



Democratization

Michael McFaul
July 31, 2017



Structural or Precondition Theories

Modernization (Lipset)

- * Positive relationship between wealth and democracy: Why?
- * Literacy
- * Urbanization
- * Demands of Greater Number of Owners

Middle Class (Marx, Barrington Moore)

- * “No Bourgeois, no democracy.” (Moore)

Equality (Aristotle)

- * Change in government does not have major distributional consequences
- * “oil curse”
- * oligarchy (big landowners) inhibits democracy
- * Increasing capital mobility helps democracy (Boix)

Structural or Precondition Theories

Culture

- * “Civic Culture” needed (Almond and Verba)
- * Some religions, cultures, traditions more conducive to democracy than others (Huntington)

Geography (Kopstein & Reilly)

- * proximity to the “West”

Borders (Rustow)

- * Must know who is in polity and who is not
- * Ethnic Homogeneity

Structures Versus Agents

- Long-Term vs. Proximate Causes
- Preconditions vs. Precipitants
- Environments vs. Actors
- Institutions vs. Individuals

The “Third Wave” Paradigm

(Rustow, O’ Donnell & Schmitter, Przeworski, Karl)

- Actors = Elites
 - Splits in Ancien Regime --Softliners versus Hardliners
 - Moderates versus Radicals (in society)
- Key Ingredient for Successful Transition = Pacts
 - “Limit agenda of policy choice”
 - Share proportionally in the distribution of benefits
 - Restrict the participation of outsiders/radicals in decision-making.
- Equal Balance of Power between incumbents and challengers
- Process Is Cooperative, Non-Zero Sum
- Strategic Interaction Creates Democracy (“democracy without democrats”)

Actors in “pacted” transitions

Softliners

Hardliners

Moderates

Radicals

Strategy of Transition

Compromise

Force

Elite Ascendant

Pact

Imposition

Relative
Actor
Strength

Reform

Revolution

Mass Ascendant

(Karl, 1990)



Manezh Square, Moscow
March 10, 1991

The “Fourth Wave” Paradigm

(Bunce, Fish, McFaul,)

- Actors = Elites **and** Masses
- Pact Not a Key Ingredient for Success
- Agenda of policy choice was not limited
 - Distribution of benefits NOT shared proportionally
 - Participation in decision-making not limited to elites
 - Mobilization not a threat to democratization
- Equal BOP not a Necessary Condition for Success
 - Can Be Cause of Conflict
- Process Is Non-Cooperative, Often Zero Sum
- You Get Democracy only with (Powerful) “Democrats”
 - Ideas or Ideology Matters

Paths from Communism

	Dictatorships	Partial Democracies	Democracies
BOP in favor of Challengers		Armenia Bosnia-Herzegovnia Georgia	Croatia * Czech Republic Estonia Hungary Latvia Lithuania Poland Slovakia* Slovenia
BOP Equal	Tajikistan	Moldova Russia Ukraine Albania Azerbaijan Macedonia	Bulgaria Mongolia
BOP in favor of Incumbents	Belarus Kazakhstan Turkmenistan Uzbekistan	FRY/Serbia	Romania

The Missing Variable in 3rd and 4th Waves: “The International System”

- **Bi-Polar System**

- Two Great Powers
- Heterogeneity of Regimes/Ideologies

- **Unipolar System**

- One Pole
- One Regime Type/Ideology

Multipolar (19th Century)

- Multiple Poles of Power
- Heterogeneity of Regimes/Ideologies

Bipolarity/Cold War Constraints on “Third Wave”

- Agenda of Change Had To Be Limited
- Evolutionary Change Necessary
- “Anti-systemic” actors kept out of transition
- Mobilization Dangerous
- Violators Squelched by US and USSR
 - Iran 1953
 - Hungary 1956
 - Czechoslovakia 1968
 - Chile 1973
 - Poland, 1980-81 (even idea of self-limiting revolution did not work)
 - These Cases not Studied in the Third Wave

Unipolarity/Post-Cold War Lack of Constraints on “Fourth Wave”

