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ABSTRACT

The concept of democracy has remarkably developed since its early days. From the simple requirement of participation and the introduction of representation, the ideals of democracy have been developing alongside the demands of modern society. The role representation of political parties also developing particularly as more countries adopt democracy thus requiring further research on the path to achieve democratic constitution. At the same time, the scope of implementing democracy has also expanded to include possibilities of international democracy, where multiple nation-states are involved in a single entity – requiring of further development of the concept. Thus, although the progress of theoretical development of the concept of democracy has been expanding, so have the demands for more adaptable and adoptable.

Key words: Democracy, democracy’s prerequisites, democratisation, democratic transition

The popularity of democracy has inspired David Held to begin Models of Democracy by stating ‘we live in the age of democracy’ (Held, 1996:xii). Dahl proves the growing popularity of democracy by counting that there were 65 democratic countries in 1990 while there was only one in 1860 (Dahl, 1998:8), and according to the Freedom House website, there are 117 electoral democracies in 2004. Transformation from non-democratic to democratic regimes has been praised as the right choice by Western governments, although anti-democratic movements continue to oppose (Huntington, 1993:1). Democracy projects a political system where everyone has fair opportunities to take part in decision making in government.

My argument here is that theories on democracy have developed tremendously. The debate on democracy has evolved since the application of first democratic practices in Athens and Rome – the first two cities that introduced the concept of people’s participation. Discussion on democracy is dominated by characteristics of democracy and the conditions where it can flourish. Especially since the 1980s and 1990s, the increasing popularity of democracy has ‘forced’ democracy theorists to focus on the transition or transformation of non-democratic, particularly in Southern and Eastern Europe. With the growing power of international organisations, debate on democracy has to tackle the issue of democratic practices at the supra-national level.

This essay discusses the argument in four sections. The first discusses the concept of democracy, where there is a short discussion of the history of democracy. The second section talks about democratisation, transition to democracy, and democratic consolidation. The paths leading to democracy will be elaborated in this section. The third section discusses various aspects of democracy, traditional and modern. I choose political parties to represent the more traditional aspect in one section and discuss briefly the application of democracy in modern nation-states in the next sub-section.
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Democracy

Democracy derived from Greek words demos (people) and kratos (to rule); put simply, it means rule of the people. Dahl explains that in around 500 B.C.E. demos was used to refer to the entire Athenians, common people, or even the poor; people who were often left out from decision-making process in Athens (Huntington 1993:12). Thus, the concept implies that there must be involvement from everyone in government’s decision-making process.
A similar concept of public participation appeared in Rome around the same time, but only in late eighteenth century the concept of representation was developed in Europe, complementing the function of assembly in Northern Europe and Scandinavian countries (Huntington, 1993:18-22).

Dahl argues that democracy results in ‘desirable outcomes’ such as general freedom, self determination, and political autonomy; thus challenging the reputation of non-democratic systems (Huntington 1993:45). The rapid spread of democracy has been boosted by, among others, the declines of colonisation and military dictatorship, and the institutions of market-capitalism (Huntington, 1993:163-164). Samuel Huntington argues that democratisation started in what he calls the first wave in the early 1800s, the second wave in 1943-1962, and the third started in 1974. The collapse of communism in Eastern Europe around the 1980s was regarded as the highlight of the waves of democratisation. Western governments reacted positively to the collapse, praising supremacy of democracy while hoping that China as the most powerful remaining non-democratic country will follow suit.

Dahl’s criteria for a democratic process lists: effective participation, voting equality, enlightened understanding, control of the agenda, and inclusion of adults (Dahl, 1998:37-38). His criteria emphasises freedom, equality, participation and rule of law. These basic preconditions have further developed from the practices of democracy in its early days in Athens and Italy, where women were still denied the right to participate. The factor of representation has also been emphasised, as modern states have developed in population as such, that it is difficult to include everybody without representation (Dahl, 1998:62-80).

