1
Transformative Democratic Politics

Kristian Stokke and Olle Törnquist

The background

The third wave of democracy in the Global South in conjunction with market-driven globalization since the mid-1980s has not only undermined authoritarianism, but has also swept away many preconditions for political advances. Moreover, it could be argued that there has been a stagnation of democracy in many post-transition states, seen in the depoliticization of public affairs and problems of flawed popular representation in particular (Harriss *et al.* 2004; Törnquist *et al.* 2009). This means that there is a need for substantive and more extensive democratization – a process that will work towards improved popular control of more widely defined public affairs on the basis of political equality. But how will this come about? It is increasingly accepted that those with power tend to dominate and manipulate democratic institutions, while those who are marginalized have insufficient power to use the rules and regulations. While advocating the need to go beyond the predominant elitist crafting of democratic institutions, we would nevertheless argue that it is possible in most cases to make advances without the postponement of fledgling democracy in favour of authoritarian revolutionary changes. The most general answer provided in this book is to thus draw attention to the importance of transformative democratic politics. By this we mean political agendas, strategies and alliances that use formal and minimalist democracy to introduce politics and policies that may enhance people's opportunities for improving democracy and making better use of it. The twofold purpose of this introduction is to first provide some conceptual pointers to the need for and meaning of such transformative democratic politics, and thereafter to outline how the

3

different chapters in the book provide key insights into the dynamics of such politics.

This is our third book on democratization in the Global South. Like its predecessors, it is produced by an international network of scholars with a common interest in the challenges of analysing *both* the problems of existing formalistic and minimal democracy that has evolved, *and* the efforts made at moving ahead towards more substantive and substantial transformation. Our first joint book, *Politicising Democracy*, focused on critical analyses of the efforts at building democracy by crafting what are commonly viewed as universally 'correct' liberal-democratic institutions (Harriss *et al.* 2004). The book highlights that efforts at crafting liberal democracy have increasingly tended to emphasize decentralization and local democracy. The major weakness of this predominant strategy, as we see it, is that the model of liberal-democratic institution-building has been uncritically applied, irrespective of the fact that there may be alternatives and irrespective of the need to pay close attention to contextual preconditions and dynamics. Our primary argument is that supposedly universal institutions are being introduced and analysed without considering context, actors and relations of power. This is what we describe as the depoliticization of democracy. Moreover, the results have been limited. In contrast to the mainstream assumption that if ideal liberal-democratic rules, regulations and organizations are introduced most actors will adjust and become democratic, the overwhelming empirical evidence is that powerful actors have instead dominated and adjusted the 'parachuted' institutions in their own interest.

What are the main characteristics of the depoliticized form of democratization? *Politicising Democracy* identifies the following key features:

(a) Pacts between powerful elites on building core institutions of democracy (related to rule of law, human rights, free and fair elections, Weberian administration and civil society) that simultaneously exclude ordinary people and their representatives

(b) Privatization to the market, and affluent civil society organizations (CSOs) and ethnic and religious communities

(c) Decentralization of government based on 'subsidiarity' and the idea that people in local communities have common interests, and that relations of power between people and regions are unimportant

(d) Technocratic and 'non-interest' based 'good governance' involving government, market actors, civil-society organizations and ethnic and religious communities, again without considering power relations

(e) A number of problems of abuse and privileged control of institutions of democracy such as unequal citizenship, unequal access to justice, poorly implemented human rights, elite and money-dominated elections, corrupt administration, middle-class dominated civil society and otherwise predominance of 'illiberal' democratic practices

(f) Some popular-oriented civil-society projects that contest negative politics and authoritarian states, but often neglect that it is necessary to foster progressive political projects such as participatory budgeting, planning and the like, and thus try to implement these ideas and projects within the hegemonic framework.

Given these tendencies towards the depoliticization of democracy, the book concludes that it is necessary to politicize democracy by considering the context for democratic institutions, that is, to pay close attention to power relations and the various actors' will and capacity to promote and use the institutions. In other words, democracy cannot be crafted by just building the supposedly appropriate institutions. It is also necessary to consider what relations of power need to be changed, what actors have the potential to achieve this and how such processes can be supported.

