 Introduction
- 12.2 Democratization: Meaning and Concept
 - 12.2.1 Minimalist and Maximalist Democratization
- 12.3 Trends in Democratization
- 12.4 Approaches to Democratization
 - 12.4.1 Modernization Approach
 - 12.4.2 Structuralism
 - 12.4.3 Transition Approach
 - 12.4.4 Multivariate Model
 - 12.4.5 International Factors
- 12.5 Factors Hampering Democratization Process
- 12.6 Let Us Sum Up
- 12.7 References
- 12.8 Answers to Check Your Progress Exercises

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 **top-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



ignou
THE PEOPLE'S
UNIVERSITY