Chapter 3

The regime typology

The unified theory outlined in the previous chapter predicts that human security will be advanced most effectively where inclusive and effective democratic institutions and procedures empower all citizens, so that they can express their demands and hold elected officials accountable for their actions, and, secondly, where state capacity is strengthened, so that the regime authorities can implement their policies and respond to public demands, including managing security, tax revenues, and the supply of public goods and services. It is argued that strengthening either liberal democracy or state capacity alone is insufficient; instead, it is proposed that the combination of both factors will provide the conditions most likely to generate effective and durable development outcomes, defined here in terms of prosperity, welfare and internal peace. The next challenge is therefore to unpack these broad concepts, to consider how they can be operationalized, and then to apply the measures to classify regimes around the world and over time.

The Concept of Governance

To clarify our terms, following the Eastonian conception of a political system, three levels can be distinguished: the nation, the regime and the incumbent authorities. The nation-state represents the community to which people belong. The ‘regime’ constitutes the basic framework for governing the nation-state within its territorial boundaries. This includes the overarching constitutional arrangements and the core government institutions at national, regional and local levels, reflecting the formal and informal rules of the game. Lastly the authorities represent the elected and appointed actors holding office and the key decision-makers in the public sector. Of these elements, nation-states are the most stable, although they can be dissolved and breakup into their component parts, as in the case of Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and Sudan, and new nation-states can succeed, such as in Timor-Leste. Regimes are moderately durable although they can also change, whether in response to conquest by an external power, popular revolution, elite coup d’état, the dissolution of the nation-state, or through processes of reconstruction and peace-building, such as a negotiated constitutional settlement following civil war. Regimes also fall into distinct eras, for example with new constitutions introduced in states following the breakdown of the Soviet Union, the downfall of Saddam Hussein’s regime in Iraq, or the end of apartheid in South Africa. It is more difficult to classify cases of regime transition where an incremental or evolutionary process gradually modifies major components of the state's existing
institutions, for example following the major electoral reform which produced an enduring shift in patterns of party competitions in New Zealand, or following the passage of laws expanding the constitutional powers of the executive and abolishing the monarchy in Nepal. In general, however, it requires a wholesale constitutional settlement altering many institutions to produce clear-cut cases of regime change.

How should regime institutions be conceptualized and measured? The idea of ‘governance’ has become intellectually fashionable in recent years, yet this complex notion is open to multiple meanings. ‘Governance’ is widely understood as more diffuse than simply ‘government’, including a broader range of actors, but scholars differ in their understanding of this term. This study seeks to remain neutral about what goals states seek to achieve, and their policies, and thus normative judgments about the most appropriate range, size, or scope of governance. State capacity is also treated as distinct from the effects of the state on society, which the research seeks to establish empirically. Unfortunately many studies of mix all these elements together conceptually, including a long and ever-growing shopping list of qualities. The term ‘governance’ is often modified in recent usage by heavily value-laden but highly abstract terms of approval, notably the World Bank’s notion of ‘good’ governance, as well as vague normative terms of approval, such as the ‘quality of governance’. The kitchen-sink approach is problematic and conceptually muddled, however, since the most appropriate role, functions, size and scope of the state remain a matter of intense ideological debate, especially the degree of government intervention in economic markets.

This study focuses primarily upon state capacity, specifically conceptualized in classical Weberian terms. State capacity determines how far regime authorities can achieve their goals and perform functions essential for collective well-being, including maintaining order and security within the nation’s territorial boundaries, improving welfare outcomes for its population, and expanding prosperity. This conception closely follows Michael Mann’s argument, focusing upon the “institutional capacity of a central state...to penetrate its territories and logistically implement decisions.” The broadest function of state capacity concerns protecting the safety and security of citizens through maintaining sovereignty against external threat, exercising a monopoly over the use of military force, and establishing social order. This understanding is consistent with the Weberian definition: “The state is a human community that (successfully) claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of force within its given territory.” At the most extreme, the antithesis of ‘governance’ is ‘anarchy’, reflecting concern about ‘fragile’ states, where the governments lack the capacity to maintain order within its territorial
boundaries, reflecting the breakdown of central authority. Fragile states, where the regime is persistently challenged through revolutionary insurgencies, political violence, and rival factions, are exemplified by long-running civil conflict in Colombia, Sri Lanka, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The antithesis of governance, at the most extreme, is anarchy, a situation where regime authorities are unable to control military forces or to maintain security and rule of law within their borders, illustrated most dramatically by cases such as the al Shabaab insurgents in southern Somalia, and the Waziristan region in northwest Pakistan. The US-based Political Instability Task Force provides estimates of the number of incidents of instability from 1955-2003, reporting that the highest number of cases occurred in sub-Saharan Africa, followed by the Middle East and South Asia. In the most extreme ‘failed’ states, independent movements seeking succession and cultural autonomy, rebel factions, and local warlords or criminal cartels roam freely and without check. Sovereignty and the maintenance of security is the most basic form of governance which is essential for any functioning nation-state. Lack of security is clearest in extreme cases where state such as Somalia, Sierra Leone, and Sudan are largely ineffective when maintaining sovereignty and the legitimate use of force within their national borders, including preventing rebel incursions. The second dimension of state capacity reflects how far the regime authorities can implement public policies, collect revenues, and manage the delivery of basic goods and services. State capacity can be strong or weak irrespective of whether the delivery of public goods and services is implemented through the public sector, non-profit civil society organizations, or private sector corporations.

Drawing upon Weberian conceptions, state capacity can be divided into two ideal types. Bureaucratic forms of governance refer to a particular type of organizational structure, which Weber argued was one of the institutional foundations for capitalist growth and the modern nation-state. Bureaucracies exert control through instrumental forms of legal-rational authority, following the principles of impartiality, effectiveness, efficiency, transparency, and integrity. Legal-rational authority rests in the office, whether the holder is recruited through election or appointment, not personal ties to the individual. Bureaucrats are responsive to elected authorities and yet somewhat autonomous from undue partisan pressures, with established mechanisms for recruitment and training based on formal qualifications and technical expertise. Moreover meritocratic procedures extend well beyond the core civil service; public sector employees such as teachers, scientists, health care officials, and social workers, use professional standards involving processes of peer review for accreditation, appointment and promotion. During the mid-to-late nineteenth century, industrialized nations gradually came to
reflect notions of Weberian rational bureaucracy. Just as factory machines gradually replaced craftsmen, bureaucracy was seen as the ideal form of public administration for managing large, complex organizations in modern states. Bureaucracy has been regarded as instrumentally rational and efficient, reflecting the top-down command-and-control way to manage the delivery of organizational goals, just as the production line transformed manufacturing industry. Bureaucratic rules and regulations, in particular, are designed to ensure that even lowly functionaries followed standardized procedures in each government department, so that all citizens received equitable treatment. Impartiality is thus a central principle of Weberian bureaucracy but it is only one of many related characteristics, and thus it should not necessarily be reduced to the defining feature.\textsuperscript{12} In the Weberian conception, bureaucracy implies that an efficient, effective, and accountable public sector requires the following characteristics:\textsuperscript{13}

- \textit{Meritocratic processes of recruitment, training, and career promotion}: based on technical qualifications, expertise, and formal education, skills, conduct, experience, and knowledge. Human resource policies are based on open competition and transparency, often administered by independent civil service commissions;

- \textit{Hierarchical and centralized decision-making authority within large-scale organizational structures}: a clear and coordinated chain-of-command links subordinate politically-neutral bureaucratic officials to superior authorities, and ultimately to elected politicians, allowing effective processes of government oversight, decision-making, and political accountability;

- \textit{Functional specialization}: officials have clearly specified fixed salaries, pensions, ranks, duties, obligations, roles and supervisors;