What might the core elements of attempts at building more substantive democracy be? This was the main question addressed in the second collective book, *Rethinking Popular Representation* (Törnquist *et al.* 2009). To answer this question it is necessary first to identify the roots of the problem and then analyse these causes more closely. Our answer in the second book was that problems such as corruption and the elite capture of democratic and decentralized institutions are rooted in the poor democratic representation of ordinary people and middle-class interests and aspirations. This calls for the need to rethink *popular democratic representation*, which we argue, primarily requires the need to:

(a) Examine the political construction of the people (*demos*) and public affairs, and related problems of democracy such as unclear definitions of what people are supposed to control what public affairs

(b) Examine problems of democratic representation in relation to all forms of governance of what are widely deemed to be public affairs, even if the means of governance have been privatized and even if some actors argue that a number of issues are no longer of common concern

(c) Examine problems of democratic representation in relation to all linkages between people and institutions of governance (i.e. direct as well as indirect representation, informal and claimed representation and so forth)

(d) Examine how symbolic, descriptive and substantive representation are legitimized and authorized

(e) Examine both the input side of democratic representation, which is to be based on politically equal generation of decisions, as well as the output side, which is to be based on impartial implementation.

From this we draw a set of major conclusions regarding political principles and dynamics towards improved popular representation. We argue that popular representation calls for empowered citizens and stronger popular organizations with a voice and with the capacity to reform the system. It also calls for improved institutional nodes and clear democratic principles of representation that ensure strong linkages between popular organizations and institutions of public governance. Substantive popular representation rests, moreover, with the distribution of resources and relations of power as well as with resistance and organized struggle for change. Yet pressure from below is not in itself sufficient for the generation of political change towards more substantial democratization. The design of public institutions for participation and representation are also crucial as they affect the ways in which people organize and mobilize. The successful introduction of institutions that are favourable for democratic popular organization and mobilization rests with a combination of leadership and demands from below.

Defining transformative democratic politics

Taken together, these conclusions call for transformative democratic politics, by which we mean, once again, political agendas, strategies and alliances for using fledgling democracy in order to introduce politics and policies that may enhance people's chances of improving democracy as well as their capacity to make better use of it to foster their aims.

Transformative politics thus defined may be specified by way of a comparison with six other major but non-democratic forms of transformative politics. First, transformative democratic politics means an emphasis on transformation by way of politics, in contrast to the economistic thesis of Marx and Kautsky that the development of capitalism generates conflicts that in turn inevitably fosters movements to transform societies from capitalism to socialism. Second,

transformative democratic politics implies a gradualism that is coun-
terposed to Lenin's (and others') 'political power first' thesis. This
position holds that transformation calls for the capture of state power
followed by 'Marxist scientifically guided politics' to alter the domi-
nating and repressive relations of power. Third, transformative demo-
cratic politics rests on an emphasis on state–society relations that
can be contrasted with Putnam's society-first thesis – that interper-
sonal trust (social capital) between people will resolve the collective
action problem between people, and thus enable them to trans-
form their societies. Similar arguments also inform many of the cur-
rent ideas around civil society-based transformative politics. Fourth,
transformative democratic politics is based on a continued centrality
of the state, in contrast to the communitarian thesis that emphasizes
the importance of national, ethnic, religious and other communi-
ties for achieving the common good. It is certainly also contrary to
the idea of authoritarian political leadership to promote communi-
tarian politics, such as in fascism and Nazism. Fifth, transformative
democratic politics implies an emphasis on collective action that is
opposed to the liberal idea that as long as there are civil, economic and
political freedoms, people can decide and implement transformative
politics. Sixth, and finally, the focus on democratic politics is counter-
posed to Huntington's thesis that transformative politics presupposes
stable institutions, constitutions, the rule of law and the politics of
order.

