

DEFINITIONS EXTRA

- **Welfare State:** system to reduce people's material inequality
- **Identities:** In democracies, identities can be predictors of what regime type people prefer (religion, ethnicity... and other things like sexual orientation, gender, environmental care, women's rights)

TOOLS OF ANALYSIS: INTERESTS, IDENTITIES AND INSTITUTIONS

Comparative politics is divided into three schools of thought:

1. RATIONAL COMPARATIVISTS = MATERIAL INTEREST

Material interests are core because people support whatever regime serves their interests and maximises their side chances. In this school of thought, they study how people with personal material interests organise themselves to achieve power.

2. CULTURAL COMPARATIVISTS = IDENTITIES

There is no such thing as a objective interest of maximising material interests in society, as each person has individual objectives and not everyone wishes to maximise their material lot. In this school of thought, they study the dominant ideas, objectives and identities of the society.

3. STRUCTURAL COMPARATIVISTS = INSTITUTIONS

They defend that what really moves and determines how a country's politics work aren't material interests of people or identities, but institutions, which are the authoritative rules and procedures that structure how power flows and organise human behaviour.

PATHS OF DEVELOPMENT

1. Early Developers (GB and France)

- Creation of middle classes with social power
- Use this power to have a say in the government
- Results in quicker economic changes
- Stated with the industrial revolution in Great Britain

2. Middle Developers (Japan, Germany and Spain)

- Late start, they needed to catch up with the advancements of the early developers to satisfy the material interests of their people
- Greater economic intervention to make the economic development happen in the quickest of the ways
- Japan and Germany developed a **fascist regime** (stress on ethnic hierarchy and racial hierarchy) as a result of the pressure, the weaker middle class and the strength of the traditional social classes

3. Late developers (Russia and China)

- Economic development was so late that it required even more government intervention which located the state and the government in a dominant position among society
- Really small and weak middle class with no power of influencing the government
- Working class was living in inhuman conditions
- In fact, because of the dominant authoritarian role given to the government, China and Russia developed a **communist regime**

4. Experimental Developers (Mexico, India, Iran, South Africa, Nigeria and the European Union)

- Mexico's experiment was their independence from the US
- India's experiment was the creation of a non-revolutionary democracy
- Iran's experiment was to introduce an Islamic governance
- South Africa's experiment was to have a multination democracy
- European Union's experiment is to preserve peace exploiting their best qualities: independence and sovereignty

Lecture 2 : Does development lead to democracy? Does democracy lead to development?

Economic development leads to democracy: (Economic Development= wealth, human rights, possibilities and encouragement of risk taking and ambition)

- **YES:**

- **Seymour Martin Lipset:** argued that there is a strong **correlation** between high levels of GDP per capita and **income per capita and the regime type** and that higher education, better information result in economic growth. **Wealth** in a country is a key contributor towards democracy - modernisation theory
- **Samuel P. Huntington:** wrote **third wave of democratisation** in 1991 and he supported that 5 factors caused democratisation in at least 30 countries between 74 and 90 and one of them was the great economic growth that happened during the 60s.
- **C. Barrington Moore:** scholar and professor at Harvard and he explained the rise of democracy in the US, England and France. He focused on three different **variables**: 1. The **strength of bourgeoisie** (No bourgeoisie no democracy) by stating that the middle class was the big core of society that was key to the development of capitalism and trading and democracy as a result of this 2. The **mode of agricultural production** and in the type of workers that were in that sector (slaves, employees or lower class owners) 3. **Peasant revolutionary potential** and the change of power from landlords to middle and lower classes even to peasants, freeing them from the control of the upper classes.
For him, in countries like the **US, France and England** where the middle class was powerful, capitalism and hence democracy was more likely to happen and remain, against countries like **Japan or Germany** which had capitalism but were in a fascist regime peasants were kept down by aristocracy, finally **Russia or China** there wasn't a middle class but there was a numerous and strong movement of revolutionary peasants
- **Huntington and O'Donnell:** they argued that YES economic development leads to democracy but to **an extent**, because there is a level beyond which probability of democracy sustainability decreases which is called the **intermediate level** because of the unstable modernisation.
- **Przeworski, Alvarez, Cheibub, Limongi 1996:** they basically argued that it is not true what Huntington and O'Donnell said because there is **no such level of income** at which democracy is weakened. Dictatorships are not more likely to generate economic growth than democracies and that once democracy is established in a developed country, it will endure because 1. Less income inequality and hence economic stability 2. Superior institutions are chosen which match the democratic features.

- **NO:**

- **Skocpol:** Barrington Moore's student who questioned those three variables and the link between capitalism and democracy as well as the revolutionary power of peasants. Puts in a chart different variables and realises that *even when those variables are the same, the outcome which is the type of regime of the country is different* hence **reliability of the variables as definers of democracy is weakened**. Also questioned the meaning of strong vs weak bourgeoisie.