- \textit{Standardized procedures}: actions are guided by transparent formal and impersonal rules, written regulations, and legal codes, designed to provide consistent, equal and impartial treatment of all citizens and employees, rejecting administration on a case by case basis;

- \textit{Strict firewalls separating private and public interests}: public officials are full-time salaried career professionals with considerable job security, receiving rewards from their salary, status, and condition of service, not benefiting by financial gain from clients, rent-seeking, or personal favors from partisan politicians.
Modern states only started to transition into Weberian rational bureaucracies following reforms in the public sector. A series of developments in European states during the mid-to-late 19th century gradually brought elements of bureaucracy into practices of public administration. In Britain, for example, a permanent, unified, meritocratic, and politically neutral civil service was introduced following the Northcote-Trevelyan report of 1854. An independent civil service commission was created by Gladstone along with requirement for technical competence for appointment in the public sector. Open competitions for appointment were adopted in the civil service in India in 1853 and became the rule throughout British government in 1870. A similar tide of reform to get rid of the spoils system swept through the post-civil war United States government; the civil service was established in 1872 and the Pendleton Act (1883) implemented meritocratic appointments and the civil service commission. Although public administration reflects cultural traditions within each society, particularly the legalistic tradition in Continental Europe, nevertheless parallel reforms were adopted in many other modern states, and at sub-national levels, reflecting the need to manage the growing size and technical complexity of government activities, and to reduce corruption, inefficiency, and malfeasance.\textsuperscript{14} Bureaucratic structures and procedures were also exported through colonial administrative practices to many countries worldwide.

By contrast, there are many other ways of arranging administrative functions and responsibilities in the public sector and implementing public policies. The chief positions can be allocated based on class, caste, ethnicity, or honorary status. The principle antithesis to bureaucracy, however, is conceptualized in this study as \textit{patronage} states, understood as those where leaders gain compliance primarily through the use of personal networks, traditional prerogatives, and social privileges, delivering goods and services selectively to clientalistic groups of loyal supporters. Personal relations and social status, nepotism, ad hoc favors, and corruption commonly determine recruitment and promotion processes in patronage states, rather than merit-based criteria, while legal, judicial, and administrative agencies are far from impartial and independent of political pressures. Patronage through the allocation of spoils helps rulers gain the loyalty and allegiance of clans, tribes and followers, and also the support of the security forces, and thus maintain control of the general population through threat of force. Patronage relationships essentially emphasize \textit{personal} connections between particular leaders and subjects, or patrons and clients, exemplified by rule by monarchs, sultans, dictators, and emirs, where authority rests in the individual rather than the office.\textsuperscript{15} Decision-making is not standardized and instead ad hoc rulings are made on a case-by-case basis. Rulers gain compliance
directly through the allocation of rewards, reinforcing their personal status, informal social ties, deference to traditional loyalties, and as well as indirectly through use of force and outright repression. Traditional forms of patronage were common in most states during the 18th and early 19th centuries, as exemplified in the United Kingdom by the purchase of army commissions, naval and civil service appointments based on personal or family recommendations (rather than by merit, open competition, and formal qualifications), and in the United States by ‘machine’ party politics. Patronage politics can still prove effective for those who directly benefit by personal gain, and the spoils system generates loyalty among followers, but in general it usually undermines the capacity of the public sector to serve the broader public interest, weakens the legitimacy of the authorities, and violates widely accepted norms of integrity, impartiality, transparency, and rule of law. In patronage states where public sector jobs are allocated as a way to reward loyalists or on the basis of kinship ties, the civil service tends to be poorly skilled, underpaid, and politicized. Senior cadres lack professional and technical expertise and they often fail to provide any chain of continuity in government decision-making over the longer term. As a result, delivery of public services tends to be inefficient, at best, and, at worst, beset by venality and corruption. Problems of patronage politics and lack of administrative capacity are illustrated most vividly today by poor states such as Haiti and Cote D’Ivoire, where the central authorities are incapable of fulfilling core governance functions, such as raising revenues through regulatory tariffs and taxation, providing essential services such as emergency relief and basic healthcare, curbing criminal activities, and policing ‘no-go’ lawless areas. By contrast, during the third wave era, states as diverse as South Korea, the Czech Republic, South Africa, Mauritius, and Brazil have a relatively successful record in maintaining security, expanding national living standards, and improving human development.

Bureaucracy is often seen negatively today, in a pejorative sense, implying organizations characterized by ‘red-tape’, inefficiency, and rigid procedural rules, rather than more flexible agencies which provide incentives for managers to respond effectively contemporary challenges of governance. Bureaucracy in the public sector has been regarded as old-fashioned and inappropriate for the 21st century, compared with the potential advantages of governance by networks or markets and reforms in the public sector associated with the ‘new’ public sector management. The assumption that bureaucracies are the most efficient organizations for governing the modern state has come under growing challenge. It is widely believed that this form of organization suffers from numerous dysfunctional flaws, including excessive rigidity, inflexibility and lack of innovation in identifying new solutions to complex social challenges. The use of written rules as mechanisms of control has been seen
as cumbersome and inefficient (red tape), slowing decisions. The chain-of-command division of responsibilities and the culture of official secrecy reduced the accountability of subordinate officials for poor performance. Bureaucratic organizations had grown in size and complexity, including in the number and cost of public sector employees. Moreover bureaucratic structures rewarded employees based on standardized procedures, fixed rewards, and career promotions, irrespective of their performance in delivering substantive results, thereby generating perverse incentives. By the early-1980s, ideas of performance management became increasingly popular in corporations, involving the construction of new metrics of service quality and customer satisfaction. These doctrines spread to the public sector as well, popularized in books such as Osborne and Gaebler’s Reinventing Government (1993). Political leaders sought new ways to limit the growth of public expenditure, while also making governance more efficient, flexible, and responsive.

These developments encouraged the rise of ‘new public management’ (NPM), transforming public sector management in leading countries – including the UK, the US, New Zealand, Australia- as well as gradually diffusing to many other societies and types of organizations. Techniques associated with New Public Management have become popular in Anglo-American societies, importing private-sector practices into the public sector, led by reforms implemented in New Zealand, Australia, the United States and the UK. In Continental Europe, however, other traditions of public administration continue to prevail. Some scholars see the trajectory of public management reform as continuing to advance, especially in states not yet touched by these movements, such as the reforms introduced to dismantle the residual Soviet-era centralized planning state bureaucracies in post-communist Central and Eastern Europe. William Easterly provides a strong argument why ‘top-down’ bureaucratic planners continue to dominate international aid and why a shift towards more innovative, flexible, and experimental ‘searchers’ are needed, with interventions assessed through the mechanisms of bottom up feedback, local accountability and independent evaluation. These notions are central to the NPM ideas of moving from ‘clients’ to ‘citizens’ and ‘customers’.

In contrast to the Weberian bureaucratic state, the common characteristics of NPM have been identified by Hood as follows: Professional leadership at the top of the organization, with clear assignment of managerial responsibilities; explicit standards of performance, with well-defined organizational goals, clear and specific indicators of success, and standardized evaluative processes; emphasis on output results, where incentives (resources and rewards) are linked to the achievement of specific strategic organizational goals; disaggregation and decentralization into smaller and more
flexible organizational units; more competition is used in the delivery of public goods and services, exemplified by contracting out to the private and non-profit sectors, private-public partnerships, and internal markets; Greater flexibility in hiring practices, career structures, and job incentives; and fiscal discipline, so that costs are more efficiently matched against output delivery.