In contrast to these alternative positions, we envision a form of
transformative democratic politics that is instead based on democratiza-
tion and rooted in two major 'most successful' traditions: (a) Bernstein-
rooted Scandinavian social democracy, especially in the 1930s, and
(b) new popular politics as in Brazil and (for a period) in the Indian
state of Kerala. We will return to the specificities in subsequent chapters
(see especially Chapters 2 and 3), but we argue tentatively that there
are some common features. The first key feature is the aforementioned
primacy of politics via popular organizations and public institutions.
In addition to this comes, second, the centrality of citizenship-based
democracy. This implies liberal-democratic constitutionalism and elec-
tions as well as democratic institutions for issue- and interest-based
representation, plus citizens' right to participation in, for instance,
urban and resource-based planning as well as 'participatory budget-
ing'. It also means giving almost equal importance to the output side
of democracy (the capacity to implement in an impartial way the
democratically decided policies) as to the input side of democracy

(the democratically decided policies). Third, there is a strong tradition of developing political demands from below for political reform and universal (non-targeted) and individualistic (non-family based) public policies and thus inclusive and equal welfare and economic policies from above. Finally, and most importantly, is the centrality of demands from below for the institutionalization from above of issue- and interest-based representation and citizen participation, fostering individual autonomy combined with strong popular organizations as well as accountability of and trust in public institutions, which (as emphasized in Rothstein 2005) may also foster interpersonal trust.

While transformative democratic politics is not the same as reform, it nevertheless has a lot to do with 'reforms that are conducive to new reforms' (Przeworski 1985: 242). In commenting on Willy Brandt *et al.*'s (1976) book on the challenges of social democracy, Adam Przeworski observes that post-World War II leaders only seemed to be 'ready to cope with whatever problems that are likely to appear, rather than to transform anything'. Yet, while 'not all reforms are conducive to new reforms', some are. As Walter Korpi (1978, 1983) has shown empirically with regard to the formative years of Swedish social democracy, 'each new wave of reforms [...] had a mobilizing impact upon the [...] working class'. And the major outcome was that *democratic* political institutions did not just create more positive freedom for ordinary citizens than the national-socialist and communist models, but also created more freedom than the market-based welfare regimes. The crucial questions that call for further studies are thus (a) *what* democratically fostered political reforms contribute to mobilization and civic freedom and (b) *when and how* these can be politically feasible (Przeworski 1985: 247).

The notion of transformative democratic politics is to be contrasted, then, to the two mainstream strategies for promoting democracy. The first is the aforementioned elitist introduction of supposedly ideal and universal liberal-democratic institutions without altering the basic relations of power. The second is the equally elitist but more conservative crafting of strong institutions of rule of law and governance ahead of democracy. The first idea is based on the expectation that the actors will adjust to new liberal-democratic institutions and become full-scale democrats. The second position, giving prime importance to the rule of law, holds that sustained government by the existing elites – what Samuel Huntington (1965) used to call 'politics of order' – is a necessary precursor to political liberalization because it allows for the

development of a solid institutional framework that will reduce the capacity of powerful actors to abuse institutions such as freedoms and elections (Carothers 2007; Mansfield and Snyder 2007).

As should be clear, we argue instead for transformative politics, in much the same way as Thomas Carothers argues in favour of gradualism.[1] This position acknowledges that the principled defence of building liberal-democratic institutions is worthy of support because autocrats rarely initiate the building of 'good governance' and the rule of law.[2] There is also a need to develop democratic politics in order to alter the relations of power and to be able to build a substantive and substantial democracy that can generate and implement the laws and policies that people want. The *main aim* of this book is, therefore, to (i) analyse and compare past and present experiences of transformative politics; and (ii) analyse whether and how new tendencies (new models of accumulation and popular engagement) may open up renewed transformative strategies.

Approach

There are three pillars to our general approach. The first is the examination of how the significant actors relate to the institutional means of democracy. David Beetham (1999) makes a key distinction between the aims of democracy, which most scholars agree is about popular control of public affairs on the basis of political equality, and the means of democracy in terms of an extensive list of specific institutions. Most of the detailed rules and regulations were developed in Western European and North American liberal democracies, but we would argue that they can be made more theoretically inclusive and contextually sensitive by being grouped together in the general terms of citizenship; international and national rule of law and equal justice; human rights and basic needs; democratic representation and participation; effective central and local democratic governance, including control of the means of coercion; as well as freedom of public discourse, culture, academia and civil society.[3]

Given the conclusions from our previous research (Törnquist *et al.* 2009), the main emphasis in this book is on (a) the constitution of the *demos* and public affairs in relation to institutions for fostering equal citizenship and (b) on institutions for fostering representation. The latter may be both by way of liberal-democratic elections and supplementary channels for participation by citizens themselves, and representation through issue and interest-based organizations. The key questions concern both the character of these political spaces and how

significant actors relate to the most crucial institutions and deal with the challenges.