Dahl argues that democracy is the best alternative for a government, because participation from citizens prevents autocracy, and thus ‘cruel and vicious autocrats’ (Dahl, 1998:46). Democracy also guarantees its citizens’ fundamental rights such as personal freedom, freedom of speech and voting (Dahl 1998:48-50). Democratic government provides moral responsibility and fosters human development (Dahl 1998:55-56). Furthermore, in interaction with each other, democratic countries are less likely to fight wars (Dahl 1998:57).

There are conditions for democracy to develop in a society. The essential conditions according to Dahl are: control of military and police by elected officials, democratic beliefs and political culture, and no strong foreign control hostile to democracy (Dahl, 1998:147). A ‘civilian-controlled’ military and existing democratic belief are repressed in non-democratic countries, making it difficult for change to democratic system. There are also favourable conditions, they are: a modern market economy and society, and weak subcultural pluralism (Dahl 1998:147). On economic development, Huntington argues further that it is by no means a determinant, but it does have significant impact on democracy (Huntington 1993:59). Przeworski and Limongi carefully conclude that ‘economic growth increases the chance that democracy would survive, while democracy does not impede economic growth’ (Hadenius, 1997:178 and 195-241).

Democratisation

Theories about transition and democratisation have focused on regions such as South America, Southern Europe, and Eastern Europe. Post-communist Europe has attracted a lot of attention in this field, especially Russia (Lane, 1996; Ferry & Kanet, 1998; Gill 1998). The more recent work of Budd has supported the notion that other regions, such as Africa and the Middle East have seemed ‘reluctant’ to adopt democracy (Budd 2003: 10, 12, 14). It is ambitious to generalise the experiences of different countries and an attempt to theorise at a general level by Diamond has been deemed as lacking in depth (Power, 2000:738-739). Pridham notes that because there are more transitions – which does not necessarily stabilise – than consolidation, there is also more work on transition compared to consolidation.

The economic growth of Asian countries has also been partly associated with the different kind of Asian-style democratisation, often called ‘soft authoritarianism’ (Hood, 1998:853). Supporters of this style of democracy claim that because Asia is culturally different from the West, its political
regime must suit this particular circumstance (Hood, 1998:853). The main feature of Asian-style democracy is the higher level of government control, which Asian leaders believe makes the difference for them to somewhat prevent social malaise such as those in Western countries (Hood, 1998:853). To transform from an authoritarian system to democracy, countries undergo a process of democratisation. Democratisation according to Pridham is ‘a loose expression describing the overall process of regime change from start to completion’, from the end of authoritarian system to emergence and permanence of democracy (Pridham, 1995:xii). Pridham defines that democratic transition starts from the collapse of totalitarian or authoritarian regime, and when democratic institutions begin to strengthen (Pridham, 1995:xii). A democracy is considered consolidated when democracy became ‘the only game in town’, meaning that no significant forces tries to overthrow the democratic regime (Linz & Stepan, 1996:5).

Linz argues that the strictest definition of the end of transition period and beginning of a democratic era is when ‘elected representatives create or restore a basic constitutional framework, defining the functions of the different organs in the government’ (Linz, 1990:157). Linz & Stepan believe that consolidation must be evident behaviourally, attitudinally, and constitutionally (Linz & Stepan, 1996:5-6). Behaviourally there must be no significant effort to overthrow the democratic regime, attitudinally when strong majority of public opinion have absolute confident in democracy, and constitutionally when governmental and non-governmental forces are subjected and habituated to specific laws (Linz & Stepan, 1996: 6).

Mainwaring and Scully claim that establishing democracies is about constructing ‘democratic institutions: norms, rules, and organisations’ that mould the way actors behave (Mainwaring & Scully, 1995:27). These rules and regulations help the formation of certainty in the system. Unexpectedness exists as a result of freedom of aspiration, but actors respect and are fearful of the law, so that they pursue their interests in accordance with the binding law. These regulations and guidelines support democracy significantly, as uncertainty in weak democracies could undermine its establishment.