By the 1990s, New Public Management practices had been adopted in some post-industrial states, notably in New Zealand, the UK and the United States. In these countries, performance and results-based management become standard in organizational strategic plans, budgets, human resource policies, project evaluation, and annual reports. The focus shifted, in particular, from managerial control of the budget, resources, and regulations governing organizational activities to managerial control of outputs. Management by results requires the use of performance indices, both qualitative and quantitative, which are closely matched to strategic organizational goals. The aim is to monitor and report how effectively core objectives are achieved both by individual managers and collectively by organizational units. Proponents argue that the flexibility of the smaller and flatter organizational units characteristic of new public management, greater innovation and creativity, and closer attention to feedback mechanism, makes this form of governance more responsive to social needs, as well as being more effective and efficient at delivering developmental results. This reform movement has proved influential in Anglo-American countries, and certain elements have spread widely, such as decentralization, the adoption of new information and communication technologies, and privatization/deregulation. More recently, however, there are signs that enthusiasm for NPM has abated in leading edge societies, as alternative ideas focused around digital-era networked governance have become more fashionable.

As a general philosophy, moreover, NPM has not yet altered traditional public administration in many European states, such as Germany, Belgium and France, with an alternative Rechtsstaat tradition and culture of governance, still less transformed the public sector in most developing nations. Moreover the fundamentals of Weberian bureaucratic public administration, in its original meaning, remain essential for governance capacity in much of the developing world. For Max Weber, bureaucratic organizations are understood to reflect the principles and values of impartiality, effectiveness, efficiency, transparency, and integrity, where public policymaking has a clear chain of command through processes of legislation, regulation, and budgeting. Administrative law governs civil service procedures and decisions, where individual citizens have transparent processes to appeal against specific bureaucratic decisions. The absence of these qualities is evident in many countries, as exemplified by
problems of corruption, maladministration, and malfeasance in the public sector. Even where the appropriate scope of the state is regarded as limited, public sector agencies reflecting these qualities are still needed, for example to regulate the process of privatization of state assets, so that it is transparent, fair, and well-managed.

_Measuring state capacity_

The Weberian framework thus continues to provide the core concepts to distinguish two ideal types of state capacity. Nevertheless these concepts are difficult to operationalize empirically, especially for consistent comparison of worldwide patterns and trends over time.

Typically, the capacity of the state to maintain security has often been often operationalized by the strength of military personnel, whether measured on a per capita basis, or as a proportion of the total labor force, or as a proportion of GDP or total government outlays. 25 Nevertheless studies have found that these indicators are poorly, or even inversely, correlated with other measures of governance.26 Not surprisingly, levels of military expenditure may in fact be a proxy for insecurity; states which perceive external or internal threat may well decide to boost spending on the armed forces.

An alternative indicator is government spending upon public order and safety (on a per capita basis, or as a proportion of total outlays), including expenditure upon the police and other law enforcement agencies. This measure is particularly important in lawless regions, where the state lacks the capacity to limit criminal activity, and standardized international data on government outlays for this function is compiled for some countries by the International Monetary Fund, derived from National Accounts. 27 Yet reliable time-series data is unavailable in many countries, especially many developing societies, and again spending on domestic security could also be expected to rise following a resurgence of criminal activity, exemplified by the Mexican government’s war on drug cartels.

Another measure assessing bureaucratic governance is the World Bank’s Resource Allocation Index, which estimates the contemporary quality of public administration, based on their annual Country Policy and Institutional Assessment exercise, but data is limited to 76 developing countries. The International Monetary Fund has also compiled general and central government revenues and outlays by function, based on standardized data from National Accounts.28 Nevertheless the IMF data covers few developing countries and, in addition, it cannot be assumed that the size of the state, or indeed high government revenues and expenditures, are indicative of state capacity.
A pioneering study of the quality of bureaucratic governance was developed by Evans and Rauch, based on expert assessments of meritocratic recruitment and predictable career ladders in the public sector. The survey gathered data during the early-1990s in around three dozen middle- and low-income countries. Evans and Rauch analyzed the links between the quality of bureaucratic governance and economic growth, concluding that in the selected countries under comparison, state bureaucracies characterized by meritocratic recruitment and rewarding career ladders generated higher rates of economic growth. This suggests an important proposition, explored further in Chapter 5, but evidence needs to be examined by comparing a far wider range of countries and time-periods to have confidence in the robustness of the results. A new cross-national dataset is under development, using expert surveys to measure several dimensions of bureaucracy in over 100 countries, but unfortunately this is unable to provide comparisons over time.

The most comprehensive geographic and longitudinal coverage which is available to assess state capacity is available from the Political Risk Service’s Group (PRSG) International Country Risk Guide. This series covers more than one hundred nation-states over time, with observations based on expert assessments since 1984. The PRSG indicators have been used in the previous research literature. The PRSG’s Quality of Government index combines three components: bureaucratic quality, corruption, and law and order. Bureaucratic Quality measures how far the country’s public sector is characterized by (i) regular processes of meritocratic recruitment and career advancement, (ii) independence from political pressures, and (iii) the ability to provide continuous administrative services during government changes. Corruption in the regime is measured by actual or potential corruption from excessive patronage, nepotism and secret party funding, as well as demands for special payments or bribes in the financial transaction with public sector employees. Lastly, Law and Order is assessed by the strength and impartiality of the legal system, including how far there is popular observance of the law or if the law is routinely ignored without sanction. Thus the conceptual framework and the core components underlying the PRSG’s Quality of Government index closely mirror the Weberian distinction between patronage and bureaucratic forms of governance, which are at the heart of this study. This measure lets us classify states worldwide and over time to compare bureaucratic state capacity. Most importantly, the data allows us to investigate whether bureaucratic state capacity is consistently associated with a more effective performance in managing the delivery of public goods and services, exemplified by levels of prosperity, welfare and peace.
At the same time it is important to establish whether the results of the analysis are robust or whether they are sensitive to measurement issues. Accordingly this study compares the PRSG Quality of Governance indicators with several of the World Bank Institute ‘good’ governance indices. These provide broader geographic coverage worldwide, although the estimates are only available for a shorter time-period, from 1996 to 2009. The World Bank composite indices seek to measure ‘government effectiveness’, ‘political stability’, ‘rule of law’, ‘voice and accountability’, ‘regulatory quality’ and ‘control of corruption’. Several of these indicators can be selected to check the robustness of the findings from the PRSG’s Quality of Governance measure.

The Concept and Measurement of Democracy

All states require state capacity to maintain security and to implement policy decisions. Only some regimes, however, are governed according to the principles of ‘liberal democracy’. The complex notion of ‘democracy’ is open to multiple conceptualizations and the employment of many alternative modifiers, such as ‘participatory’, ‘liberal’, ‘social’, ‘direct’, ‘effective’ and ‘deliberative’ forms of democracy. Liberal democracy is understood here, most simply, to mean the capacity of people to influence regime authorities within their nation-state.

Following the Schumpeterian tradition, minimalist notions of democracy focus upon the provision of competitive elections. In this perspective, leaders in democratic regimes are recruited on the basis of free and fair multiparty elections which meet international standards of integrity. Nevertheless Schumpeter offers a relatively narrow definition which fails to take account of the many other institutions required to ensure democratic elections work effectively, including the provision of freedom of expression and respect for civil liberties, checks and balances among the core regime institutions, an independent judiciary and an effective legislature. Reflecting the long tradition of classical liberal theories, following Robert Dahl’s conception, liberal democracy is understood in this study to rest upon the principles of contestation, participation, and human rights. In practice, Dahl suggested that liberal democratic regimes (or ‘polyarchies’) can be identified by the presence of certain key political institutions: 1) elected officials; 2) free and fair elections; 3) inclusive suffrage; 4) the right to run for office; 5) freedom of expression; 6) alternative information; and 7) associational autonomy. Liberal democracies use competitive multiparty elections to fill offices for the national legislature and the chief executive. Contests in this type of regime are free and fair, with an inclusive suffrage allowing widespread voting participation among all citizens, and citizens have the unrestricted right to compete.
for elected offices. Competitive elections alone, even if conducted according to international standards of electoral integrity, are insufficient to establish liberal democratic states. For electoral competition to be meaningful, other conditions need to be established, including freedom of expression, the availability of alternative sources of information (freedom of the media), and associational autonomy (freedom to organize parties, interest groups and social movements).

