

# Global Quality of Democracy as Innovation Enabler. Measuring Democracy for Success.

Campbell, David F. J. (2019).

Pgrave Studies in Democracy, Innovation and Entrepreneurship for Growth. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 509 S.

Matthias Keppel

Austrian Parliament (Advisor of the procedural judge of the parliamentary inquiry about the combat aircraft system "Eurofighter Typhoon")

E-Mail: matthias.keppel@parlament.gv.at

In times, in which democracy and its constitution are often questioned by political actors, it is good, necessary and valid to receive a picture about the state and status of democracy worldwide. The here authored book by *David F. J. Campbell*, a political scientist, attempts to answer the challenge about the constitution of democracies through formulating the following research question: *How to conceptualize and to measure democracy and quality of democracy in a global comparison?* In addition, he also reflects upon possible next-step developments of quality of democracy, by referring to democracy as an "innovation enabler": *How does quality of democracy act and play in favor of enabling innovation?* (2)

David Campbell has been carrying out research on quality of democracy and its conception and measurement now for several years. The reviewed work is therefore also a (substantial) extension of his Habilitation (Higher Doctorate), written for the Department of Political Science at the University of Vienna. These long-lasting research activities also strengthened the belief of Campbell that without a measurement it is difficult to envision how concepts and theories of democracy can be developed further. In order to be able to present his own methodical approach in a conclusive way, David Campbell, therefore, devotes himself to a historical assessment and reassessment of previous attempts of democracy measurement. His focus refers to a global view and understanding of democracy, which is also directly reflected in his conception. Through this approach, the author offers a new form of understanding of how democracy should be measured in a meaningful way. Existing examples, such as the "three dimensional", "four dimensional" or a "quadruple structure" (34) conceptualization

of democracy, are extended to a next level of analysis. The two most basic dimensions in these models are always freedom and equality.

With regard to discourse, further development of democracy theory and research on democracy and the quality of democracy, David Campbell refers primarily to the following two strands. One connection is with Hans-Joachim Lauth's three-dimensional approach, where Lauth introduced the following three dimensions: freedom, equality and control (see *Lauth, 2004 and 2016*, and *Lauth and Schlenkrich, 2018*). This basic dimensional structure is being embedded into Campbell's core conceptual framework, but is extended also by other dimensions. The other connection is with Guillermo O'Donnell's work, particularly his combination of human rights and human development, and their importance for quality of democracy (see *O'Donnell, 2004a and 2004b*). Campbell describes the work of O'Donnell as a work, in "... which a detailed and rich development of theory of democracy, with a focus on quality of democracy, is being combined with practical consequences of democracy measurement." Campbell (already as far back as in *Campbell, 2012*) was inspired by O'Donnell to add "sustainable development" to the basic dimensions (portfolio) of democracy measurement of a democracy.

In his further-extended conceptual framework of analysis, David Campbell refers to a *Quintuple-Dimensional Structure of Democracy and Quality of Democracy (12)*, and identifies the following basic dimensions to be relevant for an understanding and an analysis of democracy: freedom, equality, control, sustainable development, and self-organization (political self-organization). Government-opposition cycles (political swings) represent

one crucial form of manifestation of self-organization within a democracy. For a functioning and evolving democracy it is necessary that there is a peaceful alternation of political power, and that the opposition has a chance to define and to represent the next-phase government.

With the empirical macro model, the author does offer an extensive country sample of 160 countries (and territories) and covers the fifteen-year period of 2002–2016. By this, the model addresses more than ninety-nine percent of the world population. The model refers not only to democracies, but also to semi-democracies and non-democracies. This global perspective appears to be necessary for a comprehensive understanding of democracy, of democracy development and the development of quality of democracy. The large-scale comparison includes not only OECD countries, but also non-OECD countries, for example Brazil, Russia, China and India.

The comparison by Campbell provides readers with an impressive summary on the status of development of democracies worldwide. There is this one focus on the democracies themselves, but also in consideration of global aspects and of global trends such as freedom, equality, control, sustainable development, and also of government-opposition cycles and political swings, *the peaceful person changes of the head of government and the peaceful party changes of the head of government*. Through the multitude of new indicators (and variables), the author successfully demonstrates that it takes more than the usual or normal approach to make our current understanding of democracy and quality of democracy measurable and sensitive for the global context. The finally formulated hypotheses are attempting and encouraging to explore possible further future developments of democracy and of global quality of democracy. *Knowledge Democracy* represents a crucial reference in extension of the knowledge society and knowledge economy, and also cross-links over to democracy theory (compare with Veld, 2010).

This global approach to democracy seems to be so urgently needed and necessary for our current debates on the state and status of democracy worldwide.

## References

- Campbell, David F. J. (2012), Die österreichische Demokratiequalität in Perspektive, in: Helms, Ludger / Wineroither, David M. (eds.), Die österreichische Demokratie im Vergleich, Baden-Baden: Nomos, 293–315.
- Lauth, Hans-Joachim (2004), Demokratie und Demokratie-messung: Eine konzeptionelle Grundlegung für den interkulturellen Vergleich, Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Lauth, Hans-Joachim (2016), The Internal Relationships of the Dimensions of Democracy: The Relevance of Trade-Offs for Measuring the Quality of Democracy, in: *International Political Science Review* 37 (5), 606–617.
- Lauth, Hans-Joachim / Oliver Schlenkrich (2018), Making Trade-Offs Visible: Theoretical and Methodological Considerations about the Relationship between Dimensions and Institutions of Democracy and Empirical Findings, in: *Politics and Governance* 6 (1), 78–91, Internet: <https://www.cogitatiopress.com/politics-andgovernance/article/view/1200>.
- O'Donnell, Guillermo (2004a), Why the Rule of Law Matters, in: *Journal of Democracy* 15 (4), 32–46.
- O'Donnell, Guillermo (2004b), Human Development, Human Rights, and Democracy, in: O'Donnell, Guillermo/Cullell, Jorge Vargas/Iazzetta (eds.): *The Quality of Democracy. Theory and Applications*, Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 9–92.
- Veld, Roeland J. (2010), *Knowledge Democracy: Consequences for Science, Politics, and Media*. Heidelberg: Springer.