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Abstract


This thesis tries to evaluate the very large question of how globalization can be said to have an effect on democracy by reducing both concepts to a more usable format. In doing so it tries to evaluate how a special theory of democracy put forward by Robert Dahl in 1971 – polyarchy – could be said to be affected by the workings of contemporary globalization. When assessing the variables of the investigation, globalization is being represented by two constructed ideal images that are later measured against a set of seven variables extracted from Dahl’s theory.

By the use of qualitative text analysis the constructed ideal types help provide a framework for how one can measure the effects of globalization on polyarchy. The analysis ends in a result where it is clear that if globalization is understood as a neo-liberal ideal image it is making the circumstances for the creation of polyarchies in the future more favorable. However, if globalization is understood as an ideal image of world-system theory explanations then the circumstances for future polyarchies are less favorable. In a concluding discussion important implications of the results are highlighted when the thesis concludes that regardless of ideological starting point globalization can be said to affect the theory of polyarchy in such a way that it is in dire need of reevaluation. At the same time the essay concludes that whenever the concept of globalization is being used with scientific ambitions by politicians, they need to be aware of, and reflect, the different results that it brings depending on how it is explained.
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1. Introduction

1.1 Background

As the fall of 2008 is getting older by the minute the main attraction of world domestic politics is getting ready for what seems to be a very close and important milestone in not only one particular country, but rather the entire world. The presidential election of the United States of America is indeed interesting for many reasons; however it is at the same time a very powerful symbol of two processes running side by side in a race where it is not entirely clear if both will finish.

For one thing it is the focus of the archetypical model of democracy for many scholars, students, teachers and everyday people around the world. The election of one man (or woman) as the voice for his or her country is probably one of the most deep rooted images of democracy that men and women around the world relates to in one way or another. However that is, not at all, to say that democracy actually is the same thing as the election of a president. Quite contrary political scientists have been engaged in the study of democracy for a very long time and there are not only many different theories on the subject, but also a large number of different democratic systems around the world. Indeed in modern times, as argued by Robert Dahl (Dahl, 1971) most, if not all, governments of the world stresses how they are the legitimate voice of their people and often consider themselves as democratic.

What it is that actually makes truly democratic regimes stand out from not so democratic ones is and has been a very important part of political science and probably will be a big part of its future. The thesis presented in the following essay will be interested in one of the most influential theories of the social sciences that has ever been put forward, namely Robert Dahl’s thoughts of polyarchy (Dahl, 1971). In his theory Dahl argues that what normally is considered democracies in the world of state systems actually is better thought of as polyarchies. That is systems that are ruled by a majority under certain conditions, and to which democracy is best understood as an ideal at the end of a spectrum of possible solutions for the organization of the judicial and political formation of the state.

The image of the American presidential election may not directly be connected to Dahl’s theory but it emphasize a version of democracy and as such it also points beyond itself in a way that makes us as bystanders think of and reflect around the concept of democracy. In the best of worlds democratic elections around the world would be a day of celebration, for it crystallizes a remarkable process that most scholars probably would call a fundamental step forward for mankind. However
this is not the best of worlds and democracy, or polyarchy for that matter, is a concept under contest. Where some people have gone so far as to articulate the contemporary world as the end of history in the sense that capitalism and liberalism marks the high point of human society in a way that cannot be fundamentally better (Fukoyama, 1992), others have pointed to the exceptional injustices that seems to continue to rid the world societies at a point where they are richer than ever and, as already pointed out, according to themselves more democratic than ever.

Returning to the image of the American election it also represents another concept widely discussed in the social sciences. As a buzzword of the nineties globalisation has become so important that it sometimes seems hard not to stumble over the notion in any given newspaper, book, movie or news cast.

The presidential election can be followed (and indeed is followed) all around the world via technical advances such as Internet, TV, Radio and on demand news services. For example the coverage of the American election in Swedish news indicates that this is an event that supposedly is almost, or as, important as the domestic elections1. Hours and hours of Swedish news have already been dedicated to not only the election, but also to the primary election in which the candidates of the American parties are nominated. Everyday discussions at Swedish dinner tables and work places now seems just as likely to focus on the latest political moves by Barak Obama or John McCain as the more locally connected issues of say immigration or unemployment. This could be viewed as evidence that what is normally referred to as the globalization of world politics is indeed a process that is not only real, but also accelerating.

Like the theory of democracy, globalization too is not at all understood and studied in agreement among scholars. In fact there are many different ideologies that views the idea as constituted by very different things. As argued by for instance Jan-Aart Scholte the study of globalization tend to make social scientists disagree among many different lines of demarcations many times making the discussion hard to follow simply because one position may argue on fundamentally different premises than another (Scholte, 2005). However one could probably state that it is commonly understood that globalization is a process that represents the advancement of the world in a way that makes it appear smaller. Different parts of the world get connected not only via technical advancements but also through new and supraterritorial institutions such as the European Union.

---

1 The grasp of the Swedish media coverage regarding the American presidential election is a subjective feeling of the author; however it may very well be possible to find research on this. In any case the point of the argument is not dependant of whether or not there is a measurable increase in news coverage; rather it is enough to conclude that the election is important in other parts of the worlds than the U.S.
It is in the cross section of both these highly prolific fields of subjects, democracy and globalization, that this essay finds its problems, theories and suggestions. In a world increasingly characterized as globalized and where democracy is by some talked of as completed and by others as at stake literally thousands of interesting fields of studies can probably be found. It is not by any means the intention of the work presented here to be accountable for all of them, but at the same time it is recognized that this is a particularly contested zone of political science and as such making many different views on the problems dealt with here possible. That is not to say that the thoughts put forward here are advocates of scientific relativism, on the contrary. It is to say however, that interpretations are always part of the scientific process.

1.2 Problem orientation

Drawing from the picture painted above the main problem of this work could be characterized as trying to answer the more general question: “What happens to democracy in a globalized world?” No doubt this is a major question, not suitable for this essay's scope and limitations in time and resources. Therefore a few much more precise questions are formulated in order to say something (but not all) about the above stated general inquiry.

First of all it is imperative to narrow the subject down to a level where the different variables and concepts are able to be defined in a way that makes it even possible to ask reasonable questions. That is done in this essay by first tapering democracy to a generally and universally accepted theory, namely Robert Dahl’s thoughts about polyarchy as put forward in the 1971 classic *Polyarchy*. Using this model it is possible to handle the wide notion in a way that allows for a sort of common denominator idea of democracy. Polyarchy can indeed be criticized for not being a very broad or deep understanding of what we think of as democratic, but that is not what Dahl sets himself out to find. Rather the book describes a set of conditions that seems to be what is necessary for a democracy to ever develop. That is not to say that there isn’t a lot more to democracy then what is absolutely required, but Dahl’s point could be said to emphasize that without the conditions of a polyarchy it is very unlikely that we would find anything that resembles a democratic system in any nation of the world (Dahl, 1971). Therefore it seems to be a very ideal theory to measure the effects of globalization against since any changes in the, so to speak, foundations of democratic systems probably also means a change in estimates that stresses more extensive conditions for democracy.

As for the part of globalization it too needs to be well defined and largely scaled down to a form of abstraction, or in other words an ideal image of the real process. Globalization is, however, a notion that is quite heterogeneously understood amongst social science scholars. It could be argued that the understanding can be said to be based on different ideological assumptions of globalization so
that, for instance, the neo liberal understanding emphasizes explanations and effects that are mostly connected to the development of new inventions that expands the market to a global scale. Conversely a post colonial perspective would go about describing globalization as something to a great extent driven by dominant thoughts within our societies that includes and excludes people. This thought is said to be constructed in dichotomies such as us-them, good-bad or white-black etc. This creates a world in which one understanding dominates and poses itself on all others. The western thought coined by extreme rationalism that breeds people obsessed with measuring, weighing and describing the world to an extent where economic growth, technological control and bureaucracy becomes principal is identified as the primary explanation behind the kind of globalization we now are experiencing (Scholte, 2005).

It is therefore reasonable to speak of the impact that globalization has on democracy as something that is dependent on what ideological position you start from. To measure then, the impact on democracy, could be done by creating a series of ideal images to account for the different ideological takes on the issue. For the purpose of this essay though, two images are regarded as sufficient enough to account for the possibility of variation of answers that comes with ideological starting points. By using two diametrical positions such as neo-liberalism and the so called neo-marxist perspective of world-system theory advocated by the sociologist Immanuel Wallerstein, the two ideal images will in between them hold most of the different answers to how globalization can be said to have an impact on democracy. Granted, the variations of takes on globalization that lies between the ideal images are infinite, but the possible combinations of the simplified images could still say quite a lot about the impact on democracy. If, for instance, both neo liberalism and world-system theory explanations of globalization can be said to have a negative impact on the set of conditions that is identified by Dahl as requirements of polyarchy, then one can conclude that regardless of ideological starting point globalization has a negative impact on polyarchy and in the end democracy.

Thus the general research question of this paper is something in the line of “Does globalization, as understood by two ideal images, have an impact on the conditions that is required for Robert Dahl’s thoughts of polyarchy?”. In this vein a purpose and more stringent research questions are formulated below.
1.2.1 Purpose and research questions

The purpose of this essay is to investigate if globalization can be said to have an impact on the theory of polyarchy as put forward by Robert Dahl in the book with the same title, *Polyarchy* from 1971. This is fulfilled by answering the following research questions:

1) Can globalization understood as a neo-liberal ideal image be said to have a positive or negative effect on the requirements of polyarchy?

2) Can globalization understood as an ideal image of world-system theory explanations be said to have a positive or negative effect on the requirements of polyarchy?

3) Can the combined results in 1 and 2 contribute to say something more about the issue at hand?

1.3 Preceding research

To be sure both globalization and democracy are concepts that fill bookshelf after bookshelf in numerous libraries around the world. Therefore what is mentioned here is only an extremely small part of what exists in both fields of study. However it seems to be a lack of research in the particular area of how globalization effects on Dahl’s theory of polyarchy and therefore only the books and articles that have influenced this work in general are mentioned here.

First of all Jan-Aart Scholte contributes to the understanding of globalization in the book, *Globalization – A Critical Introduction* (2005) where he aims to describe the phenomenon, but also at the same time brings forth a number of normative solutions to what he perceive as problems. This essay has gotten the idea that globalization differs depending on ideological starting point from the research of Scholte.

When speaking of democracy tied to globalization a lot of issues and questions have been addressed in the book *Citizenship in a Global Age: Society, Culture, Politics* (2000) by Gerard Delanty. Although it focuses more on how we must get ready to speak of citizenship in new ways more than what it speaks on democracy per se, it helped raise important questions. The same is true for *Journal of World-Systems Research* that inspired and provoked to a point where some of its material also has become part of this essay.

As for the main theories that this work is concerned with they are addressed in more detail in the next chapter.
2. Theory

The train of thought through this work is resting on two cornerstones. That is first the theory of polyarchy put forward by Robert Dahl and secondly the ideal images of globalization that represents the neo-liberal ideology and the world-system analysis. This chapter presents both the theory behind polyarchy and the respective globalization theories. This serves both as an introduction and as a link to preceding research.

2.1 Polyarchy

Robert Dahl’s theory can be viewed as treating democracy as an ideal image in such a way that no existing system on earth today actually can make any claims to be a democracy. Some can however claim to be polyarchies, which means that they can be characterized as highly inclusive and liberalized with regards to their citizen’s part in public contestation and right to participate in elections and office.

Dahl comes to his conclusions by first assuming that any regime that is to be classified as a democracy (or later in his own words a polyarchy) needs to have certain key characteristics:

I assume that a key characteristic of a democracy is the continuing responsiveness of the government to the preferences of its citizens, considered as political equals. (Dahl, 1971:1)

If that characteristic is to continue over time Dahl argues that the citizens of such a system need to have unimpaired opportunities:

1. To formulate their preferences.
2. To signify their preferences to their fellow citizens and the government by individual and collective action.
3. To have their preferences weighed equally in the conduct of the government, that is, weighted with no discrimination because of the content or source of the preference. (Dahl, 1971:2)

He then identifies eight constitutional guaranties that needs to be fulfilled in order for the above three criteria to be met. By viewing those eight guarantees closer he is able to interpret them as aligning along what he calls two different dimensions of democratization. Those dimensions are the above mentioned Public contestation and Right to participate in elections and office. If one then combines them it makes a classification of different political systems possible. (Dahl, 1971)
From the figure above we can understand that Dahl views polyarchy as a system that manages to supply a high level of inclusiveness and a high level of liberalization to its citizens. It is important to keep in mind that Dahl does not intend to use the figure as any type of exact measure. It is used to serve as a graphic representation of generalized argumentation. In reality many countries probably lie in the middle ground, an area he has not named, which is a conscious decision and not something that happened by chance. Dahl wants us to understand that the measurements are rather arbitrary and serves their purpose best as such. (Dahl, 1971)

The classification along dimensions enables Dahl to ask questions about what conditions increase or decrease the chances of a government to move to the upper right corner of the diagram, where in the end the ideal of democracy is thought to be located. In all the theory is concerned with how the movement towards this ideal can be said to function. It is an ongoing struggle between the ruling regime and its opponents in such a way that a change along any of the dimensions will bring with it a potentially dangerous new position of the society as a whole. In countries that are not yet polyarchies the question about inclusiveness and liberalization is in fact a question of marginal costs of the ruling government, Dahl argues. When a government considers giving its citizens more or less participation via for instance public elections, this is assumed by Dahl to be a process of weighting the marginal costs of the alternatives. As long as the cost of keeping a repressive regime is lower than not keeping it, it only makes sense for the government to stay repressive. But as time goes by different things may change the costs so that the government actually is better of giving its people more inclusiveness, simply because the level of oppression might be more expensive to retain than the alternative, namely not retaining it. (Dahl, 1971)

As a last step before starting to delve deeper in to the elements that play significant roles for different regimes’ possibilities to move towards polyarchy Dahl summarizes his thoughts about the costs in three basic axioms, and as such lays the foundation of the theoretical framework he then builds on.
Axiom 1. The assumption that a government will tolerate an opposition increases as the expected costs of toleration decrease.

Axiom 2. The likelihood that a government will tolerate an opposition increases as the expected cost of suppression increase.

Axiom 3. The more the costs of suppression exceed the costs of toleration, the greater the chance for a competitive regime. (Dahl, 1971:15)

Dahl then moves on to identify what is going to be used as dependant variables in this essay, namely seven sets of conditions that all are important for the creation of polyarchy in a state. Those conditions are:

a) Historical sequences

b) The degree of concentration in the socioeconomic order

c) The level of socioeconomic concentration

d) Inequality

e) Sub cultural cleavages

f) Foreign control

g) The believes of political activists

Thus the theory can be summed up very briefly as one that says: Given a few underlying assumptions governments can be said to be classified as moving towards four main types of regimes depending on seven sets of conditions. The seven sets of conditions works together to classify any given regime with regards to its possibilities to approach a democratic ideal, one that can be approached as a polyarchy, which is a system that is both highly inclusive and highly liberalized, meaning that the possibility of participation and public contestation is high to the citizens of the same system.

The use of the theory in this essay will be in the line of what Dahl himself argues. Using his seven conditions as variables will make it possible to assert if and how globalization can be said to have an impact on the theory of polyarchy.