It should be noted that Dahl’s conception reflects classical liberal notions emphasizing the importance of negative freedoms, restricting the potential abuse of state power. Based upon these ideas, liberal democratic regimes are conceptualized in this study as those where legitimacy is derived from periodic multiparty elections which meet international standards, as well as guarantees of a broader range of political rights and civil liberties, including those recognized worldwide in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This is essentially a procedural definition which focuses upon the processes and institutions for decision-making. The standard indicators which have been most commonly used to measure and compare levels of liberal democracy include Polity IV’s scale of democracy-autocracy (from 1800-2007) and the Freedom House Gastil index of political rights and civil liberties (from 1972-date). Although forming the basis for many large-N comparative studies, each has certain strengths and weaknesses.

**Freedom House: Liberal Democracy** One of the best known measures of liberal democracy, and one of the most widely used in the comparative literature, is the Gastil index of civil liberties and political rights produced annually by Freedom House. The measure has been widely employed by practitioners, for example its results are incorporated into the benchmark data employed by the US Millennium Challenge Account to assess the quality of governance and award aid in poorer nations. It has also been employed by many comparative scholars, such as in recent publications by Diamond, Barro, and Inglehart and Welzel⁴⁰. Freedom House, an independent think tank based in the United States, first began to assess political trends in the 1950s with the results published as the Balance Sheet of Freedom. In 1972, Freedom House launched a new, more comprehensive annual study called *Freedom in the World*. Raymond Gastil developed the survey’s methodology, which assigned countries political rights and civil liberties ratings and categorized them as Free, Partly Free, or Not Free. The survey continued to be produced by Gastil until 1989, when a larger team of in-house survey analysts was established. Subsequent editions of the survey have followed essentially the same format although specific items have been amended over the years,⁴¹ and in recent years more details have been released about the coding framework used for each assessment and disaggregated data for specific components.
The index monitors the existence of political rights in terms of electoral processes, political pluralism, and the functioning of government. Civil liberties are defined by the existence of freedom of speech and association, rule of law, and personal rights. The research team draws upon multiple sources of information to develop their classifications based on a checklist of questions, including ten separate items monitoring the existence of political rights and fifteen on civil liberties. These items assess the presence of institutional checks and balances constraining the executive through the existence of a representative and inclusive legislature, an independent judiciary implementing the rule of law, and the existence of political rights and civil liberties, including to reasonable self-determination and participation by minorities, and the presence of free and fair election laws. Each item is allocated a score from 0 to 4 and each is given equal weight when aggregated. The raw scores for each country are then converted into a seven-point scale of political rights and a seven-point scale for civil liberties, and in turn these are collapsed to categorize each regime worldwide as either ‘free’, ‘partly free’, or ‘not free’. As a result of this process, Freedom House estimate that in 2009 out of 193 nations, almost half or 89 (46%) could be classified as free while 58 nations could be classified as ‘partly free’. This represents a remarkable net advance during the third wave era but nevertheless they estimate that the balance of regime types has largely stabilized during the last decade, for example they report that the total number of ‘not free’ states was the exactly the same in 1999 and a decade later. The emphasis of this measure on a wide range of civil liberties, rights, and freedoms means that this most closely reflects notions of liberal democracy. The index has the advantage of providing comprehensive coverage of nation-states and independent territories worldwide, as well as establishing a long time-series of observations conducted annually since 1972.

Despite these virtues, the index has been subject to considerable criticism on a number of conceptual and methodological grounds. The procedures used by the team of researchers employed by Freedom House lack transparency, so that scholars cannot double-check the reliability and consistency of the coding decisions, nor can the results be easily replicated. The questions used for constructing the index often involve two or three separate items within each sub-category, allowing ambiguous measurement and aggregation across these items. The process of compositing the separate items is not subject to systematic factor analysis, so it remains unclear whether the items do indeed cluster together into consistent scales of political rights and civil liberties. The multiple dimensions included in the index provide a broad-ranging attempt to monitor human rights, for example concerning owning property, freedom of religious expression, choice of marriage partners, and the absence of
economic exploitation. These are all widely regarded as important dimensions of human rights, with intrinsic value, but it is not clear that these are necessarily essential components or valid measures of democracy per se. The concepts of freedom and democracy are not equivalent. It remains an empirical question whether democratic regimes promote these sorts of values, for example, whether they are associated with free market capitalist economies or whether some prefer protectionist economic policies and a greater role for the government in economic planning and the welfare state. Moreover since the index contains such a broad range of indicators, this also makes it less valuable as an analytical tool useful for policymakers; for example, if it is established that the Freedom House measure of democracy is consistently linked to the protection of human rights, economic growth, peace, or the provision of more generous welfare services, it remains unclear what particular aspect of the index is driving this relationship. It is argued that a neo-liberal bias is built into the measure, reflecting the mission of the organization. The construction of the measure therefore suffers from certain problems of conflation and redundancy, and although it is widely used, it essentially reflects liberal notions of democracy, and other approaches emphasize alternative concepts.

**Polity IV: Democracy-Autocracy scale.** Another approach commonly used in the comparative and international relations literature is the classification of constitutional democracy provided by the Polity project. This was initiated by Ted Robert Gurr in the 1970s and it has evolved over the past three decades. The latest version, Polity IV, provides annual time series data in country-year format covering 161 countries from 1800 to 2007. Coders working on the Polity IV project classify democracy and autocracy in each nation-year as a composite score of different characteristics relating to authority structures. Democracy is conceived of conceptually as reflecting three essential elements: the presence of institutions and procedures through which citizens can express preferences about alternative policies and leaders; the existence of institutionalized constraints on the power of the executive; and the guarantee of civil liberties to all citizens (although not actually measured). The classification emphasizes the existence or absence of institutional features of the nation state. For example, competitive executive recruitment is measured by leadership selection through popular elections contested by two or more parties or candidates. The openness of recruitment for the chief executive is measured by the opportunity for all citizens to have the opportunity to attain the position through a regularized process, excluding hereditary succession, forceful seizure of power, or military coups. By contrast, autocracies are seen as regimes which restrict or suppress competitive political participation, in which the chief executive is chosen from within the political elite, and, once in office, leaders face few institutional
constraints on their power. The dataset constructs a ten-point democracy scale by coding the competitiveness of political participation (1-3), the competitiveness of executive recruitment (1-2), the openness of executive recruitment (1), and the constraints on the chief executive (1-4). Autocracy is measured by negative versions of the same indices. The two scales are combined into a single democracy-autocracy score varying from -10 to +10. Polity has also been used to monitor and identify processes of major regime change and democratic transitions, classified as a positive change in the democracy-autocracy score of more than 3 points.

The Polity IV scores have the virtue of providing an exceptionally long series of observations stretching over two centuries, as well as covering most nation-states worldwide. The provision of separate indices for each of the main dimensions allows scholars to disaggregate the components. The emphasis on constitutional rules restricting the executive may be particularly valuable for distinguishing the initial downfall of autocratic regimes and the transition to multiparty elections. Unfortunately the democracy-autocracy score also suffers from certain important limitations. Polity IV emphasizes the existence of constraints upon the chief executive as a central part of their measure. As Munck and Verkulian point out, however, there is a world of difference between those restrictions on the executive which arise from democratic checks and balances, such as the power of the elected legislature or an independent judiciary, and those which arise from other actors, such as the power of the military or economic elites. Although more information is now released in the user’s codebook, the processes which the Polity team uses to classify regimes continue to lack a degree of transparency and therefore replicability by independent scholars. Moreover although acknowledging the importance of civil liberties as part of their overall conceptualization of democracy, Polity IV does not actually attempt to code or measure this dimension. The Polity IV index was originally conceived by Gurr for very different purposes, to monitor notions of political stability and regime change, and the growing use of this measure to assess constitutional forms of democracy represents a newer development.

