

## Week 4: Democracy and Democratization: Competing Approaches

- This week, we move from talking about economic development in isolation to looking at the relationship between development and democracy specifically.
- Start with distinguishing two classes of theories we read about today: structuralist and voluntarist. Keep these two classes in mind as we move through our discussion.
- I encourage you to bring in India as a way of evaluating these competing theories.

### Definitions

- Structuralist: Importance of deeply entrenched conditions. Minimize the role of human agency. Tend to be pretty deterministic.
- Voluntarist: Focus on the role of leadership and human agency in shaping outcomes

### 1. Start with Dahl:

- Why is democracy important?
- How does Dahl define democracy? (inclusive/participatory and allows for public contestation)
- What has to happen in order to move from something like a closed hegemony to a polyarchy? [cost of repression goes up, cost of toleration go down]
- Is there just one path to polyarchy?
  - o NO.
    - Liberalization precedes inclusiveness (England, Sweden)
    - Inclusion precedes liberalization (Germany from Empire to Weimar)
    - Huge shock goes from closed hegemony → polyarchy (France from 1789 to 1792)

### 2. How do the following cause democracy? What are mechanisms by which these variables act? (You can think of mechanisms as the means by which the

independent variable causes the change in the dependent variable.) If it exists, identify the IV, DV and mechanism.

- economic development [Lipset 1960, Przeworski & Limongi 1997]
- social classes [Moore, 1966]
- culture [Huntington 1996]

➔ Split the section up into three groups: Lipset and P&L, Huntington, Moore. Have them talk about the argument/IV/DV/Mech.

Discussion about these three theories: (can skip if necessary)

3. Przeworski & Limongi: P&L talk about the choice between democracy and development. What do they say about it? Do they give us a causal story? In other words, is there a chicken and an egg problem in their theory?
4. Do Lipset and Moore face the same chicken or egg problem, or are their causal chains more straightforward?

Coming back to structuralist v. voluntarist:

- Write up on board where all the authors fall
- Do you guys find structuralist or voluntarist theories more compelling? Which better explains the Indian case?

Structuralist:

- Lipset (economic development)
- Moore (classes)
- Huntington (culture)

Voluntarist

- Lipset on Washington (1998)

Between Structuralist and Voluntarist

- Dahl (talks about stuff like the resources, but also about systems of mutual security, which is sort of institutional)
- Przeworski and Limongi (political actors initiate democracy, economic growth helping maintain democracies)