- Agenda of Change Less Limited
 - Property Rights AND Borders Can Be on the Table
- Evolutionary Change Not Necessary
 - Czechoslovakia 1989
 - Romania 1989
- “Anti-systemic” actors not as feared
 - Liberals in Eastern Europe
 - Communists in South Africa
 - Hamas (2005)?
- Mobilization (in “their” backyard) not as feared
 - Czechoslovakia 1989
 - Serbia 2000
 - Lebanon 2005

Before Arab Spring, I Would Have Argued This:

- Hegemon (U.S.) Supports S.Q.
- Agenda of Change Must Be Limited
- Evolutionary Change Necessary
 - Revival of “Self Limiting” Revolution
- “Anti-systemic” actors must kept out of transition
- Mobilization Feared
- Would Violators Be Squelched by US
- Iran, Russia, China Outliers

“Fifth” Wave (slide from 2006)

Softliners

Hardliners

Secularists

Islamists

How to Explain Arab Spring?

Agency Theories

- Breakdown of autocracies
- Few pacts (Tunisia, maybe Yemen)
- Mobilization (Egypt, Syria)
- Agenda of Change expansive
 - Liberal vs Islamist ideas
- Quasi 'anti-systemic' actors allowed to participate (Islamists, Salafists)
- Deficit of Democrats
- So far, few successful democratic transitions

How to Explain Arab Spring?

Structural Theories

- Low Level of Economic Development
- Culture
 - Muslim religion
 - Arab culture
 - Tribal institutions
- Contested Borders
 - Many multi-ethnic states
- Geo-Politics
 - U.S. (Support for autocrats in name of "stability")
 - Saudi Arabia vs. Iran (both autocracies)
 - Russia (support for Syrian autocracy)
- Geography
 - No democratic regimes in the neighborhood (Turkey?)

Lowering the Stakes of Transition

(The Incumbent's Perspective)

- Democracies Can Only Solve Small Problems
 - Not good at solving border issues
 - Property redistribution
 - Slavery
- Agreements on rules of game *before* first election
- Reason why equality helps
- Reason Why Private Sector Helps (where do retired rulers go?)
- Preserving property rights/Reducing Redistributive Taxes
 - Whites in South Africa
 - Red Directors in Eastern Europe
- Keeping some institutions in hands of *ancien regime*
 - Pinochet in Chile
 - Military in Turkey
 - Monarchy: Good for Democracy?
- Constraints on retribution
- Democracy a way to coopt masses/avoid revolution

Raising the Costs of Oppression (The Challenger's Perspective)

- Challengers Become Wealthier
- Challengers Not Beholden to State for Employment (USSR, Iran, Singapore)
- Challengers (workers/poor) acquire organizational capacity
 - Resources
 - Strikes/Unions
- Increase Civic Resistance more generally
 - Gandhi in India; Orange Revolution in Ukraine
- External Actor Increase Costs
 - Sanctions
 - Intervention

Democratic Triggers?

Defeat in War

Decolonization/Collapse of Empire

External Occupation

Economic Growth

Economic Crisis

Individuals & Ideas

Disaggregating Causes of Collapse of *Ancien Regime* Collapse from Causes of Democratic/Autocratic Emergence

- “Democratic” Triggers Actually Are Proximate Causes of *Ancien Regime* Collapse
- What Comes Next Not Determined by Triggers
- Tilly vs Skocpol

Path Dependency

Does Prior Regime Type
Influence the Mode or
Probability of Democratic
Transition?

Conventional Wisdom before 1989

- Authoritarian Regimes Can Democratize (Totalitarian cannot)
 - Private Sector Exists
 - “Resurrection” of Civil Society
 - Restoring democratic institutions
- Changing “regime” easier than changing whole system
 - Stakes of change too high in commy systems
 - Political and economic power intertwined

The Geddes Typology

- Personalistic Regimes
 - Small group relying on state for wealth
 - Who governs after death of dictator?
- Military Juntas Easier to democratize
 - Soldiers go back to barracks
 - Old institutions can be revived
 - “Re” democratization easier
- Hegemonic Party Systems
 - Have bigger “selectorate”
 - Can withstand crises better than generals, personalistic dictators: cooption

Survivability Rates of Autocracies (1946-1999, from Geddes 1999)

- Military Regimes: 9 years
- Personalistic Regimes: 15 years
- Single-party regimes: 23 years
- Theocracies
 - Islamic Republic of Iran (29 years)
 - Taliban in Afghanistan (5 years)
- Monarchies?