2.2 Globalization

What is globalization? When did it start? Did it start at all? Questions like these are what divide the social scientists when they are trying to form an understanding of what is probably the most discussed concept of the last decades together with the environment. One of the most informed
scholars tied to the subject could be argued to be Jan Aart Scholte who in his work *Globalization – a critical introduction* argues for an understanding that distinguishes different globalization explanations tied to ideological perspectives. In short, depending on what ideological foundation different scholars set off from, their explanations will vary (Scholte, 2005).

Each one of the possible perspectives on globalization can be said to take different ways of accounting for the central themes of what they consider the core constitution of the concept. So, like the already mentioned example, some scholars may see globalization as mostly driven by materialistic changes of our society, while others pay more attention to idealistic reforms that more or less makes us intertwined as human beings over the old nation state borders. Furthermore there is a very living debate amongst scholars about how much emphasis should be put on power relations. Where some see globalization as a way for the western world to impose neo-colonialism upon the more dependent states in the south, others claim that it is in fact the process that, if maintained as now, will free the third world from its shackles once and for all (Sholte, 2005).

It seems logical then to account for these differences when applying globalization as an independent variable in such an analysis that this essay aims to put forward. One way to render a model that at least tries to relate to the problem is to create ideal types of the perspectives and then measure them individually against the dependent variables (in this case the variables of polyarchy). Here two of the more prominent perspectives on globalization have been chosen to serve as ideal types and as such be used as ground for the analysis at hand. The more methodological issues connected to such a selection and the use of ideal images at all is discussed later. A short introduction to both ideologies is laid out here much in the same vain as Dahl’s polyarchy, or in other words it is thought to be easier to get into both the methodological discussion and later the analysis if the reader first have a basic understanding of how both perspectives view the world in general and globalization in particular.

2.2.1 A neo-marxist approach, world-system theory

Within what is commonly dubbed neo-marxism there are naturally contesting thoughts and explanations to contemporary issues such as globalization, democracy, peace, war and so forth. Four of the main alignments among scholars can be said to be Gramscianism, critical theory, new marxism and world-system theory. Even though this may seem as a very diverse and contested area, and indeed in many respects it is, one need to keep in mind that all of the above orientations

---

2 The name of this particular perspective is somewhat contested. Some scholars prefer to call it World-System Analysis, others World-System Approach and others yet World-System Theory. There has also been some debate of whether or not there should be a hyphen in “World-System”, however in this work all the names are used interchangeably to represent the theory resting on Immanuel Wallersteins and his followers work.
share some very critical stand points about how the world in general is situated. In addition it is not as easy as to say that any given writer always operates within one field, rather it is common for scholars to engage in argumentations that may sometimes shift in regards to alignment. To be sure that seems only very natural, however it is important to keep this in mind when reading the rest of this essay. World-system theory is used as a representation of neo-marxism, it does not include all arguments in its field, but it still has enough in common with the other orientations that it is useful to talk about all of them as neo-marxism (Hobden & Wyn Jones, 2008).

The earliest works of world-system theory can be traced back to when Lenin tried to apply the thoughts of Marx on the international world. When doing so Lenin argued that as capitalism reaches its highest point in its evolution it also changes in many aspects. Particularly what happens is that the corporation structure approaches a state of monopoly in all of the world’s more developed countries. This developed part of the world then becomes a core of nations that wield its powers over the periphery. A system of dependence is created so that the well to do states continually impoverishes the countries of the periphery while the latter still are very dependent on the rich to function at all (Hobden & Wyn Jones, 2008). The modern world-system approach was born in the early 1970’s as sociologist Immanuel Wallerstein started to put forward his theory of how the world actually was situated. As one of the leading views under what has been called neo-marxism it is today a wide spread research field used in virtually all social sciences, but particularly sociology, political science and human geography (Hobden & Wyn Jones, 2008).

The Wallersteinian perspective builds on some central themes of Lenin, but also rejects many things to create a position that is structured around some central claims:

- The world must be viewed as a system of nations and not as a league of independent countries on an international plane (Wallerstein, 2004).
- Such systems have a beginning and an end. During human history different systems have existed. The current one was born in the late 15th century (Wallerstein, 2004).
- The driving force behind the current one is the economic organization of capitalism (Wallerstein, 2004).
- The capitalistic organization creates a geographical split between three zones of activity within the system. There is a core of nations that are coined by wealth, democracy, welfare service, high investments and export of manufactures. Its high technology production makes it in need of abundant raw material that does not exist solely within the core. The periphery is the vast majority of nations in the world today, where non-democratic governments rule poor populations who have no welfare service and below subsistence
wages. Such nations only way of function on the international arena is to export the raw materials that they have within their borders. In addition a sort of intermediate zone that Wallerstein calls the **semi-periphery** floats in an uncertain existence between the two other. The countries of this zone have low wages for workers and usually functions as places where the capitalistic corporations ruled from the core can place such parts of the production that is yesterday’s high tech. With this logic the corporations can place more mature manufactures in the hands of workers with much less pay, but who still can do the job (Hobden & Wyn Jones, 2008).

- The existence of the three zones is a geographical dimension on the world-system; however it also has a very distinct **temporal** dimension. That is it was born, has a middle and will have an end. The way that the zones interact with each over time can be described by cyclical rhythms composed of contradictions and expansions (Wallerstein, 2004).

Taken together the world-system theorists claim that the cyclical rhythm constitutes one of the core characteristics of the capitalist system. Theorizing about this Wallerstein and his colleagues draws a lot on the work of economists Josef Schumpeter and Nikolas Kondratiev. Both of them studied and developed theories of business cycles, identifying the expansive and contradictive character of the world economy (Wallerstein, 2004).

As for the question of globalization it is obvious then that the world-system theorists dispute contemporary forms. First of all many of them sees it as a mis calculation to think of globalization as something new. In fact they argue that the current world-system has been global from its beginning, that is since the late 15th century. The global aspect is a logical conclusion when viewing the international sphere as a **world-system**, where the individual actors (the states) are in fact not independent, but intricately intertwined through business and social relations (Wallerstein, 2004).

That being said, it doesn’t mean that world-system proponents dismiss the effects of what is called globalization today. On the contrary most world-system theorists are very engaged in trying to understand what the latest development in the system means. Many of them also point to the fact that even though globalization is nothing new, its scope and importance today is accelerating.³

### 2.2.2 A neo liberal approach, commercial liberalism

When talking about neo-liberalism in this work it can more precise be said to mean **commercial liberalism** in the way that this orientation is presented by Steven L. Lamy in Baylis, Smith & Owens

³ For example it can be noticed how Journal of World-System Research has devoted many articles and entire issues to the understanding of globalization from a world-system perspective. For more detailed reference to some of those articles see the last section of this essay.
This is probably the most dominant of the thoughts within neo-liberalism, and is also often coupled with a thinking of **republican liberalism** that focuses much on the democratic peace theory.⁴

Commercial liberalism is first and foremost argued for by global financial institutions and most of the major trading states around the world. They argue that the world today is indeed coined by what we call globalization, and this is a very good thing. Championing the thoughts of free market society and individual freedom they claim that free trade should be the basics of the international relations, if we want to create and maintain democratic nations (Lamy, 2008).

Its ideas and influence can probably not be under estimated. Contemporary globalization is in many ways exactly what the neo-liberals argue for, yet many of them see challenges and obstacles lying in the way of a truly free world. As argued by Thomas L. Friedman, Johan Norberg and the think tank The Cato Institute among many other influential neo-liberals, what the world need is not less capitalism and free trade – it is much more of it (Norberg, 2001).

To be fair not all scholars who call themselves neo-liberals put as much emphasis on the economic functions of international relations. As of late an impressive following of researchers adhere to what is many times called **neo-liberal institutionalism**, an orientation that, as the name suggests, focus on the institutions that form the rules of the capitalistic society that in their view now is fully global. One of their main concerns is to address the issues of governance on a global level as they feel that in many ways the capitalistic systems needs its rules and regulations institutionalized not only on a national tier (Lamy, 2008).

However, the main stream approach of neo-liberalism is more linked to the commercial aspects as mentioned above. Therefore it feels natural to speak of neo-liberalism as a world-view that centers around some of the following main points:

- The world in the 21ˢᵗ century is indeed in many ways a global capitalistic society, and this is a good thing.
- Through capitalism and particularly free trade, nations can enrich their populations with not only material goods but also free and democratic societies.
- To achieve such goals the society as a whole need to focus primarily on the individual freedom of all of its citizens. This is done best through the market that follows with free economic trade. In such a market all individuals are assumed to be able to give attention to

---

⁴ This theory states that no democratic nations ever go to war with each other and remains a contested and influential area to debate among scholars.
their specific preferences and in time a natural equilibrium will occur that reflects all actors needs and desires in a way that is as good as possible for as many as possible.

- The above reasoning is connected to political issues in many ways. For example the market is indeed assumed to be a force that can measure all individuals’ needs, but in order to do so it must be left free of all regulations. That is there should be no distribution of wealth among citizens from the better off to the worse off. Some neo-liberals (like Robert Nozick) have gone so far as to proclaim taxation a literal theft by the state from its citizens. Even though most neo-liberals see the need of some taxation to uphold basic functions such as the police, military and the justice system (this is commonly referred to as the night watchman state) they generally think that taxation and disruptions of the market systems own allocation of resources should be kept to a minimal level.

- On a global level then, the neo-liberals argue that free trade between nations is the sole best provider of wealth. Indeed one of the founding fathers of liberalism, Adam Smith, chose to call his main work *The Wealth of nations*, in which he argues for the prosperities found through free trade.

All of the above mentioned issues are connected through the fact that the neo-liberals believe that by placing the individuals own self interest in the center of any argumentation concerning distribution of resources the best outcome will be found. Two of the most famous proponents of this perspective are economist Milton Friedman and philosopher Robert Nozick. Building on some of the foundations of liberalism and libertarianism today, Johan Norberg and Thomas Friedman can be said to be a logical following of the thoughts of Nozick and Milton Friedman. Their respective works apply the thoughts of neo-liberalism on the so-called globalization of today to try to interpret the challenges still existing for the contemporary political arena. But more specifically they both try to highlight what they view as the enormous benefits people all over the world have made thanks to global capitalism. To be sure the neo-liberals find that much of their future political fights will be fought so that more people can reap the benefits of free trade and capitalism (Norberg, 2001, T Friedman, 2005).

---

5 This is the shortened and most commonly used name of the real title: *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*

6 It may seem confusing but the name Friedman is in this case not shared by the authors through family connection.
3. Method

Before declaring the more specified method used to tackle the particular problems and questions raised in this essay it would be a good thing, I think, to assert what methodological foundation it rests on. A more general presentation is therefore offered and followed by the specific method used to answer the research questions.

3.1 Methodological approach

As presented in numerous methodological books for the social sciences a first distinction can probably be made on what type of study it is that is formulated in any given text. This work is at the same time a descriptive approach and an explanatory attempt (Esaiasson et. al, 2007). It tries to first describe how two different ideologies view the phenomena of globalization and after such a description has been made it tries to explain how the two ideologies of globalization can be said to have an impact on democracy. Even further, the take on democracy is very much the same, as the essay first describes a particular theory of democracy, namely Robert Dahl’s thoughts on polyarchy, and then uses it as part of an explanation for what globalization means for democracy.

To be sure, this could be done in a great variety of ways, such as through the use of discourse analysis, statistical techniques, interviews or any of the other common ways of approaching research within the social sciences (Esaiasson et. al, 2007). One could probably find a number of arguments as to why one method would be better than the other, however, this is neither the time nor the place to get caught up in a debate about scientific philosophy. The chosen method is oriented somewhere in the field of what is usually referred to as qualitative text analysis. A few arguments for choosing this general field of method to solve the problems at hand will be made.

First, the time frame of the problem makes it rather difficult to perform any empirical research to find statistical data on how globalization affects democracy. Indeed such studies probably take years if the data is supposed to be inductive in the sense that it is first gathered from around the world and then analyzed to form a theory around. One could of course use already established data and indexes and try to operationalize these in good ways, but generally I think this too is not as sufficient as the text analysis in this here case.

Second, globalization is a widely contested subject and so is democracy. To find indexes and statistics that say something about the processes objectively is very hard to do within the limited time associated with the work presented here. That is not to say that this cannot be done. With more time and resources it is at least a task that is within grasp. However since it seems as if most
takes on globalization and democracy is influenced by ideology it is so far a good idea to treat the process as described by for example either a **neoliberal approach** or a **constructivist approach**. Doing so is hardly done without some form of text analysis. In this essay two ideal images are created to show the neoliberal take on globalization as well as a neo-marxist perspective. To do so the qualitative text analysis seems to be the most adequate way of tackling the issue at hand. By use of text analysis of some of the most prominent work within the two traditions the ideal images can be created and shaped to fit the research questions. At the same time a text analysis is done to account for the theory of democracy that is being used. As pointed out, this does not mean that any other method is impossible; however, it seems as if doing a qualitative text analysis is somewhat unavoidable to approach at least parts of the problem. Therefore a qualitative text analysis has been chosen as the primary means of conducting the research.

### 3.2 Specified method

Substantially the method used here can be divided into two parts.

1) The creation of the ideal types through the use of qualitative text analysis.

2) Application of the ideal types on the variables extracted from Dahl’s theory through qualitative text analysis and deductive reasoning.

Concerning the first part it is based on a thorough study of some of the central works within the two fields. The neo-marxist perspective is represented by world-system analysis and the works of Immanuel Wallerstein and the people who have helped develop his ideas further.⁷ By reading three central books, *World-System Analysis: An Introduction* (2004), *The End of the World As We Know It* (1999) and *After Liberalism* (1995), where Wallerstein both explains his work and tries to draw implications of it for the future and by complementing with articles from *Journal of World-Systems Research* the ideal image of world system theory is sequestered.

Similarly the neo-liberal ideal image is developed from the reading of two works that tries to explain the phenomena of globalization with very much a neo-liberal approach. However, it is more difficult to find outspoken works of the neo-liberal perspective, as most of what constitutes neo-liberal globalization could, as Jan Aart Scholte puts it, be said to actually be globalization of today (Scholte,

---

⁷ Even though Wallerstein can be said to have founded the World-System Theory many others took the same turn around the 1960’s and some of them have been very influential from the beginning. Two of them could just as well as Wallerstein deserve to be mentioned as co-founders of the theory, namely Samir Amin and Andre Gunder Franck. A more recent prominent world system theorist is the American Christopher Chase-Dunne.
This means that while proponents of other perspectives can develop their work as critique of contemporary globalization, much of the neo-liberal take is to be found within organizations such as WTO (World Trade Organization), IMF (International Monetary Fund), The World-Bank and within political economy institutions at the universities of the world. Nonetheless there are, of course, a lot of scholars who take a neo-liberal approach to explaining globalization, and one of the leading works in this tradition as of late could probably be said to be *The World is Flat: A Brief History of the Globalized World of the 21st Century* by Thomas L. Friedman. Even though more of a popular writer Friedman has become one of the leading theoreticians behind the neo-liberal take on globalization today. The same is true for the Swedish writer Johan Norberg who has been recognized as one of the most prominent young neo-liberals and globalization experts by such influential neo-liberal think tanks as *The Cato Institute* to mention one. Norberg’s work *In Defense of Capitalism* is used here as the second opus around which the neo-liberal ideal image is formed.