Eric Budd particularly notes free elections, the writing of constitutions, and the inaugurating of a new parliament as important indicators of democratisation (Budd, 2003:5). Budd believes that ‘for democracy to be consolidated, uncertainty is essential’ and that ‘democracy thrives on uncertainty and unpredictability’ (Budd, 2003:6). On elections for example, he argues that election results must not be predetermined, but at the same time people must have confidence in the system and political institutions to vote (Budd, 2003:6). Adam Przeworski believes that the ‘institutionalisation of uncertainty’ is the most important sign of democratisation (Budd 2003:6). He believes that democracy is consolidated when political actors are willing to accept the popular will, resulted from free elections (Budd, 2003:6).

Mainwaring and Scully support this view by stating that democratic consolidation happens when ‘actors bet on electoral politics as their chief currency for achieving power and shaping the policy agenda’ (Mainwaring & Scully, 1995:27).

Linz goes further by explaining the paths to democracy. He quoted Stepan who presents different paths, determined by: connection to international war and intervention, transformation that comes from experience of authoritarian regime that initiate and control democratisation, and transformations where forces of the opposition play a major role. Although too elaborate to be explained here, Stepan believes that the most crucial question related to the process of transition is deciding who shall lead the process between the fall of authoritarian regime and the establishment of an elected government – Stepan thinks that the leadership could determine the future stability of the democracy (Linz, 1990:149). Desire to be democratised may come from within the authoritarian regime or the opposing pro-democratic movement, but success and stability of democracy would need both sides to be support democratisation, voluntarily or otherwise (Linz, 1990:149-150). Stepan teams up with Linz in a further effort to categorise the paths to democracy. They differentiate the paths according to the regime types that democracies (try to) replace: authoritarianism, totalitarianism, post-totalitarianism, and sultanism (Linz & Stepan, 1996:57-64). The paths are: reforma-pactada or ruptura-pactada, defeat in war, coup by non-hierarchical military, extrication

---

7 There are ten paths explained in Linz (1990: 148-149).
8 Reforma-pactada happens when transitions tend to be initiated when leaders in the authoritarian regime start considering the possibility of a reform leading to some form of political democracy. Ruptura-pactada happens when there is a break with the existing institutional arrangements, a change not controlled and even without any participation by previous regime (Linz, 1990: 150-151).
from rule by hierarchical led military, and other regime-specific possible transition paths and likely outcomes Linz & Stepan, 1996:57-60). Linz and Stepan also specify the minimal tasks for different regimes to finish transition and consolidation – the minimal requirements for all regimes are free and lively civil society, rule of law, free elections, functioning bureaucracy, civilian-controlled military and sufficient economic autonomy (Linz & Stepan, 1996:62-64).