- **Gershchekron: first modernisation theorist** he argued that how a country developed is affected by **WHEN that development started** and divided countries into three categories: 1. Early Developers which are countries like England and France 2. Late Developers like Germany and Japan and 3. Late Late Developers like Russia. The latter needed to grow at a much faster rate to catch up with the other countries and to do so they needed to gather capital. England had a time advantage because it was the first in the 1840s and the development was a matter of centuries whereas for the other countries it needed to be a matter of decades.
- **Kurth**: Focused on the importance of **production** and the fact that the key factor is at what stage of the **product cycle** you as a country produce the product in relation to other countries producing the same. Again defender of time advantage linked to democracy rather than economic development as a general rule.
- **Dependency School**: (Dos Santos, O'Donnell, and Frank) focused on the entry of **Latin America** into the world economy and its role in the export of raw materials as a main source of economic activity. Needed to create an **alliance between local capital, multinationals and the state**. Brazil and Argentina entered global economies but their democracies collapsed in 64 and 66 respectively.
- **Equality circle by Lindbloom**: Focused on equality and the impact of **inequality in the countries** on the success of democracy. Inequality between those who have power and the workers.
- **Rustow**: only requirement for democratisation is **national unity** which is the case of INDIA which he uses to prove wrong the link between economic growth and democracy as India is a poor country. Correlation doesn't imply causation. He says that **what Lipset state as crucial** factors for democratisation (high income per capita, high GDP, education and information and wealth) **can contribute but aren't the main cause**.
- **Larry Diamond 'the case of the Arab Spring'**: of the 16 Arab countries, 11 are rentier states: getting rents upon extraction of oil and other natural resources. No taxes, hence no need to feel represented maybe?

Democracy leads to economic development

- **Przeworski and Limongi**: three theories 1. **Either way**: democracy doesn't necessarily promote growth but can 2. **Against Democracy** says that dictators insulate state and democracy undermines investment (but are dictatorships future looking?) 3. **In favour of democracy** says that dictators are predators
- **Jagdish N. Bhagwati**: democracy is more likely to promote **entrepreneurship**, democracies lead to **peace** between countries **but** democracy **without markets doesn't ensure growth**. DEMOCRACY plus **INTERNATIONAL TRADE** = ECONOMIC GROWTH
- **Gerring, Bond, Barndt and Moreno**: focus on how much **democratic stock rather than the level of democracy** as in high or low because countries that have great experience are less likely to reverse.
- **Hristos Doucouliagos and Mehmet Ali Ulubasoglu**: Democracy impacts different variables like lower inflation, lower political instability and economic freedom and those lead to economic growth. Hence democracy isn't the direct causation but **has a strong INDIRECT impact on economic growth**.
- **Modernisation theory: (Lipset)** The richer a nation is the greater its chances of developing and sustaining democracy. (**Przeworski**) reassess the theory by saying that yes greater changes to endure but doesn't explain why it emerges.

- **PARLIAMENTARISM VS PRESIDENTIALISM:** two different institutions and parl. more durable than pres.

Presidentialism states that when the **presidential candidate** is defeated he will not be a member but Parliamentarism states that he will become the leader of the opposition.

Democratic **life under presidentialism less than 20 years vs 71 under parliamentarism.**

Parliamentarist systems are more **vulnerable during an economic crisis** than presidentialist systems who are less sensitive. However, **presidentialism dies at higher rates under any external conditions** hence parliamentarism stands out in any situation.

1989 - MOMENT OF TRANSITION (LECTURE 3)

Prior to 1989

- 1956: Hungarian Uprising
- 1968: Prague Uprising
- 1978: Wojtyla elected pope - tremendous influence on the poles
- 1980: Emergence of a solidarity trade union led by Lech Walesa
- 1981: Martial law imposed in Poland hence solidarity leaders imprisoned - situation where people left the country if they had the means to do so
- 1983: Martial law was lifted

Timeline during 1989 - January to August

- February to April: Polish roundtable talks - reforms in the regime
- March: Opposition roundtable is formed in Hungary - reforms in the regime
- 4 and 18 of June: first Polish semi-free elections since after WWII where Solidarity wins
- 27 June: Austrian and Hungarian foreign ministers cut through the border fence
- East German State and West German state were still two different states, where the EG didn't have a strong economy, no freedom in television, communist regime as opposed to WG
- 23 August: 600 km-long human chain formed across Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania (Baltic Chain)
- 24 August: 1st non communist regime in the Communist Europe was formed in Poland - prime minister elected

Timeline during 1989 - September to November

- 11 September: Hungary lets East German refugees travel through to Austria
- 9 October: Leipzig demonstration - peaceful revolution in East Germany
- 18 October: Erich Honecker, leader of EG communist party, resigns
- 4 November: 1 million people demonstration in East Berlin
- 9 November: the Berlin Wall falls

Timeline during 1989 - November and December

- 17 November: demonstrations in Czechoslovakia bring down the government
- 16 December: Romania protests
- 25 December: Romania's dictator Ceausescus is executed

Timeline during 1990

- March 1990: East Germany communist party loses elections **and** Estonia and Lithuania declare independence
- May 1990: Latvia declares independence
- June 1990: Russia declares sovereignty
- October 1990: Germany re-unites - shocking given that in even less than a year since the fall of the Berlin wall, two countries that had no communication or relationship whatsoever unite
- December 1990: Walesa, leader of the solidarity party in Poland, is elected president

Timeline during 1991

- January 1991: Soviet crackdown in Latvia and Lithuania
- June 1991: Boris Yeltsin elected Russian president
- July 1991: Warsaw Pact dissolves - Pact of military amnesty between communist countries in Europe, opponent of the American capitalism. Symbol of Soviet dominance in eastern Europe.
- August 1991: Hardliner coup led by the head of the now Old Soviet Union, fails in the USSR, as Yeltsin, the Russian president stood in front of the coups
- December 1991: Belavezha Accords declare USSR dissolved