The analysis will then end up in a labeling of the two ideologies under a set of dimensions or categories. This set has been chosen to reflect the central themes of both ideologies in reference to their thoughts about globalization. In short they are:

- i) Globalization and economic development
- ii) Globalization and Inequality
- iii) Globalization; histories and futures
- iv) Globalization, culture and foreign domination

By evaluating what type of stand both ideologies take in respect to the categories listed above ideal images are created. Again, it needs to be pointed out that this is by no means thought of as capturing all of what makes up the ideologies, but it is a way to be able to measure their ideas of globalization against Dahl’s set of variables. To be sure, much is left out. There is a very good chance that some neo-liberals and some world-system theorists may feel misrepresented by the use of such ideal images. This would be a problem if my claim was to be able to say something about all neo-liberals and all world-systems theorists; however this is not the formulation of the purpose earlier on in this essay. That is not to say that one doesn’t need to bother with problems of such nature by using ideal images. On the contrary there are many possible falls and traps linked to this particular method, and they will be dealt with further in a short while.

The second area of focus will then be to use the ideal types and measure them against Robert Dahl’s set of seven variables. This can be thought of schematically as in figure 3:1 below:
Both of the ideal images will be tested against all of the seven variables and measured to an extent that classifies them as either making the possibility of creating polyarchy in any given nation less favorable or more favorable. In the event of not being able to classify if the conditions under one variable can be said to have been changed through the effects of globalization to either more favorable or less favorable a third option is used. This is to demark the fact that the particular variable is considered as cet.par⁸. The classification will be done under each of the seven variables and is only concerned with the direction of the impact that both ideal images have on the variables.

Robert Dahl tries to make a general statement of his theory by assuming that all the world’s countries can be ordered into deciles depending on how well they score on the different variables so that even though one cannot say with certainty exactly how well any given nation scores, they can probably be ranked (Dahl, 1971). This reasoning is followed here, however reduced even further. When trying to show how the different globalizations have an effect on the variables it is assumed to be done on a hypothetical country to account for the more general level of reason that is being done. Such an effect would graphically be represented a little different than the way Dahl does, but still follow the general idea. That is, instead of using deciles, I use the aforementioned directions. Figure 3 shows first any given country before the impact of globalization, and then a hypothetical impact made by globalization on the variables. In this case, of course, the impact is not to be understood as any of the ideal images of neo-liberalism and world system theory. This is just a

---

⁸ Ceteris paribus (or cet.par as an acronym) is used in many social scientific disciplines but perhaps most often within economics. It means “all other things equal” and in this case if it is not possible to determine the direction of the impact of globalization upon a certain variable it will be treated as cet.par. To clarify even further the use of cet.par enables me to say something about the impact of globalization on polyarchy even if some of the variables are not possible to measure. They are in that case considered to be unaffected and held constant in reference to Dahl’s theories.
It is clear then that by measuring the impact of both ideal types against Dahl’s variables, two different scores such as the one in the second graph of figure 3 will be obtained. By viewing each score and from that conclude how each of the ideal types influence the chances for polyarchy they can be summed up in a small matrix, that will be used as the end result of the investigation. Since they can both score either **less favorable** or **more favorable** such a matrix would look like figure 4. In it both the ideal types implication for Dahl’s variables and thoughts of polyarchy will be plotted so that we get a graphical representation that shows us clearly the result of the study.
If, for instance the neo-liberal ideal type is considered to have an effect on the variables that together makes it classifiable as less favorable for polyarchy, then a mark in the upper right cell of the matrix would have been made. If at the same time the world-system theory approach influences the variables in such a way that its aggregated effect could be labeled as more favorable for polyarchy, it would be marked in the lower left cell.

As for the methodological take on working out the theory of polyarchy, it too is tied to the complex nature of qualitative text analysis. Indeed just as well as some of the proponents of the theories used to create the independent variables may feel misrepresented so to can the advocates of Dahl’s polyarchy feel that the theory is being reduced too much in this here work. A series of possible objections to my use of the theory can probably be thought of, and I do not intend to meet all of them here, however a preemptive attempt to answer some of them will be done.

First Dahl’s theory is complex, but that does not mean that all of that complexity is lost here. On the contrary, since what is being done is a qualitative text analysis the texts that make up the empiric material will be used in such ways that it is possible to account for some of the complexity when the different variables are being evaluated as being under impact of globalization. By nature some of the deep and interesting thoughts provided by Dahl in his original presentation of the theory (Dahl, 1971) will be lost when it is reduced to a set of variables that are useable in scientific inquiry. At the same time this is probably the case in almost all kinds of research to such an extent that by creating our theories and models we can be said to draw a map of a landscape to better orient us in that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>World-System Theory Ideal type</th>
<th>Neo-liberal ideal type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scoring profile considered less favorable for polyarchy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring profile considered more favorable for polyarchy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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particular area. We want the map to be as detailed as possible so that we can use it very accurately, but if it should be allowed to become too complex it would cease to be a map, and become the very landscape that we are trying to represent. At this point it would be of no use, since we might as well walk around without a map and see the world as it is. To find the delicate point where the complexity and usability meet seems to me to be one of the most profound goals of using a theory. That is not to say that such a thing is easily done, but it is to say that I am well aware of the problems concerning the use of theories.

Second, Dahl creates the variables himself, and even though he represents them with full chapters of his book, he also sums them up in the very same table as I am using here. He probably intended for them to be used in future research as either independent variables or dependent ones.

Third, as is the case of creating ideal types of the two ideologies, it is not my intention to try to find any hidden meanings or structures in Dahl’s work. His text is interpreted as it stands, and is not argued for or against. Rather I wish to give it a representation here that resembles the original as much as possible while at the same time scaling it down to a usable format. The only way of doing so is to present an interpretation that is logically acceptable for most readers.

3.2.1 Concerning validity

It has already been mentioned how some parts of this essay are created from interpretations and how other parts use the same interpretations to deduct conclusions. This operation holds within itself a few obvious areas that could be contested as not valid enough.

First there is the issue of the material that the interpretations that make up the ideal types rest upon. In short, does the chosen material represent the ideologies well? One could argue as Esaiasson et.al (2007) does when they claim that it would always be best to read all the books and articles that exist within a certain field before we go on to create ideal types. To be sure, such a way would probably be the most accurate when going about the task of creating ideal images of ideologies, but it would not be the fastest. It would be both very time consuming and also possibly very expensive in a way that would make it more or less impossible (Esaiasson et.al, 2007). A selection of the literature is therefore made so that each ideology is based on two books that are being labeled as important contemporary expressions for their respective approaches. Except for these two main books, more articles and secondary literature is used where it is needed to fill out gaps and give the interpretations some more solid ground. In relation to this there are at least two areas of concern:
1) If the selection of the books is not representative of the particular ideology, then the validity of all claims based on this selection would be very low.

2) Even if the selection of empirical material could be said to be representative of what is being measured, there is still a question of how large this selection should be. In short one needs to ask him or herself if two or three books are enough to give an accurate representation.

In this work the selection of the books have been made according to what is usually called strategic selection (Esaiasson et.al, 2007). The books (and articles) are thought of as typical in the sense that they are not assumed to express ideas that are very exceptional within their respective fields. This choice rests upon pure subjective reasoning, and is as such subject of critique. That is not to say that the choice is poorly done. For anyone who wishes to contest the use of the books there is just as much a matter of valid reasoning to be put forward to be able to explain why the material used is not representative. To sum up then, the selection of books and articles have been made strategically to fit as much as possible the general assumption that they are typical expressions of both ideologies. They are not all expressions, but to a great extent they incorporate most of the central themes and points to such an extent that it would be hard to find examples that falsify the assumption that they are in fact typical. As for the number of books chosen it is of course a matter of time and resources. With regards to the extent of this essay two or three books, with some complementary work, should be enough.

Second, it is of course reasonable to question the selection of the ideal types that is to be a representation of globalization. If argued that the phenomena is possibly affecting democracy and that it at the same time is understood differently depending on ideological starting points, then why are the two particular ideologies chosen here a good selection? Indeed a more comprehensive approach would have been preferable. However, the timeframe surrounding this work does not allow such a way. Instead a choice of what different ideologies to use has been made in a way that is also a form of strategic selection. As typical sides of political arguments the neo-liberal and the neo-marxist view seems interesting to examine in such a way that even though it is not the main focus of this essay, the possible differences and similarities between the two are worth highlighting. By investigating two approaches that could be thought of as opposite in many ways it becomes interesting to view the findings, even if they come to obviously different conclusions. Moreover such a selection also gets some support in recent literature about globalization. For example in the acclaimed work edited by John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens The globalization of world politics both neo-liberalism and neo-marxism are highlighted as two of the most prominent new perspectives of international relations (Baylis, Smith & Owens, 2008).
Third, the choice of Robert Dahl’s theory as a representation of democracy is of course questionable. As has already been mentioned the entire concept of democracy is not at all unambiguous within the social scientific community. It is therefore possible to choose many different theories of democracy, or to create an entirely new one. Again this work here is somewhat limited in such a way that it makes the use of already established models much more favorable. The choice of the polyarchy model has already been argued for, but to repeat; it is used here as a form of common denominator in a way that makes it possible to say that without the conditions mentioned by Dahl, it would be hard to speak of democracy at all. As a common denominator it is useful because it makes more general statements possible. In line with what is usually called strategic selection under rules of critical case (Esaiasson et.al, 2007) it can be argued that if, for instance both types of globalization ideologies point to the fact that the possibility for polyarchy to be maintained or created under contemporary globalization is worse, then one can claim that this would also be true for more demanding democracy definitions. In short then, by using polyarchy as a method it is possible to generalize some of the results to a higher level of reasoning.

A final comment of the validity of this essay has to do with its possible answers or results. What is actually being done here is to measure what kind of impact (better or worse) two constructed ideal types of globalization ideologies can be said to have on a particular form of democracy theory, namely polyarchy. Indeed the answers drawn from such an investigation are limited. First, there is no way of answering exactly how much the impact of an ideal type can be said to be. The limit here is to say “more favorable” or “less favorable”. Second, there is reason to think about how the results found under each of the seven variables are aggregated into one result for the entire ideal type. That is, if the liberal ideal type of globalization is found to have an impact on a hypothetical country such as the second graph in figure 4, is that then to be sorted as “more favorable” or “less favorable”? None of the variables have been weighted, even though it seems like a reasonable thing to do. Maybe economic development is ten times as important as the beliefs of the activists, but still is counted for with the same weight here. Obviously such an interpretation would not end up in a satisfying result.

However, such a weighting is not done by Dahl either (Dahl, 1971). Indeed there is a good reason for not doing so, namely the fact that we just don’t know the importance of the different variables. To be sure, a weighting made arbitrary would certainly produce just as insecure result as ever the interpretation used here. Therefore there are no weightings here and all of the variables are considered to be equally important when aggregated. Once again it is useful to relate to the scope of the work for a better understanding of such a choice. Indeed a weighting would be interesting to do,
however it would take both time and resources that simply are not available for this project. So a second best alternative seems to be to only speak of direction of the measured impact and at the same time treat the variables equally.

Furthermore, the use of a scale that limits the results to speak only about the direction of the impact and not absolute numbers is at the same time a way of making a more precise result. In line with the argumentation of Esaiasson et.al (2007) when speaking of problems connected to interpretative measurement it is here regarded as easier to come to a more valid conclusion if the scope of possible classifications is narrowed down. Even if this at the same time makes the result a little less comprehensive it is a risk associated with scientific research and consequently one needed to take (Esaiasson et.al, 2007). Even though it may seem as if the possible results could almost be intuitive answers to the research questions, the same answers have been subjected to scientific inquiry, and such a thing makes it possible to speak more precise in a way that makes not so exciting results become something else.

3.2.1 Creating ideal types of globalization

As mentioned the ideal types will be created through an analysis of both ideologies in regards to a set of dimensions that are considered to capture the core ideas of the perspectives on globalization. This is primarily done by references to the texts and to highlight or show specific thoughts empirically, quotations are being used. After both ideologies have been accounted for through the four dimensions they are summarized in a table where the main points are collected.

3.2.1.1 Neo-liberalism

I) Globalization; histories and futures.

The history of globalization to the neo-liberals is that of technological advancement. To a great extent what drives the current development are the inventions that made the world almost literally a smaller place, they argue. Thomas Friedman describes this history as one that stretches over some 500 years of globalization, but one where it is possible to divide it into three distinct pieces. Structuring them like computer software, Friedman argues that what he calls Globalization 1.0 occurred when Columbus sailed over the ocean to find a new path to India, but instead landed on what is today South America, thus opening a path between the new and the old world. This lasted until about 1800, and the main feature of it was that it shrank the world through inventions that enabled primarily countries to act on a global market. Globalization 2.0 spurred from about 1800 to 2000 according to Friedman, and this is indeed a time where the world shrunk even more. At the same time the agent of this decrease of world size was no longer the different countries, but rather
the great new companies that emerged. As a formidable force they encouraged the growth of inventions, capital and free people Friedman argues, in such a way that in the end of the 20th century the world had truly become global. Radio, TV, Internet coupled with automobiles, trains, transatlantic vessels and eventually airplanes have worked to the advantage of all people around the world, spreading the capitalist and liberal credo and made the world a fundamentally better place. The last years have seen an even bigger increase in this globalization Friedman argues, which is mostly to the better for all people, and he calls this globalization 3.0:

Because it is flattening and shrinking the world, Globalization 3.0 is going to be more and more driven not only by individuals but also by a much more diverse – non-western, non-white – group of individuals. Individuals from every corner of the flat world are being empowered (T. Friedman, 2007:11).

This is not something that happened by chance neo-liberals argue. On the contrary the driving force behind the evolution of globalization is the free trade and the prosperity that comes with capitalism. Both Norberg and Friedman argue that this indeed is a blessing that needs to be spread around the world in its pure form, not hindered by protectionist ideas and egalitarian states (Norberg, 2004; Friedman, T, 2007).

The future of the world is looking bright through the workings of globalization. Indeed if only the free market and the spread of capitalism continue, most neo-liberals seem to agree that we are heading for a fundamentally better world. That is not to say that they do not recognize the challenges the world face, particularly that of the environment and sustainability. However they firmly believe that such obstacles need to be faced through the market and not by regulations, tariffs and taxes. Norberg writes:

Incipient signs of the Californian effect’s race to the top are present all over the world, because globalization has caused different countries to absorb techniques more rapidly, and the new techniques are generally far gentler on the environment. A couple of researchers have investigated steel manufacturing in 50 different countries. They came to the conclusion that countries with more open economies took the lead in introducing cleaner technology, and that their production generated almost one-fifth less emissions than the same production in closed countries (Norberg, 2001:213).