It should be emphasized, however, that the democratic mechanisms which empower citizens, allowing them to participate and express their preferences, are complex, and alternative democratic theories emphasize different institutional procedures and processes. Theories which emphasize ‘participatory’, ‘deliberative’ or ‘social’ democracy provide alternative visions about the core principles and values underpinning regimes, so that the concept of liberal democracy provides only one perspective on the issues at the heart of this book. For example Alexander and Welzel emphasize the concept of ‘effective democracy’, combining both liberal democracy (measured by Freedom House)
combined with control of corruption. However, this seems to mix two distinct phenomena, making a conceptually unclear indicator, since control of corruption does not necessarily deepen democratic qualities per se. Liberal democratic theories focus upon the existence of a broad range of political and civil rights which protect and guarantee an inclusive franchise, processes of collective organization, informed deliberation, and freedom of choice, all of which seek to constrain and restrict the state, protecting citizens from the potential abuse of power. Liberal democracy therefore includes a broader range of criteria than minimalist accounts of representative democracy, reflecting Schumpeterian notions. Electoral autocracies hold multiparty contests for the effective head of government but competition is limited, to a lesser or greater extent, so that these contests are flawed or manipulated. Absolute autocracies are the most restrictive types of states, without even the fig-leaf of fake elections to legitimate rule.

Given these notions, several indices are selected to provide alternative measures of the quality of democratic governance, as listed in Table 3.1. The analysis of multiple measures allows us to check whether the results remain robust or whether they are sensitive to the specific indicator which is chosen for analysis. Thus, the analysis draws upon the International Country Risk Guide (ICRG) measures of the bureaucratic quality of governance (combining bureaucratic quality, anti-corruption, and law and order). This series is available annually for a smaller range of 136 countries but it has the important advantage of extending for a longer period (1984-2010), thus capturing the dynamics of change during the third wave era. The ICRG estimates are also more narrowly conceptualized and thus their meaning is easier to interpret conceptually. These indices are supplemented by comparing five of the World Bank Institute estimates of good governance, namely measures of the rule of law, control of corruption, government effectiveness, regulatory quality, and political stability, all aspects closely related to Weberian conceptions of the characteristics of bureaucratic governance. The broader global coverage provided by the World Bank Institute estimates is advantageous and since they include the ICRG indices, both sources are expected to be closely related. For liberal democracy, the study draws upon the Freedom House estimates of political rights and civil liberties, available annually since 1972, and the Polity IV democracy-autocracy index available since 1800. These are used in alternative models to cross-check the results.

To analyze whether the selected indices form one dimension or whether they fall into two distinct dimensions, as theorized, the technique of principle component factor analysis can be employed. The results in Table 3.2 confirm that the indices present two distinct dimensions, reflecting
the underlying concepts of bureaucratic governance and liberal democracy. Thus the World Bank Indices measuring rule of law, control of corruption, government effectiveness, and political stability, as well as the ICRG measure of the quality of bureaucratic governance, fall into the first dimension. By contrast, the Freedom House and the Polity IV measures fall into a second distinct dimension. The results provide empirical confirmation that these are indeed different phenomenon, rather than two aspects of the same underlying type of regime.

**Applying the Regime Typology**

So how are these distributed around the world? Figures 3.1 illustrates the contrasts which can be observed based on the analytical typology at the heart of this book, operationalized and compared in 2008, using a standardized 100-point index of liberal democracy drawn from annual estimates provided by Freedom House, and the Quality of Governance index generated by the ICRG. As the pattern in Figure 3.1 shows, instead of a linear relationship, one or the other dimension commonly dominates in different countries. Curve fit tests show that the regression line providing the best fit to the data is cubic ($R^2 = 0.579 ***$). The scatterplot of countries suggests a curvilinear relationship, a pattern observed elsewhere in previous studies.\(^53\) For comparison, Figure 3.2 illustrates a snapshot of historical developments which have occurred during the third wave era, in the mid-1980s and the mid-1990s. It is apparent that processes of democratization and the expansion in the state governance capacity have not necessarily evolved hand-in-hand in many countries around the world, by any means. Let us examine the characteristics and development of the regimes found in each quadrant of these scatterplots.

[Figure 3.1 and 3.2 about here]

**Bureaucratic democracies: Chile**

Bureaucratic democracies are located in the top right quadrant, including many affluent post-industrial societies where the expansion of the mass franchise and the growth of the professional civil service evolved roughly simultaneously during the mid-to-late 19th century. Scandinavian nations show the strongest performance of democratic governance in Figure 3.1, along with many of the most affluent European and Anglo-American societies. The position of these leading countries has also remained relatively stable over time. But not all the regimes falling into this category are long-established Western democracies; a diverse range of emerging economies and third wave democracies
from different world regions are also located here, including Namibia, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Croatia, Costa Rica, Botswana, South Korea, and Taiwan.

Contemporary Chile exemplifies this type of state; today this country is one of South America’s most stable democracies and successful emerging economies. Yet historically this country has not escaped the regime instability that has blighted the continent. The 1960s were a period of growing political polarization, social intolerance, and class divisions among sectors of Chilean society. The military coup on September 11th 1973, led by General Augusto Pinochet Ugarte, overthrew the democratically-elected Socialist Party administration of President Salvador Allende. The Pinochet era which lasted until 1989 saw massive violations of human rights, including mass disappearances, attacks on civil liberties, the widespread use of torture, and the killing of opposition forces. In the mid-1980s, Chile was classified in Figure 3.2 as a bureaucratic autocracy; the state exerted effective control but it lacked democratic credentials. The end of this decade saw growing liberalization of human rights and a reduction of repression in the country, such as expanding press freedoms, reflecting broader trends in democratization sweeping across Latin America. This process culminated in a plebiscite held on October 5, 1988 which denied General Pinochet a second 8-year term as president. In a major milestone towards restoring democracy, on December 14, 1989 the country elected a Christian Democrat, Patricio Aylwin, as president. Since then, a series of presidential and congressional contests, meeting international standards of electoral integrity, have seen peaceful multiparty competition and both center-left and center-right coalitions in power. By 1995, the regime in Chile could be classified as a bureaucratic democracy. The bicameral Congress consists of a 38-seat Senate and a 120-member Chamber of Deputies. Senators serve for eight years with staggered terms, while deputies are elected every four years. The most recent national congressional elections were held on December 13, 2009, concurrently with the presidential election. The lower house -the Chamber of Deputies- is currently divided fairly evenly between the governing center-right coalition and the center-left opposition, plus a few members from small parties or independents. This type of party system and coalitional politics is encouraged by the unique electoral system which uses a closed-party list majority system with small districts for the lower house. In these contests, if the majority party obtains more than two-thirds of the valid votes cast, it is entitled to the two seats of the constituency. If it obtains less than two-thirds, it is entitled to one seat and the second seat goes to the second-placed party. The party system is based on structural cleavages, such as class and income, as well as divisions between democratic and authoritarian values. The Pinochet-era constitution was revised, limiting presidential terms of office to
a single four year period, and the judicial system was overhauled to make it more independent. Therefore Chile emerged in recent decades as one of the most stable democracies in the region, even though important challenges remain concerning the expansion of minority rights, reductions in socio-economic inequality, student and labor unrest, and levels of popular disenchantment with democracy.\textsuperscript{59} This relative success story of the regime has occurred despite the authoritarian legacy of the past and contemporary problems facing a number of other Latin American countries, notably in the Andean region where the quality of electoral integrity has eroded in Colombia and Venezuela and a trend toward the concentration of executive power is evident in Bolivia and Ecuador.\textsuperscript{60} Moreover the Chilean state ranks well not just in democracy and human rights, but also on most of the indicators of governance, rating in the top 75 percentile worldwide in control of corruption, rule of law and government effectiveness.\textsuperscript{61} During the Pinochet era of the 1970s and 1980s, GDP per capita lagged well behind the Latin American average. From the early-1990s, however, during the democratic era, the economy has surged well ahead of the average growth in the region. Indeed the country had Latin America’s fastest-growing economy during the 1990s and it has weathered recent regional economic instability and natural disasters, with strong foreign trade and a reputation for effective financial institutions and sound regulatory policies. Average GDP per capita (in ppp) is $15,400 today, with solid growth in recent decades lifting millions out of poverty, although socio-economic inequality remains high.