The second pillar is the study of how the important actors relate to the determinants of their political capacity when trying to develop more or less democratic transformative strategies. The determinants of the actors' political capacity may be limited to those emphasized in major political and social movement theories and related conceptualizations of power (e.g. Tarrow 1994; McAdam *et al.* 1996; Harriss *et al.* 2004; Stokke and Selboe 2009 and Törnquist 2009). The main factors may be summarized as whether and how the actors are politically included rather than excluded; are able to transform their economic, social, cultural or coercive capital into authority (i.e. political power); have the capacity to turn common concerns into public political matters; are able to mobilize and organize support for demands and policies; and are able to use and develop existing means of participation and representation.

The critical questions thus concern the politics that key actors develop in order to promote their interests and enhance people's democratic capacity, and the transformative potentials involved.

Thirdly, these questions on actors' relations to institutions of democracy and the determinants of their political capacity need to be asked in a comparative perspective. But how can one best engage in comparing past and present experiences in quite different contexts where the outcomes are also varied? As already indicated, the most successful historical experiences with transformative democratic politics were in Scandinavia, while much talked about contemporary advances come from cases such as Brazil and Kerala. How can these be juxtaposed, and how can others compare the challenges they face with the old and new advances?

There was a time when comparisons dominated both studies and interventions in politics and development. Based on the idea that certain elements and functions are universal to successful development, a supposedly uniform European path to modernity was upheld as a possible guide for the identification of bottlenecks and strategic intervention in modernization processes. This approach was negated by research that pointed to the diversity of paths to modernity in Europe as well as the empirical problems involved in sourcing comparable data for the selected categories in European modernization all around the globe, the conceptual shortcomings of the dualist notion of tradition and modernity, the neglect of external factors (dependency) in modernization approaches and the lack of critical attention to contextual factors (e.g. different capitalist development in post-colonial settings). This does not

mean, however, that comparative analyses are irrelevant to the study of politics and development. Thematic and thoroughly contextualized comparisons have proven to be both possible and fruitful, for example on issues such as state and development, democratization, growth and inequality and social movements.

While comparisons may be improved by a stronger focus on themes, processes and contexts, the lingering question remains, where does one start from – what are the guiding questions? These have remained rooted in the north: liberal democracy, state building, new social movements, civil society, post-industrialism and so forth. The best example is probably the preoccupation with Western European and North American notions of liberal democracy in analysing and fostering democracy in the Global South. We suggest that in our thematic studies of processes and contexts one should rather take the problems as defined in the Global South as a starting point in order to then locate possible lessons in the North or elsewhere. Thus, the problems of depoliticized democratization, and particularly popular representation in the Global South that have been identified in our previous books and summarized here constitute the basis for the selection of those aspects of historical experiences elsewhere that we believe are viable and useful to focus on.

The focus is thus on similar processes and issues (in the South and North as well as South–South) with different outcomes. Of course, the full contexts are bound to be very different. But if the structural differences are spelled out from the outset and if the analysis gives priority to the processes, it should be possible to identify crucial similarities and differences by way of comparative process-tracing. A good example from this book is Bulls' chapter, which compares links between trade unions and other popular movements on the one hand and normal liberal-democratic elections and party politics in yesterday's Scandinavia and today's Latin America on the other.

Once a problem has been identified in the first context and an interesting resolution to a similar problem has been located in the second, the idea is to trace the political process through which this more positive outcome came about. The dynamics, including power relations, opportunities and forms of mobilization and organization, alliances, compromises, institutional arrangements and political ideas that relate to problematic or positive outcomes, may thus be identified and frame further discussion on what might be learnt. Of course the unique conditions in each setting must be specified, but the political priorities, alliances, coalitions, organizations and so forth may be less difficult to adapt to other contexts. For instance, many advances in Scandinavia

in the past as well as in Brazil today were not determined by long-term path dependencies and economic contexts. Crucial developments often rested instead with 'the primacy of politics' (Berman 2006) and the political dynamics of a specific kind that were similar in both countries.