To summarize then the neo-liberals view the history of globalization as primarily driven by materialistic inventions and spread of the capitalistic system. This is a very good thing, indeed it is so good that if maintained the world is at great chance to solve most of its immanent problems and ultimately arrive in a better place for all humans.
II) Globalization and economic development

To the neo-liberals the current events of world evolution is something that is very needed, not only for the poor nations, but also for the rich ones. Globalization is a very powerful force that, if handled correctly will bring prosperity to all countries. Johan Norberg spends a lot of time promoting the positive effects of globalization for the world, and tries to show how the spread of capitalism as a system actually increases the quality of life for most people, contrary to what globalization critics assume. He claims that the world is seeing an unparalleled growth of GDP in all nations, because we simply have more capitalism now than what we used to have (Norberg, 2001):

The growth of world prosperity is not a “miracle” or any of these other mystifying terms we customarily apply to countries which have succeeded economically and socially. No schools are built or incomes generated through sheer luck like a bolt from the blue. These things happen due to people thinking along new lines and working hard to bring their ideas to fruition. [...] That depends on whether people are allowed the liberty and possibility of exploring their way ahead, whether they are allowed to own property, invest in the long term, conclude agreements and trade with others. In short it depends on whether or not they have capitalism (Norberg, 2001:58).

The idea is that through a global market people of the world gets connected in a way that makes free trade much more accessible, and the prospects of it will put pressure on the leaders of different countries. Indeed to a large extent Norberg (2001) holds that globalization of today is coined by the factors that he believes to be crucial in a world that wants to develop away from the inequalities of today.

Globalization then is a very good thing as it will boost the economic development in all nations through the rules of the market. Through the WTO, The World Bank and IMF the world has its means to create a better functioning structure, however it needs to emphasize the free trade aspects in all ways, not only in such ways that benefits the rich nations. If left alone the market will give freedom and prosperity to those who embrace it (Norberg, 2001).

III) Globalization and inequalities

Norberg states that one of the most common arguments against globalization is that it spreads inequality, both within nations and amongst them. He points out two reasons why this is a very irrelevant argument. First Norberg claims that it doesn’t matter if some people get rich faster than others as long as all of them actually get richer. That is to say, even if some people tend to gain more of the advantages of globalization, others also gain some. The neo-liberals don’t think that the actual inequalities matter, rather what is important is that all people have the same starting positions.
Simplifying matters somewhat, it is equality of opportunity that matters, not equality of results. The important thing is for everyone to have certain basic opportunities and then be at liberty to explore their way forward and achieve different results (Norberg, 2001:78).

Second, the argument that globalization spreads inequality is simply false the neo-liberals declare. In fact the world shows a declining income inequality over the past globalized years, something that Norberg holds to be the effect of capitalism, and the ideology of (neo) liberalism.

Comparing just the richest and poorest tenths, inequality has increased, suggesting that a small group has lagged behind (we shall be returning to see which countries and why), but a study of all countries clearly points to a general growth of equality. [...] Since equality between the rich and poor in these countries appears to have been roughly constant during this time (having increased in half and diminished in half), the global equality, quite contrary to popular supposition, is increasing (Norberg, 2001:52)

In sum then, the neo-liberals not only hold that the argument of equality is quite irrelevant, they also state that globalization actually creates more equality for all people.

IV) Globalization; culture and foreign domination

The neo-liberal take on the issue of culture and foreign domination is far less developed than for instance the thought of economic development and inequalities. That is to say, in many respects the market is the sole solution for the neo-liberals. Culture is of course affected by the ongoing globalization the neo-liberals argue, but once again, this is simply a good thing that is spurred by increasing world capitalism. The much talked about effects of a so-called McWorld⁹, where all cultures are eradicated to give room for the one and only dominant mass-consumerism that is American capitalism, is exaggerated to say the least, neo-liberals claim.

Globalization and greater exchange result, not in all the different countries choosing the same thing but in all options suddenly finding room in one country. When markets broaden and become international, this increases the prospects of even very narrow cultural manifestations surviving and flourishing (Norberg, 2001: 264f).

In fact then, neo-liberals perceive globalization as bringing possibilities of a wider, more diverse culture in all places all over the world. In addition, if globalization is allowed to continue in the theme of market orientation, free trade and a liberal frame of mind, humans will be able to choose culture and countries as they please. There will be a free movement of people, just as there is a free movement of goods, services and capital today. To be sure, the neo-liberals are aware of the

---

⁹ This refers of course to the very symbol of American capitalism, McDonalds exceptional spread around the globe.
problems connected to migration in the global age – namely the fact that it is highly regulated. However this is not at all the fault of globalization, rather the neo-liberals point to the fact that this is the consequence of what happens when the market is tampered with and not left alone. It is a huge waste of economic development not to let humans live and work where the market wants them, Norberg argues. In time, the market forces of globalization will hopefully force a free movement of people, bringing with it diverse cultures in many countries, which essentially is a good thing according to neo-liberals (Norberg, 2001). In addition, with the emergence of all new technological inventions, it is possible that globalization will allow humans to perform and succeed at virtually everything, just by staying where they are. That is; the problem of people not being allowed to travel and live freely around the world, may be solved by the fact that they won’t need to

Friedman claims:

> While many Indians still want to come to America to work and study, thanks to the triple convergence many of them can now compete at the highest levels, and be decently paid, by staying at home. In a flat world you can innovate without having to emigrate (Friedman, T, 2007:216).

As for the case of foreign domination, neo-liberals, with Friedman taking the lead argues that the spread of the free market will eventually eradicate wars as we know them. He offered his explanation to the democratic peace theory, by stating that no countries that have a McDonalds franchise have ever gone to war with each other. In *The World is Flat - A brief history of the twenty-first century* he takes his theory further and develops what he calls **The Dell theory of conflict prevention**. This refers to the fact that in a globalized world the computer manufacturer Dell is a good example of the intricate supply chains that are involved when creating products. As more and more countries get involved the cost to go to war, that is loose the place in many supply chains due to the fact that global companies will just place them in other places, will be too high for all nations. The democratic peace is in fact a peace of free market capitalism Friedman argues, and globalization will see to it that it will become a reality (Friedman, T, 2007).

> The Dell Theory stipulates: No two countries that are both part of a major global supply chain, like Dell’s, will ever fight a war against each other as long as they are both part of the same global supply chain (Friedman, T, 2007:587)

Therefore it is possible to argue (granted a little simplified) that the thoughts about globalization, culture and foreign domination to the neo-liberal can be described by something that will take care of itself if the market is left to work without disturbance.
3.2.1.2 Neo-Marxism (World-System Theory)

1) Globalization; histories and futures.

A very essential part of world-system theory is its emphasis of understanding contemporary globalization as not a new phenomenon per se, but rather an intensification of a process that has been going on for more than 500 years. Indeed Wallerstein has stated it to be “a gigantic misreading of current reality” (Wallerstein, 2000:2) to interpret what is going on around us today as something that is essentially different from what we have ever seen before (Wallerstein, 2000).

This fundamental understanding makes world-system theorists contend that the current events do not really differ in such ways that we need to apply new and different tools to understand them. To be sure, world-system theorists have been engaged in trying to understand the capitalist world-economy as a global phenomenon since its beginning, making it a true pioneer perspective as far as using the global entity as a scientific starting point in its work (Wallerstein, 2004).

To understand what is happening now and what possible futures the world might see, it is a good thing Wallerstein holds, to think of the world system as one that started circa 1450 and has been going on until now. However in 1945, we entered an era that was the start of the intensified period:

One would think, reading most accounts, that ‘globalization’ is something that came into existence in the 1990s – perhaps only upon the collapse of the Soviet Union, perhaps a few years earlier. The 1990s are not, however, a significant time marker to use if one wants to analyze what is going on. Rather, we can most fruitfully look at the present situation in two other time frameworks, the one going from 1945 to today, and the one going from circa 1450 to today (Wallerstein, 2000:2).

The world-system exists in a capitalist world-economy hence, Wallerstein and others argue, it follows the cyclical rhythms of so called Kondratiev cycles (see below for a further explanation). Contemporary globalization fits within the most recent cycle, and as the capitalistic system holds within itself unavoidable contradictions we are to expect to see a number of problems arising as the process intensifies. First, what we have seen, Wallerstein contends, is that since 1945 many so called socialist parties have risen to power within many of the core nations of the world-system. Even though this is a fact, they have not been able to deliver what they promised, namely a new system with less uncertainty and more justice than before (Wallerstein, 2000).

Instead what has happened is that in many places people have not only lost faith in the state, they have started to develop an outright hostility towards it. The state has in line with neo-liberal rhetoric become something of a monster that is not to be trusted. This is a situation that we can expect to
increase as globalization is further developed. To be sure what is actually happening according to Wallerstein is that we are witnessing the beginning of the end of the capitalistic system, as the belief in the nation state is of crucial importance to the ongoing capital accumulation, which is the goal of the entire system (Wallerstein, 2000).

This worldwide upsurge of anti-statism has two immediate consequences. One is that social fears have escalated, and people everywhere are taking back from the states the role of providing for their own security. But of course this institutes a negative spiral. The more they do so the more there is chaotic violence, and the more there is chaotic violence, the more the states find themselves unable to handle the situation, and therefore the more people disinvest the state, which further weakens the ability of the states to limit the spiral. We have entered into this kind of spiral at varying paces in the various countries of the world system but at a growing pace virtually everywhere (Wallerstein, 2000:263).

The future of the world is indeed a scary one, Wallerstein argues, as it holds the destiny of the human race. To be fair, many world-system theorists disagree about the acute accentuation that he connects to the contemporary events of the world. According to Wallerstein the world-system has somewhere in the area of 50 years left before it totally collapses, something that many others think is a very bold claim, to say the least. That aside, most world-system theorists would probably agree with Wallerstein when he states:

We can call this a period of transition, one whose outcome is quite uncertain. At some point, however, there is a clear outcome and then we find ourselves ensconced in a different historical system (Wallerstein, 2004:77).

II) Globalization and economic development

What is identified by many scholars today as globalization is according to world-system theory closely linked to the functions of the world-system as a whole. As described earlier this is in their mind a capitalistic world-economy (Wallerstein, 1999). Wallerstein writes:

A system is capitalist if the primary dynamic of social activity is the endless accumulation of capital. This is sometimes called the new law of value. Not everyone, of course, is necessarily motivated to engage in such endless capital accumulation, and indeed only a few are able to do so successfully. But a system is capitalist if those who do engage in such activity tend to prevail in the middle run over those who follow other dynamics (Wallerstein, 1999:57f).

The capitalistic system in which we live functions in a very distinct and also unique way Wallerstein claims. It is marked by its cyclical rhythm of expansion and contraction, and this can be measured by
approximation through what is called a K-wave, or Kondratiev cycles\(^{10}\). The cycles are generally understood as a simple sinus function with very long wave length. Most theorists agree that so far in the capitalistic economy we have seen 5 cycles with a sixth one to come. That makes the wave length something in the area of 50-60 years according to Wallerstein (Wallerstein, 2004). The K-wave is usually understood to have two phases, the first one, A, marks the beginning of economic prosperity, often linked to some major breakthrough in technology that boosts the economy. It is after 25-30 years followed by the B-phase where some of the central functions of the system starts to break down. Economic crises start to build up and follow each other and in the long run form a pattern that contributes to the economic downfall. The next 25-30 years are then continually getting worse until the start of a new A-phase (Wallerstein, 2004).

To the world-system theorist contemporary society is not only a capitalist one it is also marked by the way the capitalists uses what Wallerstein calls quasi monopolies to establish a way of production that ensures a constant capital accumulation (Wallerstein, 2004). This is only possible within a state system where the states guarantee such a monopoly. Even though no state does so officially, the function of the system has an inner logic where quasi monopoly through the help of the state is unavoidable. Linked to the K-wave the monopolies tend to rise and fall so that old ones are substituted for new ones. Before this is done the leading monopolies of the core states tries to stay alive by cutting costs. What is generally called globalization is a good example of such a process according to Wallerstein. It is primarily constituted by the outsourcing of former core production to geographical areas that holds nations of the periphery or semi-periphery. In this process some nations may grow wealthier and some may even prosper, as a whole however contemporary globalization is in the midst of a Kondratiev B-wave, which makes it destined to fail in the respect of creating a sustainable rising GDP in the world:

The phenomena that are symptomatic of a normal Kondratiev B-phase are: the slowdown of growth in production, and probably a decline in per capita world production; a rise in rates of active waged work unemployment; a relative shift of loci of profits, from productive activity to gains from financial manipulations; a rise of state indebtedness; relocation of “older” industries to lower wage zones; a rise in military expenditures, whose justification is not really military in nature, but rather that of counter cyclical demand creation; falling real wages in the formal economy; expansion of the informal economy; a decline in low cost food production; increased “illegalization” of interzonal migration (Wallerstein, 1995:28).

\(^{10}\) This peculiar function of the capitalist society is one of the main works on business cycles. It was discovered in the early 20th century by Russian economist Nicolas Kondratiev. It is a contested subject, but nevertheless has found increased meaning and support in modern days after a few decades of rather limited support among scholars.
It should also be made clear that even though the world-system theorists have slightly different takes on how modern day globalization is to be accounted for they do find that it is not a new process. As pointed out they believe it has been going on for almost five centuries. It is therefore right to contemplate if they actually mean that globalization per se causes for example a decline in the economy for most states or if it is merely a side effect of normal capitalistic behavior. As exemplified by Samir Amin, there is a difference between what has been going on for a very long time and the recent development:

The globalization in question – which did not integrate so-called Pre Columbian America – was very different in the logic of its workings from that which subsequently became capitalist modernity (Amin, 2000:599).

The difference is understood to be the uneven development that the core states impose upon the rest of the world. Thus, simplifying somewhat, we can sum up this section by stating that in world-system theory globalization will not lead to an increase in world GDP for at least two reasons. First, through the working of the capitalistic system as such, contemporary globalization coincides with a B-phase of the K-wave, and it will not contribute to get out of it, on the contrary it is part of the problem. Secondly the uneven development makes it clear that even if there are some nations that may see an increase in GDP, they will certainly be a minority.

III) Globalization and inequalities

It should by now be clear that world-system theory uses a model where the nations of the world are divided into three sub-categories, the periphery, the semi-periphery and the core. To understand how they view the recent globalization in regards of inequality this is a very crucial fact to keep in mind. It follows from this reasoning that what is true about the effects of globalization in one nation is not necessarily so in another (Wallerstein, 2004).

The modern world-system and the intensified period of global interconnectivity (what most theorists call globalization) works in such a way that the countries of the core generally tend to gain advantages on the expense of nations in the semi-periphery and the periphery. According to Wallerstein this functions through first what he calls the quasi monopolies granted to the main actors of the capitalist world economy by the states where they reside. World-system theory states that in theory the capitalist economy operates on a free market with rules and functions such as those we meet in textbooks of economics. In the real world however, such a market has never existed nor will it ever exist, they claim. There are many reasons for this, but one of the most obvious are that if there was a market like that, it simply would not be to the benefit of the capitalists, and the entire meaning of a capitalist world economy, that is constant capital...
accumulation, would get lost. This is true Wallerstein argues because if every consumer and producer on the market operated with perfect information and understanding of the price-mechanism, as is the assumption of neo-classical economics, the equilibrium price for any given goods would approach such a point where there is no surplus, or at least very little of it (Wallerstein, 2004).