Table 1. The Implications of Non-democratic Regime Type for the Minimal Tasks of Completing Transition to and Consolidation of a Democratic Regime from that Regime type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Necessary Conditions</th>
<th>Authoritarianism</th>
<th>Totalitarianism</th>
<th>Post-totalitarianism</th>
<th>Sultanism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rule of law and civil society freedom</strong></td>
<td>In some authoritarian regimes there is a pretension of rule of law and civil society that might be quite lively, but civil liberties will need to be protected. Laws giving autonomy to trade unions, media, etc. may never be enacted and implemented.</td>
<td>Rule of law did not exist. Much of the legal code still needed, was highly politicised and instrumental for the party-state but not for its citizens and therefore incompatible with democracy. Civil liberties are minimal and need to be legalised, developed, and protected. The ‘flattened’ nature of civil society requires fundamental changes that are difficult to e</td>
<td>An extensive form of the legal system in place needs the rule of law to be established.</td>
<td>Given the legacy of the totalitarian state, private and the extreme personalisation of political the establishment of a rule of law and guarantees for citizens have a high priority and will be a difficult task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political society autonomy and trust and legal condition for it</strong></td>
<td>All the normal conditions ensuring the free electoral competition between competing parties need to be created. In some cases, party competition has only been suspended and can easily be reactivated. In other cases, the formation of parties needs to be legalised and restrictions on specific parties lifted. In some cases, the political rights of key political actors need to be re-established. In exceptional cases an authoritarian state party may have to be dismantled.</td>
<td>The party’s dominant position in all areas of society and its privileged status as the only party to be dismantled, its presence in all institutions removed, and almost all of its property transferred to the state. However, if citizens want to recreate the party they should be allowed to do so, and its support and power should depend on the votes people might want to give it. Given the flattened social landscape the representation of interests will be particularly difficult.</td>
<td>The dismantling of the privileged status, legal and otherwise, of the dominant party will be needed. Legal reform will also be needed to assure the free formation and competition of political parties. While society may not be as ‘flattened’ as under totalitarianism, the relative lack of economic and political differentiation makes political ‘representation’ of interests difficult and complicates the development of a normal spectrum of democratic parties.</td>
<td>The suppression of semi-private violence and the creation of a modicum of trust are requirements for the development of political parties, free contestation for power, and sufficient autonomy for the working of democratic procedures and institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constitutional rules allocate power democratically</strong></td>
<td>In some cases, there can be an immediate decision that the previous democratic constitution has been reinstated, in other cases amendments to a non-democratic constitution may be viable, in still others a full democratic constituent assembly and constitution-making process are needed.</td>
<td>A paper constitution may exist that, when filled with democratic content, might lead to perverse consequences, since it was not designed for a democratic society. The making of a new democratic constitution will be necessary, but difficult due to an inchoate political society, the lack of a constitutional culture, and the legacy created by the verbal commitments of the previous constitution.</td>
<td>Given the fictive character of the constitution, there are serious costs to using these institutions, and the making of a democratic constitution should be a high priority.</td>
<td>A universalistic legal culture will have to be developed. Even while there may be a usable corpus of law, the recent abuse of constitutional rules, a spirit of trust and respect for constitutionalism does not exist at the end of a totalitarian period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State bureaucracy acceptable and serviceable to democratic government</strong></td>
<td>To the extent that the bureaucracy has not been politicised and has maintained professional standards, there may be no immediate need for bureaucratic reform. In some cases, a more or less limited purge of bureaucrats, including the judiciary and the military, might be desirable. But if a hierarchical military played a major role in the previous non-democratic regime, such purges may be quite difficult.</td>
<td>The delegation of major tasks of the state to the party and the penetration of the party into all bureaucratic and social institutions make the creation of a non-politicised bureaucracy an imperative and difficult task. The dismantling of the party within the state might seriously reduce the efficiency and coordination of the state apparatus and open the door for a clientelistic take-over by the new democrats or by opportunists. The experience of the party state leaves a legacy of popular distrust of the state.</td>
<td>The fact that many functions of the state including judiciary functions, were performed by party bureaucrats makes purges and reform of the state bureaucracy widespread demand but a complex and contentious process. The skills of the former bureaucratic elite and the lack of experience of opposition may well give the former elite a privileged position.</td>
<td>The clientelistic penetration and corruption of bureaucratic institutions limit their efficiency and legitimacy and put extensive reform of the agenda. Even democratically elected leaders may perpetuate clientelistic practices rather than rational administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sufficient autonomy for actors to assure pluralism of civil society, political society, and economic society</strong></td>
<td>If the economy has been a functioning mixed economy, there may be no immediate changes necessary to facilitate the transition and consolidation of democracy. Whatever further reforms are desired or needed will be part of normal economic development. This might include more socialisation or more privatisation of property and more or less social and/or economic regulation of the market.</td>
<td>In communist totalitarianism the almost total public ownership of property and the linkages between the party and the economy make the growth of autonomy of civil and political society particularly difficult. Fundamental reform of the economy is imperative, but the absence of a legal institutional framework for autonomy and the weakness of legal culture make the creation of an ‘economic society’ difficult and facilitate the emergence of illegal or illegal practices.</td>
<td>Ultimate control by the state of all economy activity does not seem conducive to the minimal degree of civil and political society robustness necessary for a democratic polity. Some reforms are necessary to create an institutionalised economic democracy. The economic strategy is not a requirement for democracy.</td>
<td>Dismantling of the patronal and clientelistic structures of the ruler and his allies will be necessary to allow the normal development of civil, political, and economic society.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Donald Share presents a somewhat simpler classification of democratic transition. Share categorises transitions to democracy according to whether they happen by or against regime leader, his criteria are: consensual or non-consensual and whether the transition occurs gradually or rapidly (Share, 1987:530). He defines gradual transition by regime leaders (consensual) as incremental democratisation, rapid transition by regime leaders as transition through transaction, gradual transition against regime leaders as transition through protracted revolutionary struggle, and rapid transition against regime leaders as transition through rupture (Share, 1987:530). Share highlights the possibility of the eruption of public demands for ‘economic, social, cultural, and political change’, and intensification of mobilisation and politicisation; which could lead to chaos unless the system can contain them (Share, 1987:534).