This approach to comparisons is not intended to export idealized models but to identify the relations, alliances and principles that were crucial in the 'positive' case, and to discuss whether it is possible to identify any factors in the second case that may foster similar tendencies, as well as the potential for containing those who oppose them. This may thus also generate new questions on what happened in the second case. Non-problematic developments tend to be given insufficient attention. Thus problems and experiences in the Global South may even provide fruitful supplementary points of departure in discussions on transformative politics in the Global North.

Case studies and comparisons

The general agenda and approach, as outlined above, are pursued in the next 12 chapters of this volume, providing detailed contextual and comparative analyses of the dynamics of transformative democratic politics. The book is organized into three sections: the first focusing on historical and comparative analyses of transformative democratic politics, the second on the potential and problems of transformative strategies associated with emerging economies and the third on the potential for post-clientelist transformations.

Transformative politics in historical and comparative perspective

The first section of the book focuses on the aim of comparing past and present experiences with transformative democratic politics across different contexts. Chapter 2, written by Kristian Stokke and Olle Törnquist, examines the contemporary relevance of the classical and thus far most successful model of transformative democratic politics – the Scandinavian social democracies. The authors stress that they are not advocating the transfer of a full-scale model, which would be futile elsewhere due to different contextual preconditions and dynamics. They focus instead, on the dynamics of transformative politics that made the model real and on the lessons that can be learnt from this. Their core argument is that the emergence of a remarkably similar model in quite different national contexts across Scandinavia was first and foremost shaped by social-democratic politics and policies. Thus a key general lesson concerns the primacy of politics and furthermore, mobilization

from below for institutional reforms from above, including channels for substantive representation and participation.

In Chapter 3, Patrick Heller follows up these questions on the relevance of Scandinavian experiences for the Global South, and also on the relevance of comparative experiences from diverse contexts in the Global South, focusing especially on Brazil, South Africa and Kerala. His point of departure is the observation that social democracy first originated in local democratic arenas and in the formation of citizenship rather than in the working-class mobilization and class compromises that developed over the years. In Heller's view, this is also where the current challenge of substantive democratization lies in the Global South. The chapter then goes on to examine the diverse trajectories of decentralized participatory governance (DPG) in Brazil, South Africa and Kerala. Focusing on the interaction between institutional and political configuration, Heller observes that while South Africa has had an advantage in terms of high-capacity local states that have spurred hegemonic party politics, Brazil and Kerala have been characterized by a political competition that has pushed left parties to work closely with civil society and social movements, thus building a political movement in support of transformative democratic politics at the local scale.

Chapter 4, authored by Benedicte Bull, compares one particularly crucial dimension of both the old Scandinavian and new Latin American experiences of transformative politics: how interest organizations such as trade unions and other popular movements are being linked to organized politics and the state. The chapter focuses on the increasingly vibrant social movements and the rise to power of left-of-centre governments throughout Latin America from the late 1990s. Contemporary Latin America is marked by movements that display a diversity of positions and strategies vis-à-vis the state, producing promising experiments of transformative politics through dynamic state-movement relations, but also disappointments as governments have responded to social protests with co-optation, repression and the delegitimizing of social movements. Bull contrasts this with historical experiences in Scandinavia, where social movements led by radical labour organizations gained and used state power as a tool for societal transformation and where the main conflicts were related to the rapid expansion of capitalist industrialization. In explaining these diverse outcomes, the chapter draws attention to the importance of the global political–economic context, the capacity of the state to manage social transformation and the strategies and internal structures of popular movements. On the latter issue, Bull points out that the movements do not only

relate to the conflicts between capital and labour but also, to a larger extent than in Scandinavia, to the primitive accumulation of land and other natural resources.

Kristian Stokke and Olle Törnquist (Chapter 5) conclude the part on general comparative analysis with a discussion of two cases of failed transformative democratic politics, Indonesia and Sri Lanka. The chapter traces the process whereby initial efforts at democratic transformative politics were replaced by rapid descent into authoritarian rule in Indonesia and the gradual emergence of semi-authoritarianism in Sri Lanka. More specifically, the authors emphasize three critical turning points: first, the downgrading of the relative importance of democracy, especially in the context of Sri Lanka's ethnic politics and Indonesia's land reform and anti-imperialism; second, the crisis in both contexts of the state-facilitated social pacts for welfare and national development between peasants, labour and the 'national bourgeoisie'; and third, the contrasting roles of Sri Lanka's deteriorating and Indonesia's reborn but shallow democracy in the context of development and peace building. This leads to the general conclusion that the transition from initial transformative politics to authoritarianism and semi-authoritarianism can be ascribed to the failure to institutionalize substantive popular representation in combination with viable models for economic growth and social welfare.