Instead what happens in real life, world-system theorists argue, is that capitalists seek to monopolize their production, and historically they have gotten a lot of help to do this from the states. Generally, true monopolies have not been in effect, but at least the normal function of most capitalist markets of significance for the world economy has been oligopoly (Wallerstein, 2004). This creates a split of markets, where some are dominated by quasi monopoly production and others by more normal relations. Wallerstein calls the former **centralized production**, and this is what historically has been concentrated to the leading capitalist nations of the world-system, while other states will have to do with for instance raw-material production. It is this split between nations with lots of centralized productions and others with periphery production that also creates a world where nations can be divided into categories based on the same criteria (Wallerstein, 2004).

Wallerstein and his followers hold that this world is very much uneven, and will continue to be so. The production values that are most profitable are drained through the world-system from the periphery and the semi-periphery to the core. In effect globalization contributes to this process and thus creates more inequality, world-system theorists claim. Samir Amin states:

> The new globalization – that of capitalism – is polarizing. In two centuries, from 1800 to the end of our century, it has been able to reduce the populations of the center of the system – whose frontiers have not changed much and which generally embraces the contemporary “Triad” (the United States, Canada, Europe, Japan) – to 20 percent of the population of the planet. The developmental gaps between these centers and the vast regions of the world which have become their satellites, has continued over the last two centuries, to the point that the ratio mentioned earlier (which was two to one in 1800) is sixty to one today (Amin, 2000:599).

IV) Globalization; culture and foreign domination

The world-systems tendency to be dominated by core states of course has effects on how world-system theorists view the question of foreign domination. The dominating force of the world is western capitalism and the states that benefit from it. As such one can very much see the influence the core states have over the periphery, and the dominations that follows with it as increasing in the world today. Wallerstein writes:
The states are, however, for the first time in five hundred years, on a downward slide in terms of their sovereignty, inward and outward. This is not because of a transformation of the world economic structures but because of a transformation of a geoculture, and, first of all, because of the loss of hope by the popular masses in liberal reformism and its avatars on the left (Wallerstein, 1999:73).

The new kind of domination that globalization brings, is not primarily caused by the economic functions, but rather through a secondary effect that comes with it. This effect is the peoples’ weakened belief in the states real power. Regardless of if this is true or not (Wallerstein does not believe this) the result is that many states in fact does get dominated by foreign powers, especially trough Trans National Corporations (TNC).

To be sure world-system theorists view contemporary globalization with suspicion, after all they believe that the process is very old, and therefore one needs to be very careful when talking about the effects of it. When it comes to the issue of culture, most of them hold that there is nothing fundamentally new about the cultural effects of globalization, if there even are any. The perspective is, like neo-liberalism, very materialistic, and does not hold the cultural issue very high. The little that is the focus on culture within the research generally states that what is happening can be described as a world wide spread of an ideology that penetrates all areas of society to promote its idea – neo-liberalism.

The ideology of globalization has undercut the support and the rationale behind all sorts of so-called Second Wave institutions – labor unions, socialist parties, welfare programs, and communist states. While these institutions have not been destroyed everywhere, the politicians of the right (e.g. Newt Gingrich in the U.S.) have explicitly argued for their elimination (Chase-Dunne, 1999:200).

In conclusion then we can view the world-system theory arguments as claiming that globalization is indeed increasing foreign domination of primarily the core states through their TNCs over the rest of the world. At the same time a culture is spread that promotes a neo-liberal agenda, from which most people have nothing to gain.

3.2.2 Independent variables

The two ideal types can be represented through the four dimensions in a matrix where the core points and issues are marked. This is to simplify and to make a quick representation accessible to the reader for reference and also to be able to use as a part of the analysis. Indeed, as stated before, such a simplification is even more reduced in regards of the original theory that embodies many thousands of pages. Yet it also highlights some very important and fundamental ideas.
### 3.2.3 Dependent variables

These are the variables that Dahl indicates as important for any given nation if it wants to create or withhold a state of polyarchy. They are fully extracted from his book, and even though the table is somewhat altered, it is essentially the same as he presents it (Dahl, 1971:203).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Neo-liberalism</th>
<th>World-system theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Globalization: histories and futures</strong></td>
<td>Its history is that of materialistic inventions and this is something that has been going on for a long time. This is possible because of capitalism as a system that spreads and promotes the free market thus making more people able to reap the benefits. Ultimately this will: 1) Spread liberal ideas of freedom and capitalism, which is good. 2) Provide a means for solving most of the threats that are immanent today.</td>
<td>Globalization is nothing new. It has been around for 500 years. The recent events are intensifications of the normal function of capitalism in the world-system. As such we are now beginning to see the end of the system as a whole. Especially the fate in the state society is declining as an effect of globalization (as it in turn is an effect of the capitalistic crisis that is getting more severe).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Globalization and economic development</strong></td>
<td>Good for economic development. This is true for all states as globalization increases the connectivity of all people and generates demand for free trade. This in turn brings freedom and prosperity through the economic market.</td>
<td>Bad for economic development, particularly for periphery states. Works through: 1) The B-phase of the contemporary K-wave. 2) The structure of the capitalist world economy that orients the uneven production.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Globalization and inequality</strong></td>
<td>Inequality is a quite irrelevant concept, however if one feels inclined to consider its relations to globalization and capitalism he or she will find that it is decreasing. This is true of the relations both between countries and within them.</td>
<td>Increasing inequality between states through the world-systems axial production where the profit bringing flows from the periphery to the core is in effect. Also increasing within nations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Globalization: culture and foreign domination</strong></td>
<td>Culture will become more diverse in all countries that are connected to the global market. Foreign domination may exist in the form of TNC’s that have large influence in where they function. This is however a good thing according to The Dell Theory of Conflict Prevention.</td>
<td>Globalization is coined by a neo-liberal culture that hurts the people around the world. At the same time increases foreign domination through TNCs who exercise their power towards particularly weak nations in the periphery, but also in the core.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Conditions favoring polyarchy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Historical sequences</th>
<th>Most favorable</th>
<th>Least favorable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competition precedes inclusiveness</td>
<td>Inclusiveness precedes competition / short cut from closed hegemony to inclusive polyarchy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. The socioeconomic order:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Access to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Violence</td>
<td>Dispersed or neutralized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Socioeconomic sanctions</td>
<td>Dispersed or neutralized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Type of economy:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Agrarian</td>
<td>Free farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Commercial-Industrial</td>
<td>Decentralized direction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. The level of socioeconomic development:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High GNP/capita</td>
<td>Low GNP/capita</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV. Equalities and inequalities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Objective</td>
<td>Low or parity and dispersed inequalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Subjective: relative deprivation</td>
<td>Low or decreasing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V. Subcultural pluralism</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Amount</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If high or marked</td>
<td>None a majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None regional</td>
<td>Some regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None indefinitely out of government</td>
<td>Some permanently in opposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual guarantees</td>
<td>No mutual guarantees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VI. Domination by a foreign power</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak or temporary</td>
<td>Strong and present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VII. Believes of political activists</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Institutions of polyarchy are legitimate</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Only unilateral authority is legitimate</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Polyarchy is effective in solving major problems</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Trust in others</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Political relationships are:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strictly competitive</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strictly cooperative</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperative-competitive</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Compromise necessary and desirable</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Analysis

4.1 Analyzing polyarchy

This chapter aims to conduct the analysis of Robert Dahl’s concept of polyarchy by using the ideal images of globalization that was established in chapter three. The seven variables extracted from Dahl’s theory are dealt with one by one in a way that first brings forth Dahl’s variable and an explanation of it, to follow with an account of what kind of impact both ideal images can be said to have.

4.1.1 Historical sequences

Robert Dahl assumes that it is probably of interest in what way a country is trying to reach a polyarchic state in so much as that it is a different thing, for example, for a closed hegemony to first get more liberalized and then more inclusive, than the other way around. Therefore he generalizes his argument by observing three principal ways that a country can move from closed hegemony towards polyarchy:

A country then can either develop through path one in which it first becomes more liberalized via A and then passes on along B to finally arrive at polyarchy. It can also get there from following first the route demarked as C (getting more inclusive) and thereafter continue along D (more liberalized). Such a country is following path two. A shortcut is also represented in the form of the intersecting line number three, which represents a state that is, for some reason, becoming polyarchic more or less over night.

Naturally it makes sense to ask if one of the ways is better than the others. The first path is traditionally the one most common among the stable polyarchies, Dahl argues. Developing along the...
lines where public contestation is gradually more and more accepted allows for a certain culture of liberalization to be established first among the elite classes, which then includes the masses in the already established frame of mind. This is a preferable way for many reasons according to Dahl, but mainly it establishes a joint security between the different strata of the society. The second path is however the most likely for non-polyarchies of today to follow, simply because most countries already try to be inclusive, albeit many of them are still not polyarchies. Dahl points out, as mentioned above, that most, if not all, countries of today are inclusive through the suffrage. That is there are very few nations today that doesn’t try to have some form of elections, even if there is only one party, there is still an election. The third path is through history riddled with insecurities. The very special circumstances that existed after the Second World War where such nations as Germany, Japan, and Italy took the short-cut to polyarchy from hegemony are probably very rare.

Hence Dahl argues that the first path is the most favorable to polyarchy, but that the second one will probably be the most likely in the future. If countries are not to fall into problems of establishing a mutual trust amongst its people they need to be very careful:

> The risks of failure can be reduced, however, if steps toward liberalization are accompanied by a dedicated and enlightened search for a viable system of mutual guarantees (Dahl, 1971:40).

4.1.1.1 Effect of globalization (neo-liberal)

From the ideal image we see that the neo-liberal take is most concerned with the materialistic inventions as a driving force behind globalization. Combined with their focus on market capitalism and free trade this generally makes neo-liberals proponents of the ideas and functions of for instance the IMF and the World Bank, so called Structural Adjustment Programs (SAP). These are generally ways that are designed to help countries to achieve systems that enables sustainable growth of the economy, which in turn is said to lead to political systems that are more prone to keep its public contestation high.

Johan Norberg reasons that the current SAPs in effect around the third world nations have been riddled with problems that indeed should be criticized. But this is not primarily because it is wrong to think that it is possible to create growth and democracy through SAPs, rather it is because the IMF and World Bank simply have failed at creating systems that really installs the (neo) liberal ideas that are the back bone of the SAPs in the different countries. If a different approach is taken to implement the criteria for lending money, Norberg thinks that it would be quite possible to help what Dahl would call hegemonies, near hegemonies or near polyarchies to walk the path designated as number three in figure 5 (Norberg, 2001).
The unwillingness of the recipient countries to follow the advice given makes it wrong to brand the IMF’s liberalizing recommendations as the cause of these countries’ profound crises, as many leftwing movements do, especially as the countries actually following the recommendations apparently have done better than those disregarding them (Norberg, 2001:171).

There is also no doubt that the neo-liberals really do think that this process of trying to establish a system that generates growth through free trade also brings with it democracy. As illustrated by Norberg:

People who grow richer, are better educated and are accustomed to choice, will not acquiesce in others deciding matters on their behalf, and so the market economy often leads to democracy and democracy consolidates the market economy (Norberg, 2001:253).

It is therefore a reasonable conclusion to assume that neo-liberals do in fact encourage processes that are designed to make fast changes in certain countries economic situations because they also think that it will bring with it rather fast changes in the political system.

Naturally, if one wants to categorize the neo-liberal take on globalization, the thoughts on SAPs is not the only place to look. Rather, it could be argued that SAPs got nothing to do with globalization as such, but is a function of democracy theory regardless of circumstances. However, they are used here to illustrate a point made by many neo-liberals that globalization is a process that eventually will force all countries to accept the blessings of free trade – or suffer the consequences. The latter being a certified way of missing out on growth and democracy.

To sum up the neo-liberal globalization effect on this variable is then a way of saying that according to neo-liberals globalization is a force that spreads free trade around the world and we should do all we can to help this process. By doing so many countries will be able to take a short cut to growth (and therefore to democracy) that was not around for the already established democracies. Norberg writes:

Asia too has put on speed during the last half-century and, the path to prosperity being already known, has trodden it still faster. Living standards today, compared to 1950, are eight times higher in Japan and six times higher in China (Norberg, 2001:68).

Together this is interpreted here as so that neo-liberalistic globalization is one that works in a direction that is along either path three or path two in figure 5. It has already been stated that Dahl views the future development in this respect as most likely to be in line of just path two or three as path one more and more have become unavailable. The question at hand then is if the neo-liberals view globalization through the market as a system that is what Dahl calls “an internal system of
mutual security” (Dahl, 1971:47). Since the neo-liberal globalization is interpreted here as either moving along path two or three, and since it is hard to know whether or not it brings with it mutual security as a market function the effect on this variable is considered to be unaltered, or the same.

4.1.1.2 Effect of globalization (world-system theory)

The effect of globalization on this variable through world-system theory is bound to be interpreted out of the very crucial role played by the axial division of labor through the core, semi-periphery and the periphery. Globalization is according to Wallerstein and his colleagues intensifying the capitalistic system in particularly the effects that makes mature manufacture products being moved to the semi-periphery from the core (Wallerstein, 2004). However this is not a good thing in the end. In the age of globalization nations adhering to all three categories will see their respective governments influence decline. As we can see from the ideal types world-system theory views this decline in government influence as a part of the capitalistic crisis that is going on and it is indeed destructive to all parts of society. Especially because there is a great loss of beliefs in the system among the people, a process will start that carries with it the beginning of the end for the legitimacy of the nation state:

This worldwide upsurge of anti-statism has two immediate consequences. One is that social fears have escalated, and people everywhere are taking back from the states the role of providing for their own security. But of course this institutes a negative spiral. The more they do so the more there is chaotic violence, and the more there is chaotic violence, the more the states find themselves unable to handle the situation, and therefore the more people disinvest the state, which further weakens the ability of the states to limit the spiral. We have entered into this kind of spiral at varying paces in the various countries of the world system but at a growing pace virtually everywhere (Wallerstein, 2000).

This means that world-system theory is inclined to view globalization as destabilizing nations and since Dahl writes about figure 5 that it is not likely that nations will develop along path one, the chances for polyarchic circumstances in this variable may be at risk:

Although the first path seems to be the safest of the three, it is not likely to be followed in the future, for as we have already seen most countries with hegemonic regimes are already inclusive (Dahl, 1971:39).

So it is a consequence then, that regardless of if countries that are to establish polyarchies in the age of globalization do it via path two or three according to world-system theory, there still is no such stability and system of mutual guarantees that Dahl considers to be crucial. This is a direct function of globalization to the world-system theorists so it is only logic to categorize the influence on the variable as such that it is making it less favorable for polyarchy.
4.1.1.3 Classification
It is here interpreted that globalization as explained by neo-liberals is neither favoring nor making this variable less favorable to polyarchy. At the same time in the World-System Take globalization is seen as making this variable less favorable for polyarchy.

4.1.2 The degree of concentration in the socioeconomic order
Dahl points to the important aspects of how the society as a whole is organized as a factor of the probability to sustain or create a polyarchic regime within its borders. To sum up his argumentation he starts out by adding to the before mentioned (see page 9) axioms two new ones:

AXIOM 4: The likelihood that a government will tolerate an opposition increases as the resources available to the government for suppression decline relative to the resources of an opposition (Dahl, 1971:48).