Competitive Authoritarian Regimes: Better Or Worse for Democratization?

- Color Revolutions – Better
 - Serbia 2000
 - Georgia 2003
 - Ukraine 2004
- Russia – Worse
- Middle East?

“Color” Revolutions

- Formal Rules Democratic
 - Elections occur
 - Change of constitution is not necessary for democratic breakthrough
- Regime is Semi-Autocracy
- Precipitant: Falsified Election
- Threat of extra-constitutional actions to restore formal constitutional rules

Precipitants

- (1) Semi-Autocratic
- (2) Unpopular leader
- (3) Rift in security forces

Ancien regime
weakens

Regime Change
“Democratic
Revolution”

- (1) Effective/united
opposition
- (2) Ability to
monitor election
- (3) Modicum of
independent
media
- (4) Demonstrations

Societal
challengers
strengthen

Are Color Revolutions Over?

- Autocrats Have Learned
 - Better at stealing elections
 - Better containing mass mobilization
 - Iran (2009) Russia (2012), Egypt (2013),
 - Hong Kong today?
- External Supporters of Autocrats Have Learned
 - Russia
 - Saudi Arabia

Are Pacts Still Possible?

- Requires doing deals with Bad Guys
 - Can it be done in era of “universal values”? (Can you negotiate with Asad?)
- Can Pacts/Secret Negotiations Occur in Era of Twitter?

Different Outcomes, Different Theories

- No One Path to Democracy (Equifinality)
- No Single Theory of Democratization
- Should We Try to Develop a Unified Theory?
- Can We Combine Structural and Actor-Centric Arguments?

Democratic Transitions vs. Democratic Consolidation



The causes of democratic transition are not necessarily the same factors that cause democratic consolidation

Factors Facilitating Democratic Stability

- **Pacted Transitions** (Schmitter & O'Donnell)
- **Non-Violent Transitions** (Ackerman & Karatnycky)
 - The Larger the Peaceful Civic Coalition, the More Probable Democracy
- **Levels of Wealth** (Przeworski et al)
- **Income Equality** (Boix)
- **Parliamentary Democracy** (Linz)
- **Ethnic Homogeneity**
- **Democratic Neighborhoods** (Kopstein and Reilly)
- **Performance (political and economic)** (Diamond)
- **Time** (Huntington)

Structure vs. Agency

- In the Long Run, Lipset is Always Right
- Lots of Dramatic History in Between

Wealth and Democratic Stability

Per Capital Income

Life Expectancy of Democracy

- Less than \$1000 = 8 Years
- \$1,000-2,000 = 18 Years
- Over \$4000 = Forever

(wealthiest subverted democracy: Argentina, 1975, \$6,055)

Income and Sustaining Democracy

- “...there is no doubt that democracies are more likely to be found in the more highly developed countries. Yet the reason is not that democracies are more likely to emerge when countries develop under authoritarianism, but that, however they do emerge, they are more likely to survive in countries that are already developed.”
(Przeworski, et al, 2000, p. 106)

Why Is Wealth Good for Democracy?

- Performance of Democracy?
- Education Levels Rise?
- Lowers the Intensity of Distributional Conflicts?

New Democracies and Economic Performance

- Life expectancy of democracy with decline in incomes: 19 years
- Life expectancy of democracy with rise in incomes: 64 years

Parliamentary vs. Presidential Systems

- **Transitions to Dictatorship 1951-1990**
 - 39 Presidential Systems
 - 13 Parliamentary Systems
 - 2 Mixed Systems

Expected Life of Democracies 1950-1990

- Parliamentary Systems: 73 Years
- Presidential Systems: 21 Years

Democracy Is Always a Struggle

- Not an Engineering Problem
- Not the “Natural” Outcome of Economic Development
- Autocrats Rarely Give Up Power without a Fight