

Rapid growth as a destabilizing force to effective democracy essay

[Politics](#), [Democracy](#)



The developmental undertakings within a nation that undergoes nontrivial transitions in democracy are directly analyzed. In countries where democracy dominates are established to develop rapidly compared to a priori identical nations, while in countries where democracy is not much practiced economic progress is comparably less.

These variations do not appear to be due to distinctions in investment and education levels. The purpose of this paper is to establish the connection between democracy and economic development.

Whether educated or trained in terms of modernization point of view or the chronological stand point, theories explicating the cradle of democracy possess deterministic characteristics.

Contained in the theory of modernity no stimulates or causes democracy, but instead it is generated by economic advances and the consequent changes in the society.

According to Moore in his theory, chronicle can be altered by social strata actors; nevertheless, they maneuver at a distance of generations with the agrarian social stratification structure of the 17th century determining the forms of government embraced in varied countries with reference to two or three centuries later (Mayer, Patterson & Thames, p. 299, para 3).

With reference to Przeworski outline of phenomenological observations, this deterministic stress resulted to a view of all methodologies being extraneous whenever an issue regarding democratization was presented in political forums during the 1970s period.

The heroes in the democratic battles did not and could not be persuaded that the destiny of their nations would be based either on the contemporary levels of progress and advancement or by the far-away past events.

They held that, even though within confinements, democratization was a repercussion of actions, and not just states. Thus, some initiatives were taught based on actors and plans instead of being enlightened in terms of deterministic situations (Mayer, Patterson & Thames, p. 302, para 2).

This paper's makes inferences that profoundly justify the later perspective. The surfacing of egalitarianism is not a derivative of growth in the economic sphere. Democratic system is or is not founded by political figures undertaking their ends, and it may be instigated at any developmental point.

It is after establishment that economic problems become active and can be held responsible, hence the probability of democratic system to survive is higher when the country's economic development is at a reputable position.

Hitherto even the most recent country's wealth status is not crucial: egalitarianism is by far likely to endure in an economy that is progressive with below \$1, 000 revenue per capita compared to where revenue ranges between \$1, 000 and \$2, 000 that diminishes in economic terms.

If these two nations or countries make it in secreting progress, it is very possible for democracies even in the poorest countries to endure recession (Mayer, Patterson & Thames, p. 305, para 8).

Basing the argument from this stand point, the idea of the link between progress and egalitarianism that subjugated the intellectual attitude and served to familiarize U. S abroad measures during cold war seems in a bizarre manner complicated.

Even though Lip set viewed economic development as an exogenous variable, his colleagues were convinced that authoritarianism is the unavoidable cost that brought by development. Galenson asserts that the self-governed a regime is, the higher the degree of resources dissemination from savings to the expenditure.

According to arguments posited by De Schweinitz, if the underdeveloped nations are to economically develop, restriction of their democratic contribution in political issues becomes mandatory. Accordingly, for development to be realized, despotism plays a fundamental role (Mayer, Patterson & Thames, p. 304, para 5).

Conclusively, since this paper supposes that despotism causes economic development which in turn yields democracy, it becomes then logical to claim that the most suitable approach to democracy is a meandering one. In addition, commonsense shows that for democracy to be strong it is individual citizens to reinforce it through despotism rejection at all cost.

Therefore, at least with modernity most long-lasting despotic regimes especially in the Eastern region of Europe in the end collapses. Most of the nations established recently, many of which are languishing in absolute poverty even after being granted sovereignty, are still drowning in poverty

with the few that resisted development still retaining dictatorship (Mayer, Patterson & Thames, p. 301, para 1).

Mayer, L., Patterson, D., & Thames, F. (2009). *Contending Perspectives in Comparative Politics*. Washington, DC: CQ Press.