\textit{Patronage democracies: Ghana}

Elsewhere in the world, however, during the third wave era, processes of representative democracy and the state’s governance capacity have commonly achieved a far less balanced development. Some of the starkest disjunctions today come from countries scattered in the bottom right-hand quadrant, such as South Africa, Mali, and Ghana, which have experienced substantial gains in competitive elections and representative democracy in recent years, yet where the state continues to lack the capacity and resources to manage the delivery of many basic goods and services, such as schooling, health clinics, and economic growth.

The case of Ghana illustrates this category most clearly. A half-century ago, Ghana was the first African state to achieve independence following colonial rule. A new constitution, approved on April 29, 1954, established a cabinet comprised of African ministers drawn from an all-African legislature chosen by direct election. After independence was granted in 1957, the Convention People’s Party government
under Nkrumah sought to develop Ghana as a socialist state. A new constitution in 1960 replaced parliamentary government by a republic headed by a strong president. In 1966 its first president and pan-African hero, Kwame Nkrumah, was deposed in a coup, heralding years of mostly-military rule. In 1981 Flight Lieutenant Jerry Rawlings staged his second coup. During the late 1980s the country began to move towards economic stability and democracy. In April 1992, a constitution allowing a multi-party system was approved in a referendum, ushering in a sustained period of democracy under the fourth republic. Since then, Ghana has experienced periodic multiparty contests which international observers have regarded as free and fair. As shown in Figure 3.2, the classification indicates that Ghana shifted from a patronage autocracy in the mid-1980s to a bureaucratic democracy a decade later. The current constitution specifies that presidential elections are held using the 2nd ballot majoritarian system, while the 230 parliamentary members are elected for a four year term in single member constituencies using a first-past-the-post election system. The two largest political parties that dominate contemporary politics in Ghana, the liberal democratic New Patriotic Party (NPP) and the social democratic National Democratic Congress (NDC), have both enjoyed two consecutive terms in presidential office and majorities in parliament, the NDC from 1992-2000 and the NPP from 2000-2008. In December 2000, John Kufuor was elected as president, succeeding Jerry Rawlings in a peaceful transition of power.62 Re-elected in 2004, President Kufuour stepped down voluntarily four years later, observing the constitutional two-term limit.

In the run up to the December 7 2008 presidential and parliamentary elections, parties campaigned freely across the country, on policy driven issues such as social welfare and the economy and they published comprehensive manifestos. The campaign environment was lively and the parties canvassed voters door-to-door, holding a series of peaceful local rallies and town-hall meetings across Ghana, with the presidential candidates of the NPP and NDC touring the country. A series of independent polls were published in the media. Debates between the presidential candidates of the four parties with parliamentary representation were broadcast live via the major media outlets. Public and private sector broadcasting channels offered extensive news reporting about the campaign, especially coverage of the major parties and presidential candidates, and a large number of discussion programs. Newspapers provided a diverse range of views and covered all of the major events organized by the parties during the campaign, although as was the case with broadcasters, they focused their coverage on the larger political parties. There were also many paid political advertisements in the media and at times these were used to openly criticize opposing parties. The absence of any legal campaign
spending limits meant that political parties were free to use unlimited resources. Both the NDC and NPP organized highly developed campaign strategies.

In the first round of the presidential contest, the governing party candidate was Nana Akufo-Addo, one of the founding members of the New Patriotic Party when multi-party democracy returned to Ghana, and an advocate of human rights. He faced the opposition candidate, Professor John Atta Mills, a social democrat heading the National Democratic Congress party, and six other minor party candidates who also threw their hat into the ring. The first round election among all contestants ended on a knife-edge; the popular vote was evenly divided between Akufo-Addo (49.1%) and Atta Mills (47.9%), with scattered support for others. As no single candidate gained an absolute majority, the outcome was decided by the second round contest between the two leading candidates. This round saw an extremely close contest where Atta Mills won a slender lead (50.23%) over the governing party's Akufo-Addo (49.77%). The parliamentary elections held on 7th December 2008, held under plurality single member rules, proved equally competitive. The result saw the governing New Patriotic Party fall to 107 parliamentary seats with 49% of the popular vote. It was overtaken in a tight race by the opposition National Democratic Congress, gaining 114 seats, with a more efficient distribution of support as it won only 47% of the national popular vote. Two minor parties and four independents were also returned as members of parliament.

The European Union was among a host of institutions observing these contests, including the Carter Centre, ECOWAS, African Union, and over 4000 representatives from the Coalition of Domestic Observers (CODEO). The EU reported that the Electoral Commission who administered the contests proved impartial, professional, and independent, ensuring the transparency of the process. Electoral observers and party agents were able to observe all stages of polling, vote counting, and aggregation. There were clear legal channels for complaints and appeals challenging the results and the Commission worked to ensure conciliation and acceptance of the process among the major stakeholders. There were some minor administrative irregularities experienced on polling day, but the Electoral Commission apologized for these and sought to rectify the situation. A series of public forum, organized by the National Peace Council (NPC), brought together all major stakeholders and parties to discuss the polling process, to diffuse any discontent, and to offer recommendations for future contests. Disputes followed the second round of presidential voting, and tensions rose in the tight contest with some slight delays in announcing the vote, but these were eventually resolved peacefully. The governing NPP stood down and President Atta Mills moved into government house.
The outcome is all the more remarkable because Ghana lacks many of the social and economic conditions which are commonly associated with stable democracies. An ethically-divided society, by languages and religions, there are estimated to be more than 100 distinct groups, including the Akan, Ewe, Mole-Dagbani, Guan, and Ga-Adangbe.\textsuperscript{63} Ghana is also one of the poorest countries in the world, with an average per capita GDP of $1,400, one tenth the level of Belarus. One third of the population lives below $1.25 a day.\textsuperscript{64} Francophone West Africa is one of the least well-off and most unstable regions of the world; autocracies in Mauritania, Chad, Cameroon, and the Central African Republic coexist with fragile states engaged in peace-building after protracted conflict, including Sierra Leone, Liberia and Cote d’Ivoire. Within a few days of Ghanaians going to the polls, in Guinea the death of a dictator triggered a chaotic military coup. Overall, the Ghanaian elections have been judged by domestic and international observers to be a considerable success, another largely-orderly and peaceful contest further consolidating Ghana’s successive steps towards sustainable democracy under the Fourth Republic. In 2009, Freedom House rated Ghana 1.5 on its 7-point index of political rights and civil liberties, classifying it as a liberal democracy comparable to Greece, Israel, South Korea, and Bulgaria.\textsuperscript{65}

