

Southern Political Science Association

Review: [untitled]

Author(s): Kenneth Janda

Reviewed work(s):

The Process of Democratization: A Comparative Study of 147 States, 1980- 1988. by Tatu Vanhanen

Source: *The Journal of Politics*, Vol. 54, No. 3 (Aug., 1992), pp. 928-930

Published by: Cambridge University Press on behalf of the Southern Political Science Association

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2132336>

Accessed: 01/04/2010 22:04

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=cup>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Cambridge University Press and Southern Political Science Association are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Politics*.

The Process of Democratization: A Comparative Study of 147 States, 1980–1988. By Tatu Vanhanen. (New York: Crane Russak, 1991. Pp. vii, 326. \$55.00 cloth, \$35.00 paper.)

This book is in the tradition of empirical studies by Daniel Lerner, Seymour M. Lipset, and Philips Cutright on the socioeconomic requisites for democratic government, and it makes a distinct contribution to that important body of literature. Vanhanen pursues two tasks: (1) to measure variation in the degree of democracy among 147 nations annually from 1980 to 1988, and (2) to explain why democracy varies so much during the 1980s across countries and to a much lesser extent across time. His contribution to explaining democracy is more impressive than his approach to measuring it, although that is also noteworthy.

Prior to presenting his own measure, Vanhanen critically reviews the efforts of other scholars and faults most for employing indicators based on subjective evaluations: "I wanted to construct a measure of democratization based on a few quantitative indicators, which can be applied to all contemporary countries and which takes into account the most important dimensions of democracy" (17).

Vanhanen defines democracy as "a political system in which ideologically and socially different groups are legally entitled to compete for political power and in which institutional power holders are elected by the people and are responsible to the people" (11). His definition combines the pluralist conception of democracy as a struggle between competing groups with the majoritarian conception of government involving mass participation. Accordingly, he measures the level of democracy (he calls it "democratization") with two indicators, one for competition and one for participation. He measures competition by the smaller parties' share of the votes cast in parliamentary or presidential elections. He measures participation by the percentage of the *total population* voting. By multiplying rather than adding these indicators to form an Index of Democratization (ID), he corrects for countries that have very high voting turnouts in one-party regimes. By collecting annual data for all countries, he generates ID scores that can change for each country after each election.

Vanhanen validates his ID scale by comparing it with existing measures and concludes "that the use of numerous and complicated variables loaded with subjective evaluations has not produced better measures of democratization than my two simple quantitative variables" (23). Nevertheless, his ID scale results in the United States ranking only about thirtieth among 147 countries on democratization in the 1980s, behind such countries as Greece, Spain, Papua New Guinea, and Venezuela. Vanhanen notes that his scale produces higher index values for countries using proportional electoral systems rather than majority and plurality systems (30). The United States is

also penalized by his scale's reliance on voting turnout, which Vanhanen oddly attributes to its ethnic heterogeneity (169).

Although one can quibble with the ingredients of his ID scale, it has the advantage of offering an easy, objective, reasonably valid measure of democracy. Having computed his measure annually across countries from 1980 to 1988, Vanhanen is able to demonstrate that the mean level of democratization over all 147 countries rose annually from 1980 to 1988. This itself is a significant finding, but the more important contribution of the book lies in its second task, explaining variation in democratization.

Unlike most other empirical democratic theorists, Vanhanen works within an overarching theory of social evolution. "I assume that the major part of the variation of democratization can be explained by objective environmental factors" (3). He ties environmental factors to evolutionary theory thus: ". . . political structures are mechanisms or organs used in the political struggle for scarce resources and . . . consequently, they have evolved in this struggle and become adapted to varying environmental conditions. In other words, I try to apply the principles of the Darwinian theory of evolution by natural selection to the study of political systems. In this point my approach differs from all previous studies of democratization" (3).

Vanhanen descends from evolutionary theory to democratic politics by contending, "Democratic systems survive only in the countries in which competing groups are strong enough to prevent the usurpation of power by any single group" (34). He ties this contention to classical political thought by noting that Aristotle, Montesquieu, Rousseau, de Tocqueville, and Bryce wrote that "social and economic equality was nearly always connected with democracy" (39). However, contemporary theorists, such as Lerner, Lipset, and Deutsch tended to focus on wealth and modernity (economic development) rather than on the *distribution* of wealth. Vanhanen resurrects the earlier focus on distribution of wealth by proposing that democratization is explained by differences between societies in the way power resources are distributed among competing groups.

As he created his own democracy scale, Vanhanen also created an Index of Power Resources (IPR) consisting of six indicators: the percent urban population, the percent of population in nonagricultural occupations, the percent of students in the population, percent literacy, the percent of land in family-owned farms, and the degree of decentralization of nonagricultural economic resources. As measured, these indicators all reflect dispersion in the distribution of power resources, and Vanhanen finds that five of his six explanatory variables are moderately or strongly intercorrelated—the exception being "family farms." Nevertheless, he combines all three into a single Index of Power Resources because "it is plausible to expect that their combination (IPR) is a more valid indicator of resource distribution than any of IPR's single components" (69).

The study tests two major hypotheses. The first is that the Index of Power Resources is positively related with the Index of Democratization. This is strikingly supported, with the simple correlations between the two variables at .84 across all countries for every year, 1980 to 1988. While many multiple correlations reach this level, it is unusual to have a single explanatory variable explaining 70% of the variance in a measure of democracy.

The second hypothesis, that "All countries tend to cross the threshold of democracy at about the same level of the Index of Power Resources" (67), was tested by examining the residuals after regressing ID on IPR. This hypothesis, which follows from his evolutionary theory, showed a number of deviating cases—e.g., democracies that should not have been and vice versa. Vanhanen examined these cases in detail, accounted for them fairly convincingly, and found support for his second hypothesis also.

From a theoretical standpoint, the most significant contribution of Vanhanen's study was not the high correlations obtained between his IPR and ID scales but from his test of alternative theories of democratization. He showed "that successful democratizations have taken place not only in rich and socioeconomically highly developed countries but also in several poor countries at a relatively low level of socioeconomic development. It seems difficult to establish any lower limit of GNP per capita that could be regarded as a necessary condition for democratization" (194, witness India). "This is a crucial difference between my theory of democratization and various socioeconomic theories of democratization" (195).

Readers of Vanhanen's book will find a few peculiar interpretations of political dynamics in particular nations—e.g., that voting turnout in the United States would increase if ethnic homogeneity were increased through racial intermarriage. But these odd asides should not obscure the important contribution that the book makes to the empirical literature on democratic government.

Kenneth Janda, *Northwestern University*

Doctors and the State: The Politics of Health Care in France and the United States. By David Wilsford. (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1991. Pp. xv, 355. \$49.95 cloth, \$19.95 paper.)

David Wilsford has written an important book that deserves attention from political scientists and health professionals. Each will find that it makes an important contribution. At the theoretical level, Wilsford's book provides further evidence and a convincing argument about the relations between groups and the state in France and in the United States. Within the area of health care, he demonstrates that the French state operates with relative autonomy and that the groups that might oppose the actions of the state (in