

International Law, Economic advancement and Democratic Governance

Saeed Ullah

LLM, Khyber Law College, University of Peshawar

Rashid Khan

LLM, Khyber Law College, University of Peshawar

Abstract

The role played by the US and international bureaucrats and elites, academics and autocrats and NGO's in discouraging democratic construction as a core element of development is significant. Many democratic countries and international organizations, domestic and foreign, fail to consider the promotion of democracy as a vital national interest. From 1992 to 2002 the Democracy Coalition Project carried out the first ever systematic survey of democracies and their adherence to the policy of democratic defense and promotion abroad. Implications of the research point to the suggestion that parochial security and local economic gains often trump global democracy initiatives. Surprisingly, the newest democracies want most of all to ensure mutual and reciprocal commitment to making democracy legally defended and promoted by peaceful means. They rightly perceive those initiatives as reinforcing systematic consolidation and deterrence. It is the assertion of this paper that democratic nations nowadays need well-fledged commitment and support from IL personnel to accomplish this noble goal. The analyzed democracies unleash more assertiveness and are more likely to demand democracy when acting within the frameworks of international organizations with other democracies. This major link between democracy and development provides what one World Bank economist describes as a 'complicated and difficult issue' of contention for donors and those in the recipient countries. Overlapping decision makes have adopted formal concepts that are unattainable were Burke in practice scenarios. It is important for the advancement of world economic growth that the self-supported economic model of democracy and the rule of law takes a stand and – calmly – confronts the universe's stick-in-the-mud orthodoxy.

Keywords: That is; Rule of law, democracy, development.



Introduction

There's actually a fairly close link between democracy and development. This article refutes the prevalent doctrine in international economic development law: democracies brings a condition of instability that does not favor development. This ideology suggests it is only proper that democracy be introduced in an economy once that economy has reached a certain point of development. This article argues that if the world's poorest nations are to achieve rapid economic development, then the only possible way is the democratisation process. It affects several methods in global development such as the framework of International Business, techniques used in Delivery of Development Assistance, and setting up of standards at United Nations Development Program (UNDP). Even the most backward states advance through early liberalization; the failure to democratize remains the chief reason for stagnation in the Third World. Thus, delay in progression of the economy, conservation of the environment and protection of human rights have not only made people poorer, but also restrained them for many years. The first half of this article analyses the origins of the current model of economic development, which forms the focus of this article and is grounded in mainstream politically economy theorisation. This said work examines the application of this dogma and contributes additional discourse and research on the nature of substantive economic change through freedom and democracy. The post concludes by making a call to the international law practitioners to follow the rising trend in democratic economic development.

Growth therefore requires human freedom to be promoted economic, political and legal framework as this particular article substantiates. We must strive for broad support for that democratic development for it is the best for everybody. Challenging the current paradigm will be most challenging as there is high homogeneity in the practitioners of international economic development law. Anything that poses any threat to the current ways of the paradigm is either ignored or justified. This article provides also some insights which come from outside the existing paradigm. By reviewing the investigations on poverty in the world and international economic development, an inductive framework for attaining global development is made. It

shows that the nature of the regime within a given country is the only strong determinant of the ability of that country to develop its economy. Democracies and institutions that come with it are the most effective when it comes to pursuing economic growth. No practitioner of international law can afford to do so. International law thus occupies a unique place in the global policy more because in most areas it is closely linked with human rights and rule of law that helps democratic economic growth.

Essential Conditions for Democracy in Economic Terms

The theories which are labeled as second image were developed from the European fascist systems of the 1930s, and later reasserted by scholars and officials in industrialized states and in newly independent Africa, Asia and Latin America. According to Lipset in 1959 the levels of living thus improved the educational qualities, which in turn brought about change in political orientations and promoted progressive reforms in political culture. Investigation on relationship between democracy and world economic growth by Lipset has resulted in a substantial body of work that has become the largest body of research on any subject within comparative politics. More importantly, has influenced policies towards modernization and economic development in the subsequent decades affecting hundreds of millions of people in emerging nations.

Politics and Economic Development

The renowned political scientist Samuel P. Huntington goes further than Lipset in this respect. As Huntington in his book, Political Order in Changing Societies, published in 1968 noted, authoritarian governments work better in the administration of low income nations because of their past record of success in preserving order. He used to think that parties and the military acts as integrated networks in less developed countries. Huntington equally did not consider the regime types useful in classification, and labeled a level of governance along with the capability of the regime to exercise authority as the major political divides among the countries. He said that the major divide is between interfere states like the United States and the Soviet Union and non interfere states in Asia, Africa and Latin America with fragile political coalitions.



According to Roll and Talbott, these authors identified a highly significant gap in GNIpc after processes of democratization or demonstrations against democracy. It was found that the average sample country experiencing a democratic event had minimal economic growth of - 0.67% per annum in the five years before the event. In continuation of the democratic event, these typical Nations designated substantial economy growth and upgraded the economic growth to 2.2 percent annually in the first five years of the democratic event. The average event nation's Five-Year Gross Domestic Product growth rate dropped to a 1.7 percent annual rate in the second five years following an antidemocratic event before rising to a 2.7 percent rate in the following ten years.⁵⁴ Given that the typical sample nation that experienced an antidemocratic event had an average GDP growth rate of 1.6 percent in the decade prior to the event, that rate dropped to 0. The authors understandably claim that their study offers sufficient grounds to believe that changes in a country's governance linked to democracy cause shifts in per capita income.