Beyond the ballot box, however the capacity of many other political institutions in Ghana still require strengthening to build a more effective state, ensuring that parliament can effectively carry out its independent oversight and budgetary role, that access to justice and human rights is open to all sectors, and that local governance has the capacity to deliver basic public services, health care and education to alleviate poverty.\textsuperscript{66} The economy is heavily based on natural resources and agriculture, with an expected windfall following discovery of offshore oil, but nevertheless in 2010 per capita GDP in purchasing power parity in Ghana was only $2,500. Roughly four out of ten Ghanaians are below the poverty level. Moreover if measured against the global yardstick of progress towards achieving the 2015 targets of the Millennium Development Goals, Ghana continues to lag behind on many indicators, including cutting child mortality and improving maternal health, although at the same time reducing overall levels of extreme poverty and expanding primary education for all.\textsuperscript{67} The capacity of the public sector remains limited, despite many attempts to strengthen the civil service, public sector management and financial services, for example by use of budget planning systems, information technologies, and computerized public expenditure management systems. Hence an official assessment of governance in Ghana concluded: “It is questionable whether value has been obtained from the massive investments made in public sector reform over the last twenty years.”\textsuperscript{68} Under the Fourth Republic, citizens can therefore freely express demands through electoral channels, with a choice of parties in government,
but this does not mean that elected leaders can necessarily deliver effective public services or raise millions of Ghanaians out of poverty.

Patronage autocracies: Somalia

The patronage autocracies located in the bottom left-hand corner vary a great deal, but this typically includes many of the world’s poorest developing countries and so-called ‘failed’ states, such as Haiti, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Sudan, and Somalia, lacking effective governance. The most problematic cases are those where deep-rooted ethnic conflict and enduring conflict has eroded the authority and capacity of the central authorities to maintain social order and rule of law, the most basic functions of the state, as well as to manage the economy so as to alleviate poverty, disease and malnutrition.

Somalia exemplifies these cases, a country without an effective central government since President Siad Barre was overthrown in 1991. Years of fighting between rival warlords, and an inability to deal with famine, draughts, floods, and disease, led to the deaths of up to one million people. The UN also estimates that another one million Somalis are internally displaced, after fleeing violence. Life expectancy for the average Somali is 50 years, one of the lowest in the world. In East Africa, bordering the Gulf of Aden and the Indian Ocean, with a current population of about 10 million people, Somalia was created in 1960 as a result of merging a former British protectorate and an Italian colony. Today Somalia is one of the poorest countries in the world, with an estimated per capita GDP of $600 (in purchasing power parity). The country’s economy is largely agricultural, with livestock, hides, fish, charcoal, and bananas Somalia’s principal exports. Predominately Sunni Muslim, the population is mainly Somali, although one sixth are Bantu and other non-Somali, including Arabs.

In 1969, Somalia’s President Abdirashid Ali Shermarke was shot dead by one of his own bodyguards. His assassination was quickly followed by a bloodless military coup d’état led by the head of the army, Major General Mohamed Siad Barre. In 1970, Siad Barre proclaimed a socialist state, paving the way for close relations with the USSR. The revolutionary army spearheaded large-scale public works programs and rural literacy campaigns. The regime maintained stability for more than two decades until 1991, when President Barre was overthrown by opposing clans. After the regime’s overthrow, the clan leaders failed to agree on a replacement and thus plunged the country into a decade of lawlessness, turmoil, factional fighting, and civil warfare. In 2000 clan elders and other senior figures appointed a moderate Islamist, Abdulkassim Salat Hassan, as president at a conference in Djibouti. A transitional
government was set up, with the aim of reconciling warring militias, and Ethiopian troops withdrew. But as its mandate drew to a close, the administration had made little progress in uniting the country and Islamist insurgents are keeping up their almost daily attacks. The main fighters in opposition to the government are al-Shabab, a radical faction that emerged from the remnants of the Union of Islamic Courts. Maintaining links with al-Qaeda, the group now controls much of southern and central Somalia and it has imposed strict Sharia law in those areas. A rival group of Islamist fighters struggling for power against the government - Hisbul-Islam - is regarded as more moderate, although they also want to impose Sharia law on the population. In December 2010, Jane's Country Stability Ratings reported that Somalia was one of the world’s least stable environments, alongside Gaza, the West Bank, Haiti, Chad, Afghanistan, Guinea, Central African Republic, Sudan, Zimbabwe and Guinea-Bissau. Somalia’s ranking reflected the country’s continued fighting between the government and Islamic militia, the near continuous armed conflict in Mogadishu, the presence of pirates threatening international shipping, and difficulties in brokering an agreement between the government and opposition factions. Two years of drought in East Africa triggered widespread famine and a humanitarian crisis in 2011, but only limited aid got through to alleviate the crisis in areas of Somalia controlled by the Islamist militant group al-Shabab. Reflecting all these challenges, the indicators under comparison for Somalia show no change in autocracy and the gradual marked deterioration in the quality of bureaucratic governance over successive decades (see Figure 3.4).

Bureaucratic autocracies: Singapore

In contrast to the situation two decades earlier, few cases of bureaucratic autocracy are evident today, although China exemplifies this type of regime, located in the top left-hand corner of Figure 2.2. Governance is also rated relatively highly in other bureaucratic autocracies, such as Brunei, Qatar and Saudi Arabia, which are continue to be ruled by absolute monarchies.

Singapore illustrates this category, as a one party autocracy, where many fundamental human rights are restricted, yet where governance works well, judged by relatively clean and efficient public services, supported by substantial economic growth. As one of the East Asian ‘Four Tigers’, along with South Korea, the economy has forged ahead to make the nation one of the most prosperous in the world. The economy has been built upon high-tech electronics and the service-sector, particularly finance, banking, investment, and trade. In 2005, Singapore produced a per capita GDP of around $25,000 in 2005 (in PPP), similar to Italy and even more affluent than South Korea. The compact island
nation contains just over 4 million people (compared with 48 million South Koreans), three-quarters of whom are ethnic Chinese, while the remainder are mainly Malay and Tamil Indian. The country is multilingual, divided among Malay, Chinese, Tamil and English. In terms of wealth and size, therefore, the underlying conditions for democratic consolidation are promising.

Yet the island-state remains a one-party predominant autocracy, which Freedom House rates as only partly free.70 Indeed some observers suggest that the country has become more repressive of human rights even as it has become more prosperous.71 Given the underlying conditions, Singapore should be ripe for democracy: it is a compact island state without any threats to its borders, an ex-British colony, with low-to-moderate ethnic fractionalization. During the 19th century, the island grew in population and prosperity as a major port controlled first by the British East India Company and then, after 1867, directly from London as a crown colony as part of the Straits Settlement. After the end of World War II, demands for self-rule grew as part of the decolonization wave affecting the British Empire. In 1959, Singapore was granted full self-governance by the British authorities. In the parliamentary elections held in 1959, the People’s Action Party (PAP), founded and led by Lee Kuan Yew, swept into power by winning 47% of the vote and three-quarters of all seats. Despite a regular series of multiparty contests challenging their hegemonic status, PAP has ruled continuously ever since, winning eleven successive general elections over almost half a century.72 The PAP has controlled parliament without effective challenge to their power, winning, on average, two-thirds of the vote but a remarkable 95% of all parliamentary seats in the series of parliamentary general elections held from 1959 to 2001. This has effectively squeezed out any opposition MPs beyond an occasional token representative from the one of the parties of the left. The share of the vote won by PAP eroded slightly from 1984 to 1997, but they strengthened again in 2001. A majority of PAP candidates continue to be returned unopposed.