Another prominent democracy theorist, Giuseppe di Palma, supports the claim of the importance of uncertainty and control in consolidated democracy. He claims that democracy’s openness and open-endedness are its weakness (Pridham, 1995:194). Di Palma argues that in a democracy ‘nobody loses once and for all and on all arenas’ (Pridham, 1995:194). There is always possibility to gain control if one can convince enough supporters (for example in a free election) – this is an opportunity that democracy’s ‘enemies’ might want to capitalise on. Di Palma believes that to prevent its overthrow, a democracy must be supported by a coalition of consent to support it from a widest range possible of opponents and loyalists (Pridham, 1995:194).

The success to establish a consolidated democracy can be enhanced by favouring conditions, Huntington argues that prior experience of democracy, high level of economic development, the existence of foreign forces that support democracy, and timing could all contribute to the formation of consolidated democracy (Huntington, 1993:270-275). He also believes that less violent transformation also favours the pace of democratisation, and the number and nature of consolidation problems could be determinant in the process (Huntington, 1993:276-277).

The collapse of non-democratic regimes and the effort to establish democracies have not always been successful. Budd noted that although countries like Taiwan have relatively succeeded in building secure democracy, others like Peru experienced the temporary resurgence of authoritarianism, and Philippines have reverted back to authoritarian (Budd, 2003:79). When democratisation is successfully achieved, there are different models of democracy that can be adopted. Held presents models ranging from republicanism, liberal democracy, competitive elitist democracy, pluralism, legal democracy, and participatory democracy (Held, 1996:36-271). A resounding feature of these different models goes back to Dahl’s argument on the conditions for democracy to flourish: equality, participation, and control.

**Evolution of democracy**

The practice of democracy has evolved from its early application in Greece and Rome. The basic concept of direct participation is no longer possible with large population of nation-states, and the concept of representation has developed to replace it (Hadenius, 1997:143-160). There are more issues to consider when discussing democracy these days. When ‘simple’ democracy was introduced, what mattered was to get people involved in decision-making. As society became more sophisticated, political parties were formed as means to accumulate and organise political interests. Public debate and voting these days are no longer constricted by national boundaries, as intergovernmental organisations have become increasingly significant for countries as means to enhance co-operation. The practice of democracy has influenced international decision-making, as explained below.

**Political Parties**

Democracy is closely associated with elections, and elections are seen as the lifeblood and backbone of democracy. Huntington argues that ‘elections are the way democracy operates’ (Huntington, 1993:174). They are how representatives are chosen and less popular candidates dumped (at least until the next election). Through the mechanism of free elections, voters can express their preference for policies and candidates, and the more support the particular policies and candidates have, the more legitimacy they have to govern.

A political party is defined as ‘any political group that presents at elections, and is capable of placing through elections, candidates for public office’ (Mainwaring & Scully, 1995:2). The importance of parties lies in the fact that they are ‘the main agents of political representation and are virtually the only actors with access to elected positions in democratic politics’ (Mainwaring & Scully, 1995:2). Although
there are new social movements as another form of political representation; it is difficult if at all possible to have a proper democracy without political parties. Political parties are the official associations functioning as vehicles to obtain governmental position, and express political aspirations.