In one of the most conscious insights of Dankwart Rustow's study of democratic transitions, he warned that it is futile to look for preconditions to explain why a particular nation emerged into democracy. He criticised research which suggested linear correlations of other external and internal economic, social, cultural, psychological etcetera aspects with democracy without paying adequate attention to certain vital political factors. However, an ambivalent attitude to democracy continues to some extent, and not only in some democratic countries but within several of them. For example, the webpage of the US Department of State in its advocates on democratic principles implicitly endorsed the Lipset-Huntington thesis that 'economic development brings democracy'. However, to be effective there is not only one democracy but the best model is liberal democracy; this stream of democracy is best rooted in the angelic liberal tradition of England. The English believe in freedom concerning liberty and the social organization and lack of external force; on the other hand, the French brand of liberalism is the constant striving and the imposition of an idealized collective purpose or vision which reflects the rationalist agenda The English...put forward a very important and sound theory about the



very nature of liberty But the French rationalist) return is has been calamitous, with many of the devotees never having known anything other than the

The Nature Of The Regime Is Then Relevant

These two stances along with the more general discussion of democracy in development circles lead to the question of whether the type of government really matters at all. Statistical modeling lately completed by a group led by Adam Przeworski of the University of Chicago has finally settled the matter—it does. In his massive study of the nature of democracy or development Przeworski found some empirical evidence on the consequences of dictatorship and democracy.⁴⁰ Przeworski surveyed quantitatively, 111 indicators concerning political regime type of 135 nations for each year between 1950 and 1990. According to Przeworski, the author of the given article, the author of the given article partly accepts the idea which states that a minimum per capita income is necessary for transforming a dictatorship into democracy, but, in fact, Przeworski dismisses the dictator-to-development paradigm. While Przeworski sets his study beyond the remit of modernization theory, he does not entirely support the promotion of democracy. In an update of Lipset and Huntington, Przeworski argues that it is clear that democracies are primarily found in countries with higher levels of development due to the fact that democratic regimes stable do not fail the moment per capita incomes cross the level of approximately \$6,000. The rate of per capita earnings rises up in both democrat and autocrat nations; but when the income rises above \$6,000, antenna remains strong and democracy triumphs. In her paper, Przeworski made this statement in 2003: no democracy has actually broken down in any country with per head income below \$7,455 which was Argentinas income per head in 1975. It goes beyond \$6,055 to have a statement ‘Democracy endures indefinitely.’ Nonetheless, Przeworski goes beyond modernization theory by denying the very premise of modernization theory, that is democratic and authoritarian regimes are equally effective. In their work Democracy and Development, Przeworski et al. argued that political regimes do not explain the rate of economic development. However, in their work, authors



identify that dictatorships – political systems that depend on a dictatorial whim of a dictator – have high variability of economic performance.

Conclusion: Deriving Democratic Progress

Both political and economic institutions are fully capable of functioning independently in order to help states in achieving economic growth. Free societies that embrace liberal democracy and free markets create far more wealth, a cleaner environment, better human and national protection. Combining liberty and democracy as a major concept of a development regime means that millions of people's lives can be changed for the better. As is evident even from impoverished free societies, these have been marvels of dynamism as platforms of economic growth. Frequently, developmental ambitions in several countries have not being achieved despite the presence of developmental paradigms. The trend towards globalism and penchant for international remedies obscure the primacy of the state and national strategies to development and environmental issues. Over the centuries, countries have wrestled between freedom and rule by the elite and at this stage, the nations are almost ready to decide to choose freedom and democracy may spear head an economic revolution for a number of poor countries in the world. Development, as all those governments are agreed, will only happen if they embrace this new democratic development paradigm.

MCA's funding target the national, regional and municipal governments and non-governmental organizations in most and lower-middle income countries who support democratic governance and market economic reforms. Sixty-eight The MCA defines democratic criteria that include political liberalization, equality, rule of law, protection of human and civil liberties that includes the disabled, the protection of property rights, transparency and accountability in governance and The Lasswell-McDougal team at Yale University has been commended for policy-oriented research through which have been helpful in helping practitioners of international law to understand that they are dealing with process and not formula. The area of economic growth is the best example since international law practitioners can influence the existing norms. High levels of democracy and markets mean that an overarching perspective on economic growth



needs to engage or it will be ignored, and increasingly so in the United States. This would be calamity, substantially setting back the opportunity for real worldwide progress and diminishing the effectiveness of vast quantities of American capital and leverage to confront worldwide economic development issues.

References

- Adam Przeworski and Fernando Limongi, "Modernization: Theories and Facts," *World Politics*, Vol. 49, No. 2, January 1997, 156. Over the years,
- Adam Przeworski, Michael E. Alvarez, Jose Antonio Cheibub and Fernando Limongi, *Democracy and Development: Political Institutions and Well-Being in the World, 1950-1990* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University, 2000), 79.
- Guillermo A. O'Donnell, *Modernization and Bureaucratic-Authoritarianism* (Berkeley, CA: Institute of International Studies, University of California, Berkeley, 1973), 3-15.
- Huntington, "Will Countries Become More Democratic?" 200.
- Kenneth N. Waltz, *Man, the State and War* (New York: Columbia University Press 1954).
- Lipset, "Some Social Requisites of Democracy: Economic Development and Political Legitimacy," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 53, No. 1, March 1959, 69-105.
- Lipset, "Some Social Requisites," 74-76. 7 Lipset, "Some Social Requisites," Table II, 76.
- Lipset's work has been "supported and contested, revised and extended, buried and resuscitated."
- Morton H. Halperin, Joseph T. Siegle, and Michael M. Weinstein, *The Democracy Advantage: How Democracies Promote Prosperity and Peace* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2005), 3.
- Thomas M. Franck, "The Emerging Right to Democratic Governance," *The American Journal of International Law*, Vol. 86, January 1992, 49.
- Waltz, *Man, the State and War*, 114.