One reason for the ruling party’s hegemony lies in the majoritarian electoral system which translates their share of the vote into an overwhelming majority in parliament. The unicameral parliament uses a combined-independent electoral system.73 In the current parliament, nine members were elected from simple plurality single-member constituencies (First-Past-the-Post). In total, 75 other MPs were elected in a Block Vote system (termed locally ‘Group Representation Constituencies’) from 14 multimember districts, where parties field a list of three to six candidates. In these, the party with a simple plurality of votes in the district wins all the seats. The Block Vote system is designed to ensure the representation of members from the Malay, Indian and other minority communities, as each party list must include at least one candidate from these communities, encouraging parties to nominate
ethnically-diverse lists. Another nine members of parliament can be nominated by the president from among the opposition parties, without standing for election. Another factor contributing to the ruling party’s predominance is alleged gerrymandering and the redrawing of electoral districts just a few months before the general election. In particular, constituencies where the PAP did relatively badly in one contest have sometimes been systematically removed from the electoral map by the next election.  

The 1965 constitution established a Westminster-style parliamentary democracy where the president, elected by parliament, used to be a largely-ceremonial head of state. The 1991 constitutional revision introduced a more powerful president where the office is directly elected through simple plurality vote. A contested election was held in 1993, but in 1999 and in 2005 the position was filled by President Sellappan Ramanathan, as all other nominated candidate were declared ineligible by the Presidential Election Committee. Candidates can be ruled out of the contest if the Committee judges that they are not ‘a person of integrity, good character and reputation’, amongst other stringent criteria. Nominees also must not be a member of the government or a current member of a political party. The president appoints the prime minister, the head of government, government ministers from among the members of parliament, and key members of the civil service, as well as exercising veto budgetary powers and other responsibilities. After leading the PAP in seven victorious elections since 1959, Lee Kuan Yew stepped down as prime minister in 1990, remaining ‘Minister Mentor’ in an advisory position but handing over to his PAP successor, Goh Chok Tong. After a series of PAP prime ministers, in 2004 the elder son of Lee Kuan Yew, Lee Hsien Loong, took office as part of a planned handover of power.

Another way in which PAP maintains control is through its influence over the judicial system, including suing opposition members for libel, interring opposition politicians without trial under the Internal Security Act, and requiring police permits to hold any kind of public talk, exhibition, or demonstration. The government also exercises strong control of the press and news media, for example the leading newspaper of Singapore, the Straits Times, is often perceived as a propaganda newspaper because it rarely criticizes government policy, and it covers little about the opposition. The owners of the paper, Singapore Press Holdings, have close links to the ruling party and the corporation has a virtual monopoly of the newspaper industry. Government censorship of journalism is common, using the threat or imposition of heavy fines or distribution bans imposed by the Media Development Authority, with these techniques also used against articles seen to be critical of the government published in the international press, including The Economist and International Times Herald Tribune. Internet access is
regulated in Singapore, and private ownership of satellite dishes is not allowed. Due to this record, the Reporters Without Borders assessment of Press Freedom Worldwide in 2005 ranked Singapore 140th out of 167 nation states.

Singapore is governed by the rule of law. Thus Singapore has not suffered the violent repression of opposition movements. Human rights agencies do not report cases of ballot stuffing, polling irregularities, tinkering with the electoral roll, or voter intimidation conducted in fraudulent elections by security forces. The administration of elections is widely regarded by election observers as free, fair, and well-organized, within the rules. Indeed the government of Singapore can be admired as a model of technocratic efficiency, delivering effective public services such as housing and transport without the widespread corruption and abuse of public office which are characteristic of many autocracies. Singapore is ranked relatively positively on the World Bank measures of government effectiveness, political stability, regulatory quality, control of corruption, and rule of law. Thus Singapore exemplifies a type of regime where bureaucratic governance is exceptionally strong, and the public sector works efficiently, even though basic human rights continue to fail to meet democratic standards in the one-party predominant state.

Conclusions

Therefore the cases highlighted in this comparison illustrate the major contrasts among regimes which are evident around the world today. The differences observed among Chile, Somalia, Ghana and Singapore are not simply confined to these countries; instead these can be understood as reflecting broader general patterns and types of regimes. Clearly each of the countries starts from a different position, in terms of levels of human development and processes of political change. Nevertheless the annual changes and the trajectories summarized in Figures 3.3 and 3.4 illustrate divergent pathways taken by each country. Bureaucratic democracies are most common among affluent post-industrial societies, but post-Pinochet Chile exemplifies the successful development of this type of regime during the third wave era in an emerging economy. By contrast, in Ghana during the same years, democratic processes and institutions have strengthened over successive elections, improving human rights, but the state administrative capacity and resources to provide basic public services meeting social needs have actually worsened in recent years. Singapore reflects the opposite challenge, with efficient and effective public services and political stability, but without effective checks and counter balances on executive one-party rule. Somalia exemplifies the worst case of a failed state, where the regime has gradually lost
its capacity to deliver security or to lift their population out of enduring poverty. Rather than looking only at either democracy of governance, the new typology provides insights into the importance of understanding the interaction of these phenomena. Building upon this foundation, the task addressed in the next chapter is to consider how to apply this regime typology to analyze its effects upon human security.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Years available</th>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>N. Obs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rule of Law</td>
<td>World Bank Institute</td>
<td>1996-2010</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>2077</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of Corruption</td>
<td>World Bank Institute</td>
<td>1996-2010</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>2037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Effectiveness</td>
<td>World Bank Institute</td>
<td>1996-2010</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>2090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Quality</td>
<td>World Bank Institute</td>
<td>1996-2010</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>2066</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Stability</td>
<td>World Bank Institute</td>
<td>1996-2010</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>2070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Democracy</td>
<td>Polity IV democracy-autocracy index standardized</td>
<td>100-pts</td>
<td>1800-2007</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>4783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Democracy</td>
<td>Freedom House political rights and civil liberties scale, standardized</td>
<td>100-pts</td>
<td>1972-2010</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>3822</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** *The Quality of Government Dataset*, March 2011, The Quality of Government Institute, University of Gothenburg [www.qog.pol.gu.se](http://www.qog.pol.gu.se)
Table 3.2: Components of Democratic Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>State capacity index</th>
<th>Liberal democracy index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rule of Law (WBI)</td>
<td>.945</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of Corruption (WBI)</td>
<td>.933</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Effectiveness (WBI)</td>
<td>.915</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Government (ICRG)</td>
<td>.915</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Quality (WBI)</td>
<td>.836</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Stability (WBI)</td>
<td>.826</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Democracy standardized (Polity IV)</td>
<td>.970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Democracy standardized (Freedom House)</td>
<td>.869</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% variance 62.5 62.5 28.5

Notes: Principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation and Kaiser normalization, excluding coefficients less than 0.45. Years: 1984+

Source: See Table 3.1: *The Quality of Government Dataset*, March 2011, The Quality of Government Institute, University of Gothenburg [www.qog.pol.gu.se](http://www.qog.pol.gu.se)
Figure 3.1: Democratic governance, 2008

Notes: State capacity standardized to 100-points scale is measured by the ICRG Indicator of Quality of Governance, Political Risk Service Group, International Country Risk Guide; Liberal democracy standardized scale is measured by the Freedom House Political Rights and Civil Liberties index.

Source: See Table 3.1: for more details and The Quality of Government Dataset, March 2011, The Quality of Government Institute, University of Gothenburg www.qog.pol.gu.se
Figure 3.2: Democratic governance over time
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Figure 3.3: Annual changes in democratic governance in the four case-study countries, 1980-2010

Source: See Table 3.1: The Quality of Government Dataset, March 2011, The Quality of Government Institute, University of Gothenburg www.qog.pol.gu.se
Figure 3.4: Trajectories of democratic governance in the four case-study countries

Source: See Table 3.1: *The Quality of Government Dataset*, March 2011, The Quality of Government Institute, University of Gothenburg [www.qog.pol.gu.se](http://www.qog.pol.gu.se)
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