Transformative politics in the context of growth economies

The first section demonstrates that there are close links between transformative democratic politics and economic growth, as seen in the historical making of and contemporary changes in Scandinavian social democracies; in the new experiments with transformative politics in Latin America, South Africa and Kerala; and in the failed cases of transformative politics in Indonesia and Sri Lanka. The second section of the book follows up on this theme and provides in-depth analyses of the spaces, challenges and dynamics of transformative democratic politics in the framework of the rapidly emerging industrial economies of China, India, South Africa and Brazil. Kristen Nordhaug (Chapter 6) begins with an analysis of economic growth and inequality in China, with an emphasis on the spaces for social inclusion and welfare. The author observes that while China has experienced strong economic growth, this has been distributed unequally and welfare rights have been abandoned or weakened. Problems of inequality and destabilization have led the central government to undertake social reform, but this social reform from above has been fraught with difficulties. One

basic contradiction lies in the fact that China's growth dynamic has to a large extent been based on the devolution of political power to local governments and strong alliances between local governments and business. This means that local governments and businesses frequently oppose, stall or distort the implementation of the central government's social reform initiatives. Nordhaug thus argues that the successful implementation of reform 'from above' requires the support of popular mobilization 'from below'. While recent trends in China's labour relations could foster developments in this direction, popular mobilization is hampered by the authoritarian order. This means that China has a long way to go before reform from above and popular mobilization from below are able to reinforce one another in a dynamic process of transformative politics.

In Chapter 7, Neera Chandhoke provides a comparative analysis of Indian states to discuss local state capacity in negotiating and utilizing global economic imperatives for the promotion of economic growth and social welfare. Arguing against tendencies to reduce politics to questions of economics, the author observes that different Indian states have responded very differently to the challenges of globalization and the need to ensure social well-being. Moreover, she finds that there is no simple relation between integration into economic globalization and state commitment to social well-being. These differences can only be explained, she argues, with reference to contextual political dynamics, particularly the presence or absence of four key factors: a competitive party system, high investment in the social sector, a politicized electorate and political mobilization in civil society. Since democratic states have to constantly produce and reproduce the conditions of their own legitimacy, economic growth and social well-being become key concerns in democratic politics. This opens up some space, Chandhoke argues, for transformative democratic politics, even in the context of an economic globalization that is commonly seen as undermining both the state and social welfare.

The question of transformative democratic politics in India is also addressed by John Harriss in Chapter 8. Taking India's progressive liberalization of its economy over the past 20 or more years as a point of departure, the chapter examines the responses to these developments in Indian society. Are there any indications of a counter-hegemonic movement against economic liberalization? And how much scope is there within this context for transformative democratic politics? Having identified and analysed potential class constituencies, Harriss concludes that such a counter-movement to liberalization remains relatively muted and

fragmented. In this situation, it is remarkable that the Government of India has nevertheless begun to recognize economic and social rights and has enacted a series of legislative innovations in support of social welfare. Harriss sees this as being driven largely from above by middle-class-led associations that often bypass rather than embrace democratic politics. Thus, Harriss concludes that the ideas of a counter-hegemonic movement and transformative democratic politics in India must be correspondingly qualified.

Chapter 9, by David Christoffer Jordhus-Lier, follows up on Harriss's theme of counter-hegemonic mobilization through an analysis of union strategies for political representation and popular mobilization in South Africa. The South African labour movement is a well-organized mass movement that has emphasized democracy and is an integral part of a tripartite government alliance. The question is whether unions have contributed to a broader process of democratic transformative politics. At the local level, trade unions have been placed in the middle of the restructuring of processes that affect organized labour. In this situation, affected unions have sought influence through a combination of popular mobilization (social movement unionism and the recruitment of marginalized workers) and engagement with the formal political system. This is a strategy fraught with difficulties and contradictions. Jordhus-Lier demonstrates that while the tripartite alliance has given trade unions political influence and recognition of workers' rights, it has also weakened its capacity to provide substantive political representation to the working poor. Finding ways to effectively engage with both communities and authorities thus remains the challenge that unions have to address in order to play a productive role in transformative democratic politics.