AXIOM 5: The likelihood that a government will tolerate an opposition increases with a reduction in the capacity of the government to use violence or socioeconomic sanctions to suppress an opposition (Dahl, 1971:49).

Therefore it can be said that in any given country the possibility for polyarchy is depending on how the relative dispersion of access to violence and socioeconomic sanctions are situated. If both sanctions and violence is a monopoly controlled by the state then that state could be said to have all the resources available to oppress its people (as postulated in axiom 4). On the contrary if both means are available to both opposition and the government, then the situation can be called dispersed. If none of the means is in the hands of the government or the oppression then we can categorize the relationship as neutralized. In the line of this Dahl recognizes four main different dispersions schematically displayed as:

![Figure 6: Access to violence and socioeconomic sanctions](image)

The most auspicious circumstances for polyarchy can be located within frame A of the matrix. Consequently the least favorable environment is found in countries coined by presumptions as those
in frame D. It is more difficult, Dahl claims, to say which of B and C that mostly favors political competition and therefore also polyarchy (Dahl, 1971).

To further his argument Dahl also recognizes the fact that the social order in itself is important. In a broad sense the world’s countries can be divided into agrarian or industrialized economies and the former can also be said to approach what Dahl argues to be two ideal types; “Free farmer societies” or “Traditional peasant societies”. Where the free farmer organization is favorable to political competition and polyarchy through its emphasis of equality and distribution of land, the traditional peasant society is more associated with hegemonic regimes (Dahl, 1971).

As for the industrialized countries Dahl rejects the liberal idea that states that a capitalistic society is a requisition for democracy. Instead he argues for the fact that is not so much the ownership as it is the level of centralization of the economy that is important. As shown by a number of empirical cases countries with quite a high level of public ownership can still produce competitive politics and there is no reason to believe that a decentralized socialist economy could not prove to be just as good as capitalistic ones at fulfilling the needs of polyarchy. If however the economy is very centralized then it follows, Dahl argues that such a situation severely restricts the competitive politics and therefore it is less favorable to polyarchy.

4.1.2.1 Effect of globalization (neo-liberal)

In this case the analysis is rather simple. From the ideal types it is quite clear that neo-liberals see globalization as primarily driven by market forces, which it eventually will bring to most of the world. It follows from how Dahl thinks about this variable that such a process would be something that favors polyarchy because it will be a way to establish (or keep) a pluralistic social order (Dahl, 1971).

To be sure this is also what the neo-liberals argue:

This is because globalization and free trade make it easier for us to obtain by exchange those things which our system disfavors, from countries with other systems. If the monopolization of Swedish medical care disfavors the development of new technology and science in the medical sector, we can import these things from a country where the medical sector is more dynamic. If high taxes impede the emergence of broad financial markets, companies can procure capital in other countries. Globalization enables countries to afford things they are not good at (Norberg, 2001:259).

Furthermore the neo-liberal globalization concept argues that the spread of new inventions and the market will speed up the industrialization forces of the nations that get involved (Friedman, T, 2007). In short then the fact that such a process is believed to take place, coupled with the above statement about the maintaining of the pluralistic social order it would be correct, I think, to classify
the influence of globalization on this variable according to neo-liberals as such that it makes it more favorable for polyarchy.

4.1.2.2 Effect of globalization (world-system theory)
We can see from the ideal type (table 3:1, page 38) that a world-system theory take on globalization highlights the dependency processes that is said to be a normal function of the capitalistic world-economy. In this case it is important because it tells us that the world-system theorists don’t think that globalization is a liberalizing force to such an extent that it brings with it more advanced industrialization to all countries. Rather what happens is that the corporations of the core may choose to outsource already mature technologies to mostly the semi-periphery, but the majority of all countries, the periphery, actually gets drained of its potential (Wallerstein, 2004).

This doesn’t necessarily mean that the socio-economic diversity gets more centralized and thus less favorable for the development of polyarchy, however in this case there are reasons to believe that this is a good interpretation of how world-system theorists view the effect of globalization. Wallerstein argues that what is commonly treated as an anomaly, monopoly, is actually a crucial part of all markets. The seller wants to achieve monopoly in every situation, because it simply benefits him the most:

> What sellers always prefer is a monopoly, for then they can create a relatively wide margin between the costs of production and the sales price, and thus realize high rates of profit. Of course perfect monopolies are extremely difficult to create, and rare, but quasi-monopolies are not. What one needs most of all is the support of the machinery of a relatively strong state, one which can enforce a quasi-monopoly (Wallerstein, 2004:26).

Since globalization according to the ideal image of world-system theory has a lot to do with the intensification of otherwise normal procedures within the world-system, then we can assume that this strive for monopoly amongst the corporations, and also their influence over weak regimes in the periphery, may in fact increase. At the same time, the crises that globalization is an expression for is in fact the failure of the same capitalistic interests to maintain monopolies according to Wallerstein. In the long run, they will not be able to maintain the quasi-monopolies and the system as a whole will cease to function (Wallerstein, 2004). The aggregated analysis is therefore different in the long run compared to the short run here.

In sum then, we can establish that World-System theory points to the fact that in the short (and medium) run, globalization will increase the socio-economic concentration within the states in the periphery and semi-periphery. In the long run however, this will all fail, and the capitalistic system will stand before a great crisis. Relating this to Dahl’s variable then, it is necessary to understand
how he thinks about the economic concentrations relationship with the social order. When investigating this he develops two basic equations that say:

The correct equations, in short, seem to be:

Competitive politics $\rightarrow$ pluralistic social order $\rightarrow$ decentralized economy

Highly centralized economy $\rightarrow$ centrally dominated social order $\rightarrow$ hegemonic regime (Dahl, 1971:60)

From this it follows that any economy that gets too centralized, whether the monopoly is upheld by the state or by private ownership, is on its way to a hegemonic regime. Thus the world-system theory claims about globalization leading to monopolized markets is indeed something that is less favorable for the advancement of polyarchy. Even though the long run effects may differ, they also bring with them a situation where it logically would be hard to even talk about polyarchy in the way we do today, therefore they are not considered in the classification below.

4.1.2.3 Classification
Under this variable the interpretation made is such that a neo-liberal model sees globalization as something that is more favorable for polyarchy. Conversely, a world-system approach views the effects of globalization in a way that makes it influence this variable to a point where it gets less favorable for polyarchy.

4.1.3 Level of socioeconomic development
The level of socioeconomic development within a country is usually something that is linked with the presence of democracy. However, this is not an easy relationship. Dahl argues that there is overwhelming evidence to support the theory that it is more likely to see a polyarchy amongst what we usually call highly developed states than among poorly developed ones. What is not clear though is the nature of the relationship.

First of all it does not seem to be simply linear. Rather when examining the empirical evidence\(^{11}\) it seems reasonable to assume that the relations contains some form of thresholds so that above a certain point of economic development the increase of democratic tendencies declines, and vice versa at the bottom end of the spectrum. Second, there also exist a lot of deviant cases, both

\(^{11}\) Keep in mind that when Dahl formulated the hypothesis there were not as sufficient research on the subject as there is today. However the general statement is probably still true. That is, it is not so easy as to say that democracy and economic development enacts an example of perfect linear relations.
present and historically\textsuperscript{12} that shows combinations of economic development and democracy that is not in line with the evidence. Third, it is not an easy task to show what actually causes what. That is; as much as economic development can be said to favor democracy, the same thing can be said about the influence of democracy on economic development.

In sum then, it is not as easy as to say that the more economically developed a country is the more democratic it is. Instead Dahl refines the argument, while still holding it true that generally economic development is good for polyarchy, it is depending on a number of things. Dahl explains the relationship as:

The chances that a country will develop and maintain a competitive political regime (and even more so, a polyarchy) depend up on the extent to which the country’s society and economy:

a) Provide literacy, education and communication
b) Create a pluralistic rather than a centrally dominated social order
c) And prevent extreme inequalities among the politically relevant strata of the country (Dahl, 1971:74).

It is amongst those three areas that Dahl finds it most relevant to start investigating the relationship of polyarchy and level of development. First, regarding a, there is an intricate interdependence between the educational process and the capitalistic development. To Dahl this means that in any highly developed country there will be a large need of skilled workers. The more advanced the economy the more educated the workers need to be. That is true even for the lowest workers in for instance a factory, as they need to be able to read instructions, understand schematics and so forth. The spread of free press serves the same purpose. Newspapers and media communications will help rising the general awareness of a country’s people so that a competitive political regime is within grasp. Together these factors account for a lower threshold Dahl argues. A country that cannot provide these fundamental needs for its people is highly unlikely to show signs of polyarchy.

Second since any advanced economy actually needs skilled and educated workers and more or less also requires a free press system, Dahl assumes that these elements actually creates the pluralistic social order that is needed for the advancement to polyarchy. The third factor, which revolves around inequality, is so important that it has been made a variable of its own, but is of course closely linked to the reasoning made in the above presentation of the socioeconomic development level.

\textsuperscript{12} Again, in 1971 The Soviet Union was an example of a present country with low political contestation and democratic tendencies in general but at the same time showed great economic development. Today it is empirically a historic example, but the point made by Dahl is still the same.
4.1.3.1 Effect of globalization (neo-liberal)

The ideal image is clear on this point. Globalization as interpreted by neo-liberals brings growth and prosperity around the world through increased free trade. Regardless of the direction of the relationship between a nation’s GDP and level of democracy, Dahl assumes that higher GDP is something that works in favor of polyarchy, as illustrated in table 2 (see p.39). Therefore the interpretation here is that neo-liberal globalization is more favorable to polyarchy under this variable. The belief that globalization leads to growth is present all over both the works of Friedman and Norberg, but can be illustrated by a quote from Friedman:

It [economic development] happened when we connected New York, New Mexico and California. It happened when we connected Western Europe, America and Japan. And it will happen when we connect India and China with America, Europe and Japan (Friedman, T, 2007:277).

4.1.3.2 Effect of globalization (world-system theory)

From the ideal type it is possible to state that in two ways globalization is bad for economic development for most countries. However it is not the same for all countries. Indeed an analysis that tries to say something about how globalization according to World-System Theory is affecting economic development needs to take into consideration the idea of a set of core states as opposed to the periphery and semi-periphery.

Wallerstein and his followers holds that the capitalistic world-economy is characterized by its division of labor in a way that makes the most profitable manufacture production cluster in a small core of countries, while the less profitable production is spread out in the periphery (Wallerstein, 2004):

Core-like processes tend to group themselves in a few states and to constitute the bulk of the production activity in such states. Peripheral processes tend to be scattered among a large number of states and to constitute the bulk of production activity in these states. Thus for shorthand purposes we can talk of core states and peripheral states, so long as we remember that we are really talking of a relationship between production processes (Wallerstein, 2004:28).

Furthermore this division makes the core states benefit on behalf of the periphery and therefore in this analysis the result would be that globalization is making economic development better in the core, while worse in the periphery and most of the semi-periphery. However, as understood by the ideal image represented in table 1 (see p.38) there is also another factor. Because of the fact that what is interpreted as globalization by Wallerstein (the increased speed of otherwise normal processes) is a result of a process where the corporations of the core desperately tries to maintain
quasi-monopoly, it coincides with the start of a new K-Wave down turn (Wallerstein, 2004). In the long run this means that the overall economic development will come to a halt, not only to states in the periphery, but to the world-system as whole.

The changes that solve the immediate (or short-run) problem of inadequate expansion of the world-economy (an essential element in maintaining the possibility of the endless accumulation of capital) restore a middle-run equilibrium, but begin to create problems for the structure in the long run (Wallerstein, 2004:31).

Thus in relation to Dahl’s variable, globalization as understood by world-system theory, is making the circumstances for polyarchy less favorable. This is not true for the core states in the short and middle-run, but in the long run it is true for all states within the current world-system. Therefore the interpretation made here is such that it views the effects of globalization on the variable as less favorable, when approached from a world-system perspective.

4.1.3.3 Classification

The neo-liberal globalization perspective makes the circumstances for polyarchy under this variable more favorable. The opposite is true about the world-system theory take on the issue.

4.1.4 Equalities and inequalities

As for the question of the level of inequalities within a society Dahl argues that in general more inequality is bad for polyarchy. Here his theory operates with a distinction of countries into categories that sorts nations with regards to their social system. That is, he assumes that the inequalities may have different effects in agrarian societies compared to industrialized ones, and also that the effect differs if polyarchic nations are measured against hegemonies (Dahl, 1971).

The main reason that inequalities matter at all is because, according to Dahl, they tend to stack together. If a country portraits large income inequalities then it will most likely also show inequalities in housing and wealth. In the end, Dahl argues:

Extreme inequality in the distribution of such key variables as income, wealth, status, knowledge, and military prowess are equivalent to extreme inequalities in political resources (Dahl, 1971:82).

It is apparent then that such a situation does not help strive towards polyarchy. This does not mean that inequalities cannot exist within polyarchy, the contemporary society and our history is well congested with such examples. Dahl argues that polyarchic nations have been able to overcome extreme inequalities by creating a political system of exclusion and inclusion so that some people of the population are left outside. For example the United States had two parallel systems for whites
and blacks up until at least the late 1960s (Dahl, 1971). The effect of inequality on the possibility of forming a society coined by inclusiveness and political competitiveness (a polyarchy) can according to Dahl be summed up as follows.

In a country with a hegemonic regime, extreme inequalities will decrease the chances for that particular country to develop a system of public contestation. And analogous in a society with a regime imbued by public contestation, extreme inequalities will increase the chance that competitive politics will be displaced by a hegemony. Polyarchies are in general very vulnerable to the effects of extreme inequalities. This is because of the fact that a distribution of key factors such as wealth and income is likely to generate offense against the ruling system within the disadvantaged strata of the population (Dahl, 1971:103).

Furthermore another important aspect is if the individuals within a society perceive themselves as treated unequal. In general they need to do this for any effect on polyarchy. If they don’t then in principle the objective inequality is not as important.

4.1.4.1 Effect of globalization (neo-liberal)
The ideal image states that the neo-liberal take on globalization holds inequality to be quite irrelevant. This is further exemplified from reading Norberg:

Many believe that liberalization and economic growth imply a growth of inequality in a society. Once again I would like to point out that this is not the crux of the matter. The important thing should be how well situated you are, not how well situated you are in relation to others (Norberg, 2001:77).

Furthermore, even if the inequality would be more relevant (and to some extent it is to different neo-liberals), as illustrated by the ideal image, it is simply a false image that globalization causes inequality. Rather it helps creating economic equality, or at least reduces inequality.

Equality is growing fastest in poor developing countries which are quickly reforming their economies. Berggren’s findings are indicating that there are above all two aspects which increase equality in a society: freedom of international trade and freedom of international movements of capital – the two most “globalizing” reforms (Norberg, 2001:81).

However, the so called objective decrease in inequality is not all that concerns Dahl. Instead, as important is the way that the population perceives the inequality. Here the neo-liberal take is much more toned down. Indeed, since inequality really is not a big issue as long as all are getting better according to neo-liberals, then naturally they don’t think of perceived inequality as something that might differ from the objective one.
The lack of interest from the neo-liberals in the perceived inequality may make the interpretation here a little limp, but it still points in a direction where neo-liberal globalization is thought to reduce objective inequality, and thus making the circumstances for polyarchy more favorable.