The significance of political parties as political vehicles has also been somewhat eroded alongside the modernisation of society. Increasingly, people no longer feel the need to be associated with particular parties. Modern society might value being a member of political party as less than, for example, member of prestigious business society. Voters can vote for their parties without being a member; and probably they would feel less controlled or obliged that way, especially in case they want to vote for another party in the next elections. Linz believes that although this trend of ‘floating voters’ could be seen as detrimental to the future of democracy, it actually promotes the accountability of elected parties and officials (Hadenius, 1997:416).

Because parties functions as the vehicles of political competition, in order for a democracy to be consolidated it must have an institutionalised party system – meaning that the party system’s organisation and procedures ‘have value and stability’ (Mainwaring & Scully, 1995:4, 416). Leonardo Morlino points out to Europe to argue that parties are crucial for democratic consolidation. This model of consolidation involves progressive organisation and expansion of party structures and system, solid alignments of parties with social groups, well-established party identities, and high influence of party elites in decision-making (Pridham, 1995:583).

Hofferbert believes that ideally political parties must ‘articulate and aggregate societal interests’, and ‘the extent to which parties fulfil these functions require a degree of stability in the structure of electoral competition and parliamentary organisation’ (Hofferbert, 1998:7). Hofferbert goes on by explaining that democratic control by the voters depends on the ability to make electoral choices predictive of political performance, and at the same time apply retrospective punishment for party failure (Hofferbert, 1998:7). Thus, while it is uncertain who is going to win the election, there must be confidence that the popular winner should perform according to popular demand – consequences of non-performance is failure in the next election.

Mainwaring and Scully stress that the institutionalisation of party system itself implies that there is possible conflict, as party systems function differently – some promote moderation and compromise and others encourage extremism (Mainwaring & Scully, 1995: 21). What is crucial is that because democracy is unpredictable, when the party system is institutionalised there is more certainty in the structure of political process (Mainwaring & Scully, 1995:21-22). Rustow believes that in a consolidated democracy there is confidence in the rules and practice of democratic techniques, where the ‘population becomes fitted into the new structure by the forging of effective links of party organisation’ (Pridham, 1995:598).

**Democracy beyond borders**

It is virtually impossible these days for a country to have no co-operation with other countries. International organisations (governmental and non-governmental) have developed and include more countries than 20-30 years ago. There is a growing need to form groupings or ‘alliances’ with other countries with the same interests. These groupings, because they consist of a collection of countries, have greater power than a single country.

The jurisdiction of nation-states is increasingly challenged by the growing connections and relatedness among countries. The decision to join an international organisation usually automatically translates to the transfer of parts of authority and decision-making to the organisation as well. David Held on this issue argues that ‘sovereignty is eroded only when it is displaced by forms of higher and/or independent authority which curtail the rightful basis of decision-making within a national framework (Held, 1996:342). Structures and rules are usually valid within boundaries, so when boundaries are enlarged by the groupings of countries, it means that bureaucracy must have an enlarged jurisdiction as well.

---

8 Mainwaring and Scully name new social movement as a new form of contemporary political communication that challenges the function of political parties (Mainwaring & Scully, 1995: 2).

9 Theories on political parties, mainly in Europe have suggested that there is a ‘decline of parties’ as degree of partisanship has been declining (Hofferber, 1998).

10 International organisations such as United Nations (UN) and European Union keep enlarging their membership bases since their establishments. The UN had 51 members in 1945, and in 2002 had 191 members. The European Union has developed from six to 25 members in 2004.
The essence of democracy is to give power to the largest number of votes or most supported decision, and only that decision has legitimacy. The issue becomes more complicated when the decision affects other communities as well and conflict may arise. For example, decision to ban marriages between different religions may upset mixed-religions couples; but decision to allow mixed-religions marriages could also upset particular religious leaders. In a larger scale, international body’s decision to preserve rain forest in a particular country might conflict with the country’s individual policy to clear the forest for housing purposes, so decisions have to be made extremely carefully.

In international level, the problem becomes more complicated as countries have their own autonomy with particular interests. A decision made in one country could affect other countries as well, and may trigger conflict. Held gives examples: decision to build a nuclear plant near border areas is probably taken without consulting the nearby countries although implications might be applicable to them, and decision to increase interest rates is a national decision but could change international economic situation (Held, 1996:337). Even a decision to permit harvesting of trees planted in the jurisdictional area of a particular country could be protested by other countries arguing that such actions could have ecological impact surpassing national borders (Held, 1996:337).

The emergence of issues that affect multiple countries or international issues, such as HIV/AIDS and nuclear weaponry, has made national-decision making a focus of attention of international organisations. Held believes that the growing interconnectedness of countries have made national decisions of the international issues questionable in their coherence, viability, and accountability (Held, 1996:337). International organisations feel they have the power to ensure the seriousness of nation-states to handle international problems.

At the same time, democratic legitimacy from decisions made by international organisations is also problematic. Decisions made by the organisations could have conflicts with national decisions of individual member countries. Furthermore, the application of democratic principles would probably have to be somewhat altered or adjusted in supra-national level. To formulate a fair system of representation, there are sensitive aspects to be considered; for example: should larger population be given more votes, or whether representatives be allocated according to population size (Held, 1996:355). There are conflicts that could arise from such debates. There needs to be communally binding rules obeyed by the member countries.

Held further refers to the evolved and modern democracy as ‘cosmopolitan democracy’, which ‘would involve the development of administrative capacity and independent political resources at regional and global levels as a necessary complement to those in local and national polities’ (Held, 1996:354). He implies that this model of democracy requires the ‘strengthening of administration capacity’ of organisations such as the European Union and United Nations (Held, 1996:354). State capacity will decrease, but democratic institutions at regional and global level are an important complement. What this means, is a greater intensity of uncertainty because of the uncertainties of international issues, and the requirement for stronger management and bureaucratic control across boundaries.

Jagdish Bhagwati argues however, that globalisation in general brings positive effects for democracy – not only has globalisation spread the idea of democracy and enhanced awareness about democracy; he also believes that the quality of democracy has improved with increased international trade and investments (Hadenius, 1997:278). Larry Diamond supports this conviction by explaining that globalisation also encourages international assistance and aid to promote the growth of democracy (Hadenius, 1997:311-370). Thus, there seem to be various advantages and disadvantages of internationalisation and globalisation for nation-states, and they need to be cautious in weighing both effects.

An unfinished debate

Debate on democracy has evolved to include more ‘contemporary’ issues such as the possible conflict between and international organisation’s and individual member countries’ policies, and the application of democratic decision-making in international organisations. From Plato, Aristotle, to Dahl; the debate of democracy has been enriched with various aspects to be considered. When the
concept of representation became inevitable, theorists thought about the best and fairest way of representing the population.

When political groupings were formed, democracy’s concerns were focused on how they compete, and how to regulate the competition or the elections. Political parties have established themselves as important actors and crucial vehicles to obtain governmental posts, but democracy theorists require that there must be a free and lively civil society in a democracy – thus, conditions for democracy have been enlarged. Dahl’s conditions for democracy (five of them: effective participation, voting equality, enlightened understanding, control of the agenda, and inclusion of adults) have been focused and elaborated by Linz and Stepan by classifying various non-democratic regimes and the specific conditions that they need to reform to be democratic (see Table 1).

David Held goes one level higher to observe the application of democracy in a global scope. With varying interests and sizes, international organisations need to be careful in accommodating their members’ wills. Specific democratic mechanisms such as voting must take into account that there are varying degrees of importance of issues for different countries. Furthermore, members have to agree on whether to apply one country, one vote or proportionately allocate votes according to size of population.

The issues considered in this essay are only some of the facets of democracy. With the modernisation of countries there are new facets that the democracy debate needs to include. With the interconnectedness and interdependence of countries, issues such as nuclear war, the ozone layer, and rain forests are no longer national issues and have become more international and more sensitive. It is yet to be seen how modernisation and globalisation will really impact the debate on democracy in the future.
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