Chapter 10, written by Gianpaolo Baiocchi, Einar Braathen and Ana Claudia Teixeira, concludes the section on emerging economies with a discussion on participatory democracy in Brazil. The authors observe that Brazil has come to be known for its social movements that advocate a new kind of participatory politics and that have found expression in the *Partido dos Trabalhadores* (Workers Party). While Brazil can be seen as an illustrative example of the 'pink tide' governments and participatory governance that are discussed by Bull and Heller, it also appears to be a successful case of growth with redistribution and the kind of transformative democratic politics outlined by Stokke and Törnquist. Baiocchi, Braathen and Teixeira provide, however, a more nuanced interpretation. Focusing on the evolution of participatory institutions, the authors argue that there has been a pronounced shift both in the

quality of participation and the underlying relationship between social movements and the Workers Party. While the earlier years were marked by close links between movements and the party, social movements and unions have come to occupy a subordinate role as the party has risen to national power. At the same time, participatory institutions have become arenas for 'listening and dialogue' while movement concerns have been downplayed. The authors thus observe that Brazil's experience with institutionalizing participation reflects a clash of logics between social movements and the state and, in the process, demonstrates the need for careful analysis of contextual political dynamics and the problems of representation – a major factor behind the difficulties to scale up the celebrated local democracy.

Potential for post-clientelist transformations

The third section of the book discusses the possibilities and dynamics of transforming undemocratic forms of political incorporation at the local level. In Bull's comparative analysis of Scandinavian and Latin American experiences, she points to the persistent prevalence of clientelism in Latin American politics and argues that this limits the prospect for transformative democratic politics. In Chapter 11, James Manor argues that many politicians in the Global South have begun to de-emphasize, or at least complement distribution of patronage by way of 'post-clientelist' initiatives. This change has come about as patronage distribution has become costly and insufficient for maintaining popularity and political legitimacy. The result is different kinds of post-clientelism, of which the author identifies seven ideal-types. Manor stresses, however, that the importance of these initiatives should not be exaggerated and that they stop short of constituting transformations. He also observes that post-clientelism is almost always pursued not instead of but in addition to clientelism and that such hybrids may be relatively stable over time. Despite these qualifications, Manor demonstrates that clientelism is not a fixed feature of politics in the Global South, but that it is politically constructed and appears to be undergoing transformations in post-clientelist directions in many localities. To examine the political dynamics behind such transformations remains an analytical challenge.

Chapter 12, by Pratikno and Cornelis Lay, follows up on this agenda and provides a case study of the political dynamics behind the transition from populism and clientelism to participatory democracy in the Indonesian city of Solo. The city of Solo is often portrayed as the main positive case of democratic local governance in Indonesia, including

efforts at participatory budgeting and planning. The authors provide a critical assessment of this claim with a focus on the political dynamics behind local democracy. Their argument is that local democracy has been shaped by contentious local politics, where a confrontation between the political executive and parliament provided a political space for popular forces and the introduction of popular participation in planning and budgeting. These initiatives have been central to building popular support for the mayor among the urban poor and the middle classes. While this has produced a more inclusive form of local democracy, Pratikno and Lay point out that the present structures for negotiation between the state and the people have yet to be firmly institutionalized, meaning that they remain vulnerable to a possible return of populism and clientelism.

In Chapter 13 Jayadeva Uyangoda poses the question of whether local government can become an arena for substantive local democracy and promote politics that produce egalitarian social transformation in Sri Lanka. The author acknowledges the importance of institutional reform to the achievement of governance goals such as local participation and efficient delivery of public services. But the more fundamental challenges for local democracy and transformative democratic politics, he argues, are entrenched structures and practices of social and political exclusion. This argument is substantiated through an analysis of Sri Lanka's experience with local government and case studies from two socially and politically marginalized rural communities. This analysis yields the conclusion that concepts and institutions of local government in Sri Lanka need to be re-understood and re-framed in terms of the sociology of political power. Inventing and reforming institutions is a necessary condition for the greater democratization of local government, but it is not sufficient for the renewal of local democracy if this requires that democratic institutions become agencies for transforming inegalitarian social contexts of power and social exclusion, as demonstrated by caste-based discrimination in Sri Lanka.