4.1.4.2 Effect of globalization (world-system theory)
Recall the argumentation from the world-system theorists under the variable above. Here too, the same reasoning about core and periphery is very much in effect. To repeat: The capitalistic world-economy that coins the current world-system works through a process that makes certain production concentrate in a small number of prominent states, the core. This core is in need of raw material that is a much less profitable kind of production located in countries that becomes economically peripheral. In between these two zones exists a third, intermediary one, that the world-system theorists dubs the semi-periphery. Its production is a marked by a mix of raw material and so-called mature manufactures that are outsourced from the core to make them more profitable through the use of cheaper labor (Wallerstein, 2004).

Taken together the inequality that concerns world-system theorists the most is the one that arises between nations within the world-system as an effect of the world-economy. However, Dahl is concerned with the inequality that exists within states as one variable for the probability that any given country will be able to create or maintain a polyarchic state. Moreover, as we can see from table 2 (see p.39) he is concerned with two types of inequalities, namely one that is objective and one that is perceived by the involved actors (Dahl, 1971).

As for the objective one, it is little doubt that the world-system theorists view the processes on the macro level as affecting also the inequality within nations. For instance Chris Chase-Dunn writes about globalization:

> Globalization is producing a backlash much as it did in the nineteenth century and in the 1920s. Capitalist globalization, especially the kind that has occurred since the 1970s, exposes many individuals to disruptive market forces and increases inequalities within countries and internationally. The gap between the winners and the losers grows, and the winners use more coercion and less consent in their efforts to stay on top (Chase-Dunn, 2005:183).

To understand this process, it is however once again needed to operate with different expectations in the long run versus the short run. What Chase-Dunn is saying is true in the short run according to Wallerstein. Globalization is indeed causing an increased inequality, but at the same, in the long run this process will work in favor for the labor force around the world. Wallerstein holds that one of the most significant parts of what is called globalization is the capitalistic corporations’ tries to keep boosting profits by displacing manufactures and process to locations outside of the core. The
rationale behind this is that over time this actually is the only way for them to keep getting cheap labor. As workers are included in the system they generally tend to win the class struggle against the companies, which result in rising real wages, and more specifically and important to Wallerstein, a rising quota of real wages as a proportion of the production cost. In the long run the capitalists of the core will simply run out of spaces where workers are not yet included in the system and therefore are willing to accept low wages (Wallerstein, 2000).

What one can say is that over time in any given geographical/sectoral locality, the workforce will seek to create some form of syndical organization and action that will enable them to bargain more effectively either directly with the employer or indirectly via their influence on the relevant political machinery. While no doubt such political strength can be set back in given localities through the political counteroffensives of capitalist groups, it is also true that the long-run ‘democratization’ of the political machineries throughout the history of the modern world system has served to make the curve of the political strength of the working classes an upward one over the *longue durée* in virtually all states in the world system (Wallerstein, 2000:11).

Hence the interpretation of the influence of globalization on Dahl’s variable will once again be different in the short term as opposed to the long term. Moreover it is in this case very much like with the neo-liberal one, that is, the world-system theorists generally do not pay much attention to the so-called perceived inequality. Therefore the classification here too, is somewhat constrained. Still the long run on effect of globalization is an increased equality to the point where the world-system will enter a crisis (Wallerstein, 2000).

4.1.4.3 Classification

Neo-liberal globalization is considered to lower inequalities making the circumstances for polyarchy more favorable. The same is true in the long run for World-System Theory.

4.1.5 Subcultural cleavage

Turning now to the issue of subcultural cleavage, it is clear according to Dahl, that countries with homogeneous populations are better suited, or at least not presented with as many difficulties, compared to heterogeneous countries with regards of the possibility of polyarchy. Many social scientists have too long focused only on class as a cultural divide within countries Dahl argues, an unfortunate situation since many real problems are not reducible to class only (Dahl, 1971).

On the contrary the most prominent conflicts today seem to stem from divisions in such areas as religion, language and the vaguer concept of ethnicity. It follows then that to consider such intra-national dismemberments is an important task if one wants to know how they affect the possibilities for any given country to produce polyarchy.
When taken into account it becomes clear that if a country shows significant cultural cleavage in any of the above mentioned areas then that country is at risk of meeting hard obstacles that may be impossible to overcome if it wants to maintain a polyarchy within its present borders. Dahl argues that it is very unusual for a country to be highly diverse culturally and at the same time show functioning aspects of a polyarchy. However it is not impossible, a few countries show that such cleavages is surmountable (Dahl, 1971).

In sum Dahl’s argument can be shortened down in line with the following claims. A country is more probable to maintain or become a polyarchic state if it makes sure that none of its minorities are indefinitely excluded from political participation. A second way to increase the possibility of polyarchy is for a country to make sure that, legally codified or not, its minorities are safe from the other’s harm, should they not occupy the government themselves. At the same time it is probably important that the people of a country believes that polyarchy is a good way of responding to the particular problems they face. That is, if the people feel that polyarchy cannot gather up what is necessary to both solve cultural problems and serve the interests of one’s specific group, then it will be very hard to maintain one within such a country.

4.1.5.1 Effect of globalization (neo-liberal)

The neo-liberal ideal image tells us that their view is that globalization increases the cultural diversity all over the world. However they also identify problems linked to this. For example Norberg argues that contemporary globalization has been too influenced by old nation-state thinking. This has lead to controlled borders for arguably the most important of all resources, namely human beings (Norberg, 2001). This thinking coupled with the fact that it is not only good forces that are being globalized, is a possible threat in the form of increased cultural conflicts, both within and between nations neo-liberals argue (Friedman, 2007).

To make use of this perspective here, it needs to be translated into an interpretation that is relevant to Dahl’s variable. The idea that culture will become more diverse with globalization seems to be linked with two things according to neo-liberals. First, globalization holds within it the possibility of creating huge migration to where labor is needed. This is a good thing, and it probably will happen with time, creating a scenario then where the future is a place with nations much more diverse in terms of different ethnicities, nationalities, religious groups and genders. In short; nations with larger sub-cultural cleavage. Second, the cultural diversity will be boosted by the technological advancements, particularly the internet. Such inventions allows all cultures to have a piece of the pie, as opposed to before, when indeed the global channels of information where coined by western ideas in general and Americanization in particular (Friedman, 2007).
This fact that so many people worldwide now have tools to create and upload their own content – their own news reports, their own opinions, their own music, their own videos, their own photos, their own software, their own encyclopedias, their own dictionaries – is a very powerful force for the preservation and enhancement of cultural autonomy and particularity (Friedman, 2007:478).

Taken together this indicates a direction where the effect of globalization on sub-cultural cleavage according to neo-liberals would make it less favorable for polyarchy. However, Dahl points to the important fact that a cultural diversity is not necessarily bad in itself. In table 2 (see p.39) we find that if sub-cultural diversity is marked or high, it depends on a few more factors if it should be considered favorable or less favorable to polyarchy (Dahl, 1971).

In the context of the neo-liberal argumentation that stresses how the market will solve most things, the interpretation made here is that even so, it cannot be accounted for to solve all of the factors listed in table 2 under sub-cultural cleavage. There are no guaranties that the increased cultural cleavage will not have one majority, that none will be regional, none indefinitely left out nor are there any certain way to ensure mutual guarantees to all minorities that they will not be sidelined. In sum then, the effect of globalization on this variable according to neo-liberal theory is interpreted as less favorable for polyarchy.

4.1.5.2 Effect of globalization (world-system theory)

The effect of globalization on a macro level is that it through the work of the core states versus the periphery creates a reality of inclusion and exclusion. Wallerstein holds that such a system of nations, where some are better off while others are doing significantly worse, will run into problems when facing its own concept of citizenship (Wallerstein, 1999).

> The concept of citizen makes no sense unless some are excluded from it. And the some who are to be excluded must be, in the last analysis, an arbitrary selected group. There is no perfect rationale for the boundaries of the categories of exclusion. Furthermore, the concept of citizens is bound up with the fundamental structure of the capitalist world-economy. It derives from the construction of a states-system that is hierarchical and polarizing [...] (Wallerstein, 1999:117)

This conclusion is important because at the same time, the world-system theorists hold that migration is a very essential thing to the capitalist-world economy. This force the logic conclusion that a system which is both coined by migration and excluding citizenship will be riddled with problems related to so-called cultural diversity.

However, in relation to Dahl and globalization, it is important to ask if World-System Theorists think that this is something that is a growing problem as an effect of the recent evolution of the world-
system. Wallerstein holds that it is not as obvious as to say that migration today is greater than earlier periods in history, though it is definitely a more highlighted issue:

I am not sure that migration, however defined, is really quantitatively greater today than in previous centuries as a percentage of the entire population, despite the improvement in transport facilities, but it is certainly a more politically noticed and politically controversial phenomenon (Wallerstein, 1999:109).

At the same time, most world-system theorists hold that what we call globalization is in fact an intensified effect of many of the normal functions within the current world-system. Since they also think that migration to a great extent is an effect of the world economy in a capitalistic system, it follows that an intensified situation in the economic system also raises the intensity in the migration (Wallerstein, 1999). Therefore it is here interpreted that world-system theorists see migration as rising and coupled with the excluding and including problem of current nation-states, this means that there probably will be increased problems with cultural diversity.

In relation to Dahl’s variable then, the result will be that globalization increases the sub-cultural cleavage, making it less favorable for polyarchy. At the same time there are, like in the case of neo-liberalism, no guaranties that this increase can be handled in a good way. Therefore the overall interpretation is that globalization as understood by world-system theorists is making circumstances less favorable for polyarchy.

4.1.5.3 Classification
Both neo-liberal and world-system theory explanations of globalization are making circumstances for polyarchy less favorable in relation to the variable sub-cultural cleavage.

4.1.6 Foreign domination
No country is acting in an environment that makes it totally independent of other countries. Rather, the world as it is situated makes all nations more or less dependent on the actions of people in states that are governed by others. This means of course that the process of polyarchy in any given country must be understood at least to some extent by the actions of foreign regimes. That is not to say that it always is the same, or that all nations impose the same amount of power over one another, not at all. The United States is the world’s most dominant power, and as such it yields an enormous influence not only military, but economically and also culturally. Indeed in this day and age it can be brought in to question just how much small nations of the world are able to exercise

---

13 The original theory by Dahl of course operates with two super powers, but like in the above footnotes, I think it is safe to say that the importance of the general argument has not changed.
their polyarchy in a way that makes them approach the democratic ideal, when in fact so many decisions are made on a level where their elected officials have very little say.

However, the point made by Dahl is that no matter how important and powerfull a nation, it too is in many ways tied to and in some ways restricted by the actions of other regimes. It is a difficult task he claims to account for all of the ways in which nations evoke power on each other, but three general conclusions can be drawn (Dahl, 1971).

First it is, as stated above, reasonable to assume that the influence of other countries over one specific will almost certainly have an effect on the decision making in both the countries exercising influence and in the country that is being influenced. Second, Dahl argues that the actions of foreigners may profoundly change the options available to any given nation, but that does not need to change the political structure of the country. This means that even though some polyarchies can be said to be very restricted by the actions of foreigners, they are still polyarchies, and their system will not automatically change because of the foreign influence. The opposite situation is also true, a hegemonic regime cannot be expected to change in to a polyarchy solely because of polyarchic influence. Of course in both cases the influence is important but it is not a single causing mechanism. Rather as the other sections above have shown, Dahl operates with many different factors as pre-requisites for the advancement of polyarchy. Third, it is not possible to leave out such a factor that the people of a country can also choose to deliberately try to invoke their beliefs on a particular nation, that is, through invasion (Dahl, 1971).

It is with the last type of domination that Dahl concerns himself the most. He recognizes that this kind of foreign influence differs depending on if the invading force is a hegemony or polyarchy, and also if the invaded nation is a hegemony or a polyarchy. He then also shows that it is not an easy task for any nation to invade another with the aim of trying to establish for instance a polyarchy. In sum he is rather skeptical of the possibilities to spread democracy through invasions, and also shows that there are many empirical examples where hegemonic regimes has been invoked on more polyarchic nations, but that such an experiment did not change the population in the invaded country. Instead empirically it seems almost as if the opposite is true, that any invaded polyarchy, can after the invasion and foreign rule go back to being a functioning state with competitive politics (Dahl, 1971).

4.1.6.1 Effect of globalization (neo-liberal)
As pointed out at numerous times by now, the neo-liberal take on globalization stresses its relationship to technological advancement and a capitalistic market economy. This is, according to Friedman, closely connected to a more stable world in the future. That is not to say that neo-liberals are not concerned with new threats such as terrorism and environmental disasters. It is however to
say that neo-liberals in general believe that through globalization and free trade comes a future that is less tormented by wars and great conflicts (Friedman, 2007).

The much talked about risk that transnational corporations will become so big that they are a danger to the sovereignty of particular nations, is much over exaggerated neo-liberals think. Instead transnational corporations are an essential part of establishing a world with fewer problems. From the ideal type in table 1 (see p.38) we find that a central part for the neo-liberals is the concept that Friedman calls *The Dell theory of conflict prevention*. This theory holds that with increasing globalization come more geographically spread production chains. Companies outsource many parts of their production so that when Dell assembles one of its computers, the parts may be put together at one factory, constructed in numerous others, and shipped off to be sold in many different retail stores all over the world. This generates a system of dependence that makes nations less inclined to try to exercise power over each other through the means of invasion. Simply put, it is too costly to start wars that interrupts these international production chains, because if that happens Dell will just switch locations and the country that went to war will be left out of the loop, even after things settle down (Friedman, 2007).

The effect of this in relation to Dahl’s theory is of course that with globalization the risk of invasion is getting lower. Hence it points in a direction where such foreign dominations will be less likely, and therefore it is more favorable to polyarchy. And to any extent that this still will exist it is likely that such invasions will be quite temporary, which furthers the conclusion that neo-liberal globalization is making things more favorable for polyarchy.

What is certain, though, is that as the world flattens, one of the most interesting dramas to watch in international relations will be the interplay between the traditional global threats and the newly emergent global supply chains. The interaction between old time threats (like China versus Taiwan) and just-in-time supply chains (like China plus Taiwan) will be a rich source of study for the field of international relations in the early twenty-first century (Friedman, 2007:586).

At one particular point it becomes a problem to an interpretation that holds that foreign domination according to neo-liberals will decrease as an effect of globalization. That is the fact that such forces as terrorism also has gone global, and that the response from the established nation-states has been to engage in a war against this seemingly hidden enemy. Most neo-liberals hold, like Friedman, that it is necessary to maintain a stability and that this many times must be done through tough actions such as wars, and more control over citizens, however they also realize that this is a threat to the globalization they have come to like. Norberg writes:
When boundaries become less important, not only can people, goods and capital move more freely but so too, for example, can crime and disease (Norberg, 2001:271).

There is an uncertainty amongst neo-liberals how this will affect the world. On the one hand it might be that we take a step back and become less globalized, and through that looses more than we gain. On the other hand, if neo-liberals continue to fight for what they believe is the essential fact of globalization, namely that it has so many benefits that we cannot let isolated incidents such as 9/11 or other terrorist attacks force us to fold, there is still a great chance that we will see less conflict in the future. Once again, if free trade and the market are left alone, it will benefit all of us in the long run, neo-liberals claim. That doesn’t mean that we will live in a world without problems, but those problems will be outweighed by the benefits, and by far so (Friedman, 2007).

We need our president to restore September 11 to its rightful place on the calendar – as the day after September 10 and before September 12. We must never let it become a day that defines us. Because ultimately September 11 is about them – the bad guys – not about us. We’re about the Fourth of July (Friedman, 2007:618).

This means that in one way the neo-liberals believe that globalizations brings more stability, but at the same time they reason that it is a lot of fighting left to do to keep it that way. Taken together though it is here interpreted as that globalization per se is making foreign domination through invasion less likely, and that is why it is also making it more favorable to polyarchy.

4.1.6.2 Effect of globalization (world-system theory)

From the ideal image we find that world-system theorists are most concerned about the influence of transnational corporations over dependant nations in the periphery. Since the core nations function within the world-system as such that they drain the periphery from resources, they also drain them of possibilities. This makes contemporary globalization, and also its future in the short and medium run, increase a situation coined by rich and powerful states in the core and poor and dependant nations in the periphery. That allows for an interpretation claiming that the foreign domination is increasing with globalization, albeit not for all countries (Wallerstein, 1995).

At the same time, however, what we generally refer to as globalization brings forth a change in the world-system of significant proportions. It is the beginning of a crisis that will see to it that the world is rid from its dominant hegemon, the United States. This will in turn cause the world-system to become unstable, so much that in the long run it will crumble.

When such periods have ended, that is, when the erstwhile hegemonic power became once again simply one major power among others (even if it continued to be for some time the
Since the future then is a place where the main hegemonic power will have to step back and become one of many strong forces in the world-system, and because this is an effect of what we call globalization, the interpretation available here is that according to world-system theorists this is creating a scenario less favorable for polyarchy. This is true for all countries in the long run.

4.1.6.3 Classification

Neo-liberal understanding of globalization claims it to be more favorable for polyarchy, through its effects that makes foreign domination less common. On the contrary, World-System Theorists view globalization as bringing with it a situation that in the future is coined by more instability and wars, making it less favorable for polyarchy.

4.1.7 The Beliefs of political activists

As a final variable to account for the probability of polyarchy within any given political system, Dahl points to beliefs of the political activists. This is indeed a very complex matter that in many ways is hard to determine. However, the general concept is represented by Dahl according to a simple function:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
& I & II & III & IV \\
Factors determining beliefs. & \rightarrow & Political beliefs & \rightarrow & Political actions & \rightarrow P & \rightarrow & Regimes
\end{array}
\]

In the function arrows symbolizes “accounts for” and the arrow broken by the letter P is to be understood as “affects the probability of” (Dahl, 1971:124). What Dahl concerns himself with is how, and to what extent political beliefs (II) determine the political actions of the activists (III), and thereby having an influence on what kind of regime a certain country will hold (IV).

Dahl then moves on to identify some crucial beliefs he holds essential for the creation of polyarchy. In doing so he lists five areas where the political activists may differ in thought in a way that would have an impact on what kind of political system they may be inclined to struggle towards. First it is of interest how the activists perceive the legitimacy of polyarchy and its institutions. Almost self evident, the relationship is according to Dahl such that the higher the beliefs of the activists in the legitimacy of polyarchy the higher the probability for it to be maintained or created. The second area is how the political activists relate to authority and Dahl concludes that there are some countries and ethnic groups that hold a belief system coined by extreme thoughts about the authority as
something that just is without grasp for the ordinary citizen. Needless to say in a nation where the authority is so high held and obedience is a virtue to all, polyarchy is much less probable compared to an authoritarian regime (Dahl, 1971).

The third area pointed out by Dahl is the belief in the effectiveness of polyarchy. That is, if the activists are not convinced that polyarchy is an effective system, then the likelihood for it to be maintained or created is negatively affected. Area number four is related to the trust that exists amongst the activists. In systems where the trust is high it is more probable that polyarchy would be able to exist, Dahl concludes. Finally, the fifth area is how the activist’s beliefs are related to cooperation as means of political activity. According to Dahl strictly competitive and strictly cooperative systems are worse off than a system where both competition and cooperation exists as crucial parts of everyday political lives (Dahl, 1971).

What Dahl finds however, is that in many ways it is exceptionally difficult to determine just exactly how all of the above factors function. First of all it is very difficult to determine how the beliefs are formed and maintained within individuals, and it is even more difficult to talk about the beliefs of larger entities such as nations (for instance “American beliefs), or even regions (European beliefs). What is clear is that social scientists tend to make a much too reductive approach to the subject, concluding that in if they only find the factors determining the political beliefs (I) they can determine directly how they influence the probability of a regime (IV). This is simply not true according to Dahl for the matter is much more complex and riddled with randomness at present time to be represented correctly. At the same time it is very important that it must be a factor in any model that tries to reason about polyarchy. His conclusion is:

At present and for an indefinite future no explanatory theory can account satisfactorily for the beliefs of political activists and leaders.

Consequently, just as any theory that attempts to account for variations in regimes in different countries must take as major independent variables such factors as the socio-economic level of a country, the nature and extent of inequalities, the extent of subcultural cleavages, and other factors discussed in previous chapters, so too must such a theory, as a practical matter, treat the beliefs and “ideas” of political activists as a major independent variable (Dahl, 1971:188).

4.1.7.1 Effect of globalization (Neo-liberal and World-System Theory)

It is a very difficult task to put forward an analysis based on the information given by Dahl on this variable for the same reasons that are mentioned above. Indeed, the analysis in itself rests upon the possibility to use the variable in a way that measures the effect of globalization upon it. In this case
the variable is said to be highly difficult to even define and explain, and it follows that it is even more risky then to try and measure the change in the variable caused by globalization.

To further the problem both ideal types of globalization are materialistic in their explanations of globalization, meaning that they rarely speak of the beliefs of the actors as a significant factor. Instead they tend to link materialistic presumptions to how we are to understand what is most often called globalization. The analysis would begin with trying to determine the answers to what is listed in table 2 (see p.39) under “Beliefs of political activists” from the ideal types in table 1 (see p.38). It would go further into detail by finding the specific parts of the contending perspectives where they focus on the particular issue to highlight indications of a movement in one direction or the other in relation to the possibility for polyarchy. However under this particular variable the choice has been to call the analysis in both cases as not effecting the beliefs of the political activists. This is not because I believe that this is actually the case, it is rather because as Dahl points out, it is exceptionally difficult to account for this under the circumstances of today. To be sure, neo-liberals and world-system theorists probably have lots of ideas about how globalization function in relation this variable, however it would be quite pointless to proceed with the analysis if the object that it is being measured against is in such a shape that it just can’t be used. In short the validity would be very low. Instead globalizations’ influence upon the variable is considered as cet.par in both ideologies explanations.

4.1.7.2 Classification
The classification is the same for both perspectives, cet.par, or in other words unchanged by the influence of globalization.
5. Result

The result of the analysis is presented by first plotting the effects of both ideal types on Dahl’s variables after which an aggregation is made possible. Taken together the results are marked in a matrix where the aggregated effect is labeled.

5.1 The effect of globalization on the seven variables

The effects on all seven variables are plotted below.

![Figure 7](image.png)

The Black squares represent the interpreted classification under all variables starting from one to seven.
5.2 Aggregated result

The result from figure 5:1 is interpreted as producing an aggregated result that is displayed in figure 8.

X marks the result for both ideal types.
6. Concluding Discussion

Before the concluding remarks are made, there is a good reason to first reflect over what has been done here. A short recap: This essay has tried to measure the effect of globalization on democracy. In doing so it has been recognized that this is a very broad subject, much too broad in fact, for a work with a scope such as the one presented here. Therefore globalization and democracy has been narrowed down to more functional concepts. In this case globalization has been understood as something that differs according to what ideological starting point one adopts when trying to interpret what it actually is. This has been shown here as two ideal types that generates quite different results when used. In the case of democracy, the influential theory of polyarchy, put forward by Robert Dahl has been used as a sort of common denominator for what most people call democracy. It has then been measured against the ideal types of globalization, and the result has shown that if globalization is understood as it is by neo-liberals, then it mostly works in a way that is favorable for polyarchy. The opposite seems to be the case if globalization is functioning as the so-called world-system theorists interpret it. Taken together though it seems clear that no matter what perspective one puts on globalization it has an impact on the variables that Dahl holds as crucial for the development or maintaining of polyarchy in any given nation. It seems to me that from these findings there are at least two conclusions to be drawn. First, one must recognize the fact that the theory of polyarchy may need to be updated or at least further reasoned about in the age of globalization. Second, the result implies that globalization is affecting central notions of the world such as democracy in very different ways depending on how it is interpreted. Since there is a rather diverse understanding of the idea among scholars, then this diversity must show in any investigations, predictions, reports or official documents that try to take the factor of globalization into consideration. This must be the case for instance in such high aspiring government projects such as the Swedish Globalization Council, a body that tries to analyze the effects of globalization on Sweden so that the nation best can reap its benefits and avoid its threats (Globaliseringsrådet, 2008).

To be sure there are more things to be considered in relation to the analysis put forward in this thesis, but I will concentrate my thoughts in this section on the two mentioned above. It is however needed to keep in mind that when reasoning about the effects on polyarchy this is done on a purely theoretical plane. Even though it would probably be possible to expand the analysis to concrete empirical investigations, it is something that has to wait given the time frame and limited space.

Let me then first turn to the issue about globalization and polyarchy. When Dahl developed his theory in the late 1960s the starting point of what we normally call globalization was still in the
future. True, there had been significant advances in many areas that started to tie the world’s
nations and people closer to each other; however it was on a different level of intensity. Both neo-
liberals and world-system theorists would agree that even though they see globalization as much
older than that, the intensity of it is much more significant today than 40 years ago (Wallerstein,
2004; Friedman, 2007).

The result of this essay shows that regardless of which of the two takes on globalization that is
adopted, the presumptions for the possibility of a state to develop into a polyarchy are greatly
affected. Generally speaking, globalization could make the circumstances better or worse for
polyarchy, but it will not leave it at status quo. To be fair, one could probably measure other
ideological takes on globalization that would come closer to a score that would leave the effects
much less significant, however most perspectives probably don’t

The implication here is that one needs to evaluate this effect in relation to the theory. In principal
there are two ways to explain the results. Either the theory in itself is now reaching a point where it
is in dire need of an update because globalization is such a force that it cannot be disregarded in any
theory that deals with the fundamentals of democratic systems. On the other hand the measuring
that has been done here can be said to speak more about globalization than polyarchy. That is; if we
accept the polyarchic theory to be a reasonable explanation of what is needed to provide the
fundamentals of democracy, then the result implies that globalization is simply good or bad. It is of
course possible that the theory still is functional and that the current events in our social reality is
leading us towards a world with better or worse circumstances for the development of polyarchy. I
am inclined to explain the results with a mix of both of the alternatives.

It is obvious that the theory of Polyarchy needs an extensive overhaul to keep up with the events of
today. In all of the variables except for “the beliefs of political activists”, globalization has been
shown to affect the possibilities in one way or another according to the ideal types. At the same time
it is very interesting to see how different ideological takes on the issue comes to very different
conclusions. It is, to say the least, rather important to prepare for globalization if it is true that it
works in any of the ways suggested by neo-liberals or world-system theorists. Here in lies the
difficulty of interpreting the results. They seem to point both in a direction that shows that the
theory is in need of an update, and at the same time they point towards important conclusions
concerning how politicians should use the concept of globalization when planning our future. As
mentioned I wouldn’t favor one explanation over the other at this point.
We are in many respects used to see democracy as an independent variable in social-scientific studies, but we find it more seldom as a dependent variable - as something that may be subject to change caused by fluctuations in other variables. Indeed, both the institutions of democracy and the theory behind it are things that are of great interest to social-scientists in general and political scientists in particular, but as the introduction to this essay pointed out the discussion about the concept is not at all finished. The work presented here does not intend to finish it. From its results though, it is possible to conclude that the theory of polyarchy is being challenged by the reality it tries to explain.

What is needed now is a theory of polyarchy that accounts for globalization as a major variable, either on its own, or integrated in the reasoning that lays the foundation for the other variables. By doing so it would be possible to handle the other explanation of the results. With a working model that includes globalization we could start to evaluate how to address the issues of tomorrow. This is of course riddled with difficulties, most obviously linked to the problem of defining globalization.

To some degree this is a scientific issue in as much as that we can try to examine how globalization as it appears today functions. We can try to determine what it is, how it is driven or when it started. For instance in this case it is safe to say that depending on what ideological starting point one holds there will be severely different prescriptions for how to handle the political decisions of tomorrow. This is probably as close as scientific research can come at this point and therefore if any science is to be used as base for such decisions it must reflect this diversity, if not we run the risk of being nothing but charlatans or just plain uninformed guessers. Sadly this seems to be the case when one evaluates the work of for instance the Swedish Globalization Council. As I have shown in a previous thesis it is very much only reflecting one ideological take on globalization, namely neo-liberalism and uses this as ground for how to deal with contemporary Swedish issues (Öjehag, 2008). To a great extent this shows how much this, in fact, is not so much an issue of science, but rather one of politics.

Globalization has arisen to become, like the so-called market, something that is out of reach to humanity in a way that closely resembles how Marx thought about the alienation process of man before God. It becomes understood as something that the societies around the world must adjust to, and is as such used as a pretext by politicians, union officials, corporate leaders and everyday humans to accept whatever is happening to our collective riches, jobs, security, welfare or everyday lives. More seldom globalization is being spoken of as something that is created by mankind and therefore also controllable by mankind. True, it is a very complex issue that is hard to get a grasp of, but this is not the same as saying that nothing can be done. Indeed much of this forcing power that
is linked to globalization is a consequence of understanding it much in the line of neo-liberalism. That is to say that the focus on the market and its internationalization brings with it the thought of the invisible hand as thought of by Adam Smith in the 18th century. This hand works in such a way that if left alone, it will bring prosperity to all nations and people through the means of free trade. However, many times the hand more resembles a clenched fist. Democracy is brought around the world with guns and steel bath economy while at the same time invisible and highly visible walls are being constructed around the different centers of the earth.

Neo-liberals would say that this is not at all an effect of their ideology, but rather the lack of it (Norberg, 2001), others would point to the current world as an inevitable extension of a capitalistic society (Wallerstein, 2004). No matter what, it is clear that as a social phenomenon globalization brings with it change. Interestingly, change, is also the message brought to the American public (and of course to the rest of the world) by the new American president Barack Obama.

This essay ends where it started. While it was being finished Barack Obama won the election in the United States, thereby making him the first African-American to ever hold the presidency in the country’s over 200 years of existence. Indeed his very appearance in such a position speaks of change, a very positive one, and maybe it was made possible on some level by an increasing globalization. However, at the same time the global effects of what is being called the worst financial crises since the great depression also appeared. Maybe the coming years of world politics are indeed to be coined by change. The question is: change from what into what? When the political leaders of today try to juggle both the effects of globalization and the ideal of democracy, it is imperative to not let the latter of them drop to the ground. To prevent this we need to constantly update and revise our thoughts and theories of democracy so that it is the people who govern the world, not the world that governs the people.
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