Finally, Chapter 14, by Kristian Stokke and Olle Törnquist, extracts some of the key lessons from the preceding chapters before turning to a discussion of strategic interventions in support of transformative democratic politics. All the chapters in the book testify to the importance of transformative democratic politics, both for improving popular control over public affairs and ensuring outcomes from democracy that promote both economic growth and social welfare. The book also demonstrates the importance of comparisons and learning across contextual specificities, not as a matter of transferring institutional blueprints but through

PROOF

the careful examination of the political dynamics behind desired transformations. If the challenge for democratization in the Global South is to substantiate formal and minimalist democracy, the contribution of this book is to point to the importance of transformative democratic politics.

Notes

1. Carothers' concept of gradualism 'is based on the recognition that authoritarian rule is itself usually a key obstacle to building a well-functioning state and establishing the rule of law. The gradualist approach seeks to find a way for countries where few circumstances favour democratization to take incremental but definite steps toward open political competition while *simultaneously* pursuing state-building and rule-of-law reforms' (Carothers 2007: 21).
2. The main exceptions would be countries like Singapore and South Korea where the system of rule of law was introduced ahead of democracy; yet this was based on the overthrow of the old rulers (including by way of popular struggles), not on the sustained rule of moderate autocrats.
3. Our more-detailed list includes: (i) equal and inclusive citizenship in relation to well-defined public affairs; (ii) governance in line with international law and UNconventions; (iii) rule of law; (iv) equal justice; (v) universal human rights, including basic needs; (vi) democratic political representation through parties and elections; (vii) rights-based citizen participation in public governance; (viii) Institutionalized channels for interest and issue-based representation; (ix) local democracy made real in combination with relevant influence on other levels; (x) democratic control of instruments of coercion (including private forces); (xi) transparent, impartial and accountable governance; (xii) government's independence and capacity to take decisions and implement them; (xiii) freedom of and equal access to public discourse, culture and academia within the framework of human rights; and (xiv) citizens' democratic self-organizing. For a more elaborate discussion, see Törnquist (2012).

Bibliography

Beetham, D. (1999) *Democracy and Human Rights* (Oxford: Polity Press).

Berman, S. (2006) *The Primacy of Politics. Social Democracy and the Making of Europe's Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Carothers, T. (2007) 'How Democracies Emerge. The "Sequencing" Fallacy' in *Journal of Democracy* 18(1): 12–27.

Harriss, J., Stokke, K. and Törnquist, O. (eds) (2004) *Politicising Democracy. The New Local Politics of Democratisation* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Huntington, S. (1965) 'Political Development and Political Decay' in *World Politics* 17(3): 386–430.

Korpi, W. (1978) *The Working Class in Welfare Capitalism: Work, Unions, and Politics in Sweden* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul).

Korpi, W. (1983) *The Democratic Class Struggle* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul).

PROOF

Mansfield, E. D. and Snyder, J. (2007) 'The Sequencing "Fallacy"' in *Journal of Democracy* 18(3): 5–9.

McAdam, D., McCarthy, J. D. and Zald, M. N. (1996) *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Przeworski, A. (1985) *Capitalism and Social Democracy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Rothstein, B. (2005) *Social Traps and the Problem of Trust. Theories of Institutional Design* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Stokke, K. and Selboe, E. (2009) 'Practices of Symbolic Representation' in Törnquist, O., Webster, N. and Stokke, K. (eds) *Rethinking Popular Representation*, pp. 59–78 (New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Tarrow, S. (1994) *Power in Movement: Social Movements, Collective Action and Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Törnquist, O. (2009) 'Introduction: The Problem is Representation! Towards an Analytical Framework' in Törnquist, O., Webster, N. and Stokke, K. (eds) *Rethinking Popular Representation*, pp. 1–24 (New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Törnquist, O. (2012) *Assessing Democratisation. A Critical Handbook with Indonesian Illustrations* (Oslo: University of Oslo, manuscript).

Törnquist, O., Webster, N. and Stokke, K. (eds) (2009) *Rethinking Popular Representation* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan).