

Palgrave Studies in Democracy, Innovation,
and Entrepreneurship for Growth

Series Editor

Elias G. Carayannis
The George Washington University
Washington, DC, USA

The central theme of this series is to explore why some areas grow and others stagnate, and to measure the effects and implications in a trans-disciplinary context that takes both historical evolution and geographical location into account. In other words, when, how and why does the nature and dynamics of a political regime inform and shape the drivers of growth and especially innovation and entrepreneurship? In this socio-economic and socio-technical context, how could we best achieve growth, financially and environmentally?

This series aims to address such issues as:

- How does technological advance occur, and what are the strategic processes and institutions involved?
- How are new businesses created? To what extent is intellectual property protected?
- Which cultural characteristics serve to promote or impede innovation? In what ways is wealth distributed or concentrated?

These are among the key questions framing policy and strategic decision-making at firm, industry, national, and regional levels.

A primary feature of the series is to consider the dynamics of innovation and entrepreneurship in the context of globalization, with particular respect to emerging markets, such as China, India, Russia, and Latin America. (For example, what are the implications of China's rapid transition from providing low-cost manufacturing and services to becoming an innovation powerhouse? How do the perspectives of history and geography explain this phenomenon?)

Contributions from researchers in a wide variety of fields will connect and relate the relationships and inter-dependencies among (1) Innovation, (2) Political Regime, and (3) Economic and Social Development. We will consider whether innovation is demonstrated differently across sectors (e.g., health, education, technology) and disciplines (e.g., social sciences, physical sciences), with an emphasis on discovering emerging patterns, factors, triggers, catalysts, and accelerators to innovation, and their impact on future research, practice, and policy.

This series will delve into what are the sustainable and sufficient growth mechanisms for the foreseeable future for developed, knowledge-based economies and societies (such as the EU and the US) in the context of multiple, concurrent and inter-connected "tipping-point" effects with short (MENA) as well as long (China, India) term effects from a geo-strategic, geo-economic, geo-political and geo-technological set of perspectives.

This conceptualization lies at the heart of the series, and offers to explore the correlation between democracy, innovation and growth.

More information about this series at
<http://www.palgrave.com/gp/series/14635>

David F. J. Campbell

Global Quality of Democracy as Innovation Enabler

Measuring Democracy for Success

palgrave
macmillan

David F. J. Campbell
Department for Continuing Education
Research and Educational Management,
Center for Educational Management and
Higher Education Development
Danube University Krems
Krems an der Donau, Austria

and
University of Applied Arts Vienna
Vienna, Austria

and

Department of Political Science
University of Vienna
Vienna, Austria

and
Faculty for Interdisciplinary Studies (iff),
Department of Science Communication
and Higher Education Research (WIHO)
Alpen-Adria-Universität Klagenfurt
Vienna, Austria

Palgrave Studies in Democracy, Innovation, and Entrepreneurship for Growth
ISBN 978-3-319-72528-4 ISBN 978-3-319-72529-1 (eBook)
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-72529-1>

Library of Congress Control Number: 2018949047

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s) 2019

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Cover illustration: agsandrew/iStock/Getty

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature
Switzerland AG

The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely. Great men are almost always bad men.

*John Emerich Edward Dalberg Acton,
first Baron Acton (1834–1902)*

Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world; indeed, it's the only thing that ever has.

Popularly attributed to Margaret Mead (1910–1978)

*On résiste à l'invasion des armées;
on ne résiste pas à l'invasion des idées:*

One resists the invasion of armies; one does not resist the invasion of ideas.

*No army can stop an idea whose time has come.
Victor Hugo (1802–1885), in Histoire d'un Crime
(The History of a Crime), 1877*

This work I dedicate to:
Stéphanie;
Natalie, Paul, Fatih, Hannah;
Patricia, Benjamin, Paul, Christoph;
Regina and George;
Guylaine et Maurice;
ΗΛΙΑΣ, ΘΕΟΔΩΡΑ, ΓΕΩΡΓΙΟΣ, ANNA.

This work I dedicate to:
Gertrude, my beloved grandmother, who was born in Vienna in 1918.
During all the dark years of Nazi dictatorship, my grandmother lived
in a small village in the Austrian Province of Niederösterreich
(Lower Austria), and she lived a long life. She passed away in peace
in 2000. For me, my grandmother was one of the Greatest Persons,
intellectually and emotionally. She always was with me. She always
will be with me ...

Preface

What is democracy? This certainly represents a complex question, to which different (very different) answers seem (and are) possible. We should state that there exists a pluralism of theories, concepts and models with overlapping, but also competing understandings of democracy. *Perhaps the concept of democracy already by itself implies that there is a pluralism of concepts, in fact puts forward even a demand for this. Political pluralism within democracy is being mirrored by a pluralism in the conceptual self-reflexivity of democracy about democracy.* In addition, democracy is not static. Therefore, also: *How does democracy evolve?*

We could assert that there may be an implicit (not necessarily explicit) tendency within several of our concepts and models (also theories) of democracy to actually to refer to already “established” democracies of the economically further developed countries, and by this to focus on industrialized countries or advanced economies in context of the OECD, concentrating analysis on North America, Europe, Japan, Australia, and New Zealand. *But democracy also is a global phenomenon, and there are indications that democracy increasingly manifests itself as a global process.* Therefore, democracy is just as valid in the non-OECD countries, in the developing countries and emerging

economies. Therefore: *How does democracy evolve in global context?* Democracy, of course, also is permanently challenged. In the OECD countries, democracy faces the problem of stagnation, or even set-backs. In the non-OECD countries, there is a contest between democracies, semi-democracies and non-democracies, which systems are more successful in achieving development and sustainable development. *Quality of Democracy as a concept emphasizes these evolving aspects and evolving character of democracy, by stating that there can be different degrees or levels in the accomplishment of democracy, and that these are fluid and can change over time. Furthermore, the question arises, to which extent quality of democracy also associates with knowledge democracy and “democracy as innovation enabler”?*

The work and analysis, which is presented in the following sections, is being carried by the following motivation and interest:

1. *Comparison:* Comparisons are not the only possibility, for creating insight and information for further model building and theory design. Comparisons, however, are a very powerful and useful approach in political science (Peters 1998; Whitehead 1998). For our work, the comparison of the different countries represented the one practical way of driving further analysis. Democracy, here, is being analyzed in terms of “country-based democracies”.¹
2. *Global comparison and empirical measurement:* The one major interest was to engage in a truly global analysis, and by this explicitly not to limit the analysis of democracy to the OECD or industrialized countries and advanced economies, but to extend analysis to the non-OECD and developing countries, as well as to emerging economies. In principle, our analysis wanted to address the “whole world,” and was constrained only by empirical data availability. Particularly we were interested in comparing developments in the OECD and non-OECD countries. Not all countries in the world are democracies.

¹For example, later in the text, when we talk about European democracy, this represents an aggregation of the different individual European country-based democracies, and does not refer specifically to the system of governance of the supranational institutions of the EU. This logic of aggregation also applies to the terms of “EU15” and “EU28” (when not otherwise indicated).

Therefore, to pursue such a global perspective, it was necessary to extend the scope of analysis from democracies to all countries (democracies, semi-democracies and non-democracies), by this being in a position of being capable of comparing developments in democracies and non-democracies. The outcome should be an empirical measurement of democracy (and non-democracy) in global context.

3. *Quality of democracy and the quintuple-dimensional structure of democracy*: A global empirical comparison of democracies (democracies and non-democracies) must be grounded on a conceptual model or framework of analysis. The decision here was taken to refer democracy and quality of democracy (or the absence of democracy) to the following five basic dimensions (basic conceptual dimensions): freedom, equality, control, sustainable development and self-organization (political self-organization). Freedom and equality represent two key dimensions for democracy. Freedom and equality also qualify as two already conventionally and traditionally established dimensions in our thinking about democracy. However, in our analysis a particular focus and emphasis was placed on the (“new”) dimensions of sustainable development and self-organization (here approached through political swings and government/opposition cycles). The assertion would be that sustainable development and self-organization have a certain innovative momentum for influencing our theories, models and the way how we conceptualize democracy and quality of democracy. A further proposition is that it would be difficult to understand or to assess democracy in global context (and by this extending the narrow perspective of only looking at the economically advanced OECD countries) when ignoring features and aspects of sustainable development. Of course, it remains to be tested and to be seen, whether or not sustainable development and self-organization (political self-organization) can establish themselves in the realm of theories of democracy to which we conventionally refer to. By applying this quintuple-dimensional structure of democracy and quality of democracy, it was also demonstrated that a comparative multidimensional index-building of quality of democracy in a global format and context already is possible with the currently existing data (at least in a contemporary time frame).

4. *Quality of Democracy and Knowledge Democracy, “Democracy as Innovation Enabler”*: There are certain assumptions that the progress of democracy and quality of democracy may also associate with “*knowledge democracy*”. In a knowledge democracy, a particular emphasis is being placed on knowledge and innovation, and knowledge and innovation are being regarded there as key drivers for development and further progress, by this converting and transforming economy, society and democracy into knowledge economy, knowledge society and knowledge democracy. In such a context, within such scenarios, there also can be expectations about “*democracy as innovation enabler*.”
5. *Explorative analysis and the “Why Question”*: Our analysis approached new terrain, particularly in empirical terms, because we were interested in systematically measuring and mapping democracies (and non-democracies) worldwide in reference to a quintuple-dimensional structuring of democracy and by placing an emphasis on the dimensions of freedom, equality, sustainable development and self-organization. We tested our conceptual framework of analysis empirically in full extent. Still, the character of our empirical research is more “explorative” in character. Therefore, our empirical research was not hypothesis-guided or hypothesis-based. However, in the conclusion we engaged in the process of hypothesis formulation to which could be referred to (in future research) as possible analytical reference points for further research on democracy and the global development of democracy. *Empirically we concentrated on demonstrating, which empirical processes associate with each other and to offer a whole spectrum of propositions as potential explanations, but also inviting different, by this also conflicting views and view points*. In fact, we were interested in highlighting ambiguities, puzzling empirical effects and trade-offs, where these, according to our analysis, existed. *So there are no easy answers in reference to the processes, how democracy evolves in global context*. It may be asserted that there are three types of questions for investigation in political science research: the “How Question”; the “What Question” (What is the content or substance?); and the “Why Question,” which refers to cause-and-effect relations, a causal reasoning and causality in more general (What

is the reason?). Our analysis clearly addresses the how-questions. However, at the same time we were cautious to ask too directly the why-questions. Two factors came here into play: (1) a general believe that the “explorative” character of our empirical research would make it difficult to employ always a straightforward causal reasoning; (2) our interest was more to fully demonstrate the whole spectrum of empirical ambiguities and puzzling effects, thus having the impression that too much of a causal reasoning would narrow down the options of offered propositions for explanation. However, were appropriate (appropriate in our opinion), we also explicitly addressed the “Why Question.”² (So we did not exclude the “Why Question”.)

Our conceptualizing of democracy and quality of democracy was set in contrast to an empirical measuring of democracy in world-wide context. For that purpose we developed an empirical macro-model that refers to 160 countries (and territories) in the time period of 2002–2016. These 160 countries represent more than 99% of the whole world population. The country sample included democracies and non-democracies (or democracies, semi-democracies and non-democracies). The empirical propositions that we developed for quality of democracy and democratic development were based and framed within that specific framework for analysis. Of course, there always remain chances that empirical developments and trends after 2016 may point into directions different when compared with trends during the period 2002–2016.³

All together, the analysis being presented here represents a work that lasted almost for ten years, beginning in the summer of 2010, focusing on the month of August as the first phase of data collection. The book manuscript is based on the “Habilitation” text (Venia Docendi manuscript) *“Conceptualizing and Measuring the Quality of Democracy*

²For example, in Chapter 6 we discuss several factors that drive and encourage government/opposition cycles (political swings) in democracies. It can be said (as a proposition) that government/opposition cycles and political swings are essential for democracies and their quality. Our specific discussion there can be interpreted in a way to actually reflect on the “Why Question”.

³We started our time series in 2002, because Freedom House (2013a) launched to release “aggregate scores” for political rights and civil liberties only as of the calendar year 2002.

in Global Comparison. Freedom, Equality, Sustainable Development, and Political Self-Organization (Political Swings, Government/Opposition Cycles) in 151 Countries (Democracies, Semi-Democracies and Non-Democracies), 2002–2008” (Campbell 2013), which I had handed in at the University of Vienna on September 12, 2013. The Habilitation Committee was led by Professor Sieglinde Rosenberger (University of Vienna) and co-lead by Ludger Helms (University of Innsbruck). The three reviewers were Professor Brigitte Geißel (Goethe-University Frankfurt), Professor Barbara Prainsack (formerly King’s College London, now University of Vienna) and Professor Dieter Segert (University of Vienna). On May 15, 2014, the Habilitation Committee came together, and decided unanimously to grant to me the status of a *Venia Docendi* for Comparative Political Science at the University of Vienna. I want to thank all the members to the Habilitation Committee and the reviewers for their valuable input and comments and feedback that they had provided to me!

In the aftermath of this habilitation process and for the purpose of the book publication with Palgrave Macmillan now, the original “Habilitation” text was overworked by me, and, perhaps most importantly, the original time series of 2002–2008 was extended (and by this more than doubled) to 2002–2016. In addition, a greater emphasis has been placed on knowledge and innovation, also the theme of “*Democracy as Innovation Enabler.*” In that context I also want to thank Professor Elias Carayannis (George Washington University) for his advice and guidance. Would the focus of this book and research only have been on the OECD countries, then results could have been achieved faster. The inclusion of the non-OECD countries implied considerably greater analytical efforts. The inclusion of the non-OECD countries, however, was thought to be necessary to set up more focused propositions for further discussions on: *How do democracy and quality of democracy evolve in global context? Is “Democracy an Innovation Enabler”?* The global perspective was time-consuming. But the global perspective was also the one finally so interesting aspect.

Finally, in the form of a personal note, I would like to add, that in the world of literature, that I was (am) impressed by the following three pieces of text and work, which I thought were (are) very interesting:

Alice in Wonderland (by Lewis Carroll, 1865), *Das Parfüm/The Perfume* (by Patrick Süskind, 1985), and *Der Kauz/The Codger* (by Simon Guerel, 2017).

Vienna and Bad Vöslau, Austria
Washington, DC, USA
Champigné, France
July 2018

David F. J. Campbell
dfjcampbell.research@gmail.com

Acknowledgements

I want to thank Professor Elias G. Carayannis (George Washington University and Athens), for all the Intellectual Vigor and Academic Excitement, which we had in recent years, and which shall never end in the coming years still lying ahead of us.

I want to thank Professor Sieglinde K. Rosenberger (University of Vienna, Department of Political Science) for the many challenging discussions that we had on politics, political science and quality of democracy. These discussions provided most useful references and help for developing the logic of argumentation further. Rosenberger had the lead of my Habilitation Committee with the University of Vienna, for this I am most thankful to her.

I want to thank Professor Wolfgang C. Müller (University of Vienna, Department of Government), who had supervised in the past my dissertation, for which he had provided helpful support and kind feedback. Without this dissertational experience, I would not have arrived here.

I want to thank Professor Ludger Helms (University of Innsbruck, Department of Political Science) for the many exciting debates and the intellectual exchange that we had, which had broadened and expanded my views on politics and the arts.

I want to thank Thorsten Barth, Gerald Bast, Guy Ben-Ari, Peter Biegelbauer, Gerhard Blasche, Günther Burkert, Elias Carayannis, Tung Tung Chan, Amelie Drexler, Igor Dubina, Birgit Eigelsreiter, Alexandra Fabrykowska, Robert Fragnito, Alexandra Frank, Georg Hanschitz, Regina Jankowitsch, Matthias Keppel, Bernhard Kernegger, Samar Kobald, Christine and Walter Kreiner, Florian Kreiner, Chang-Yool Lee, Ruth Mateus-Berr, Birgit Mitterlehner, Derya Öcal, Ivan Pantelić, Attila Pausits, Thomas Pfeffer, Klaus Poier, Barbara Prainsack, Katharina and Gregor Puschnig, Walter Rohn, Anja Seipenbusch-Hufschmied, Kajetan Stransky-Can, David Wineroither and Qiaoshan Ye, with whom I have shared so many Great Times in Great Complexity.

Poem on Democracy

Gedicht über Demokratie

(written by David F. J. Campbell in German)

was ist
demokratie?

es ist die
wahrheit
der vielen wahrheiten.

es ist die
wahrheit,
die möglich ist,
weil sie verlangt,
dass verschiedene
und zueinander
widersprüchliche
wahrheiten
nebeneinander
bestehen.

es ist der
pluralismus im
vielen licht,
das in den
schatten tropft,
und die nacht
heller blühen
lässt.

der schatten
des lichts und
das licht
des schattens,
und es gibt
keine
wahrheit
außerhalb
des pluralismus:
frage folgt
auf antwort,
fragen folgt
auf frage.
auf licht
folgt neues
licht
am blühenden tag.

ΠΟΙΗΜΑ ΓΙΑ ΤΗΝ ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑ

(translated into Greek by Elias G. Carayannis)

ΤΙ ΕΙΝΑΙ Η
ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑ?

ΕΙΝΑΙ Η
ΑΛΗΘΕΙΑ
ΤΩΝ ΑΛΗΘΕΙΩΝ.

ΕΙΝΑΙ Η ΑΛΗΘΕΙΑ ΠΟΥ ΕΙΝΑΙ ΕΦΙΚΤΗ ΓΙΑΤΙ ΑΠΑΙΤΕΙ
ΔΙΑΦΟΡΕΤΙΚΕΣ ΚΑΙ ΣΥΓΚΡΟΥΟΜΕΝΕΣ ΑΛΗΘΕΙΕΣ
ΝΑ ΣΤΗΝΥΠΑΡΧΟΥΝ ΑΡΜΟΝΙΚΑ ΜΑΖΙ.

ΕΙΝΑΙ Η ΠΟΙΚΙΛΟΤΗΤΑ ΣΕ ΑΠΛΕΤΟ ΦΩΣ,
ΠΟΥ ΑΚΟΥΓΕΤΑΙ ΣΑΝ ΣΤΑΓΟΝΑ ΝΕΡΟΥ ΣΤΟΥΣ
ΣΚΙΕΡΟΥΣ ΤΟΠΟΥΣ ΚΑΙ ΚΑΝΕΙ ΤΗΝ ΝΥΧΤΑ ΝΑ
ΛΑΜΠΕΙ ΠΙΟ ΛΑΜΠΡΗ.

Ο ΙΣΚΙΟΣ ΤΟΥ ΦΩΤΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΟ ΦΩΣ ΤΟΥ ΣΚΟΤΑΔΙΟΥ,
ΚΑΙ ΔΕΝ ΥΠΑΡΧΕΙ ΑΛΛΗ ΑΛΗΘΕΙΑ ΑΠΟ ΤΗΝ
ΠΟΙΚΙΛΟΤΗΤΑ – Η ΕΡΩΤΗΣΗ ΑΚΟΛΟΥΘΕΙ ΤΗΝ
ΑΠΑΝΤΗΣΗ ΚΑΙ ΟΙ ΕΡΩΤΗΣΕΙΣ ΑΚΟΛΟΥΘΟΥΝ
ΤΙΣ ΕΡΩΤΗΣΕΙΣ ΚΑΘΩΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΟ ΦΩΣ ΑΚΟΛΟΥΘΕΙ
ΚΑΙΝΟΥΡΓΙΟ ΦΩΣ ΤΗΝ ΗΜΕΡΑ ΠΟΥ ΞΗΜΕΡΩΝΕΙ.

Poem on Democracy

(translated into English by Gerhard W. E. Blasche)

what is democracy?

the truth it is
of the many truths

the truth it is,
made possible,
because it demands
different and opposing truths
to stand side by side

it is pluralism
immersed in light
the rays of which
gently penetrate the shade
and make the night bloom
brighter still

the shadow of light
the light of shade

and there is no truth beyond
(pluralism):

question follows answer
question follows question

light is followed
by new light
on the blooming day

Poem on Democracy

(translated into English by David F. J. Campbell and George S. Campbell)

what is
democracy?

it is the
truth
of the many truths.

it is the
truth
that is possible,
because it requires
that different
and to each other
contradictory
truths
exist
next to each other.

it is the
pluralism in
the many light
that drips
into the shade
and lets the night
blossom
lighter in light.

the shade
of light and
the light
of shade,
and there is
no
truth
outside
of pluralism:
question follows
answer,
questions follow
in questioning.
after light
follows new
light
on the blossoming day.

Poème sur la Démocratie

(translated into French by Birgit Eigelsreiter)

qu'est-ce que la
démocratie?

elle, est la
vérité
de nombreuses vérités.

elle, est la
vérité
qui peut exister,
puisqu'elle se construit
des vérités
distinctes et
divergentes
en exigeant
qu'elles
coexistent.

elle est le pluralisme
d'une lucidité;
qui envahit
l'obscurité,
tout en
éclaircissant
les ténèbres
nocturnes.

l'ombre
de la lumière
et la lumière
de l'ombre;
il n'existe
aucune
vérité
en dehors
du pluralisme:
réponse
suivie par question
questionner –
ce qui suit
une question
en plein jour,
une nouvelle lumière
succède
à la lumière.

Поэма о демократии

(translated into Russian by Alexandra Fabrykowska)

что такое
демократия?

это
истина
многих правд.

это
истина,
разрешающая,
требующая,
что различные
и любые
несообразные
правды
вместе
существуют.

Это
плюрализм в
множестве огней,
падающих каплями
в полумрак
и разрешающих ночи
цвести
ярче света.

мрачность
вспышки и,
светлость
тьма
нет
другой
правды
кроме
плюрализма:
вопрос следует
за ответом,
вопросы непрерывны
в вопрошании.
за светом
приходит новый
свет
в цветущий день.

שיר על דמוקרטיה
(translated into Hebrew by Guy Ben-Ari)

מהי
דמוקרטיה?

היא
האמת
של כל האמיתות.

היא
האמת
המתאפשרת
מפני שהיא דורשת,
שאמיתות
שונות
ומנוגדות
יתקיימו
זו לצד זו.

היא
הרב-גונית
שבאור
המטפטפת אל הצל
ומאפשרת
ללילה
לפרוח באור חזק יותר

הצל
שבאור
והאור
שבצל,
ואין
אמת
מעבר
לרב-גונית:
שאלה
בעקבות תשובה
שאלות
בעקבות שאלה
אור חדש

בעקבות
 אור
 ביום הבהיר

قصيدة عن الديمقراطية
 (translated into Arabic by Samar Kobald)

ما هي
 الديمقراطية؟

إنها
 حقيقة
 الحقائق العديدة.

إنها
 حقيقة
 الممكنة
 لأنها تطالب,
 تعيش
 حقائق
 مختلفة
 ومتناقضة.

إنها
 التعددية في
 العديد من الضوء
 الذي يقطر
 في الظلال,
 ويجعل الليل
 أكثر إشراقاً.

الظل
 من الضوء و
 الضوء
 ،من الظل
 وهناك
 لا
 حقيقة
 خارج

التعددية:
السؤال يتبع
الجواب،
وطرح الأسئلة.
على ضوء
يأتي ضوء
جديد
في يوم مشرق.

Demokrasi 'nin Şiiri

(translated into Turkish by Derya Öcal)

Nedir
Demokrasi?
O
Gerçektir
Birçok gerçeklerin
O
Gerçektir
Mümkün olan
Çünkü talep ettiği
Farklı
Ve birbirine karşı
Muhalif
Gerçeklerin
Yanyana
Olması
O
Çoğunluktur
Birçok ışıklar içinde
Gölgeye damlayıp
Geceyi
Daha parlak
Açtıran
Isığın

Gölgesi ve
Gölgenin
Işığı
Ve gerçek yok
Çoğunluk dışında
Soru
Cevabı izler
Sormak ise
Soruyu
Işık ardından
Yeni ışık gelir
Açan günde

Poem on Democracy

(translated into Chinese by Amelie Drexler and Qiaoshan Ye)

什么是
民主？

民主是
众多真理背后的
终极真理

之所以称它为终极真理，
是因为它能够容许各种不同的，
互相矛盾的真理共同存在

它是一个闪烁着
不同光芒的多种真相的
凝聚体
这些光芒滴进阴影里
照亮了黑夜，
并让黑夜开出了花朵

光芒的影子
阴影的光亮
真相不可能只有一个
而是诸多个

一个答案后面还会冒出新的问题
新的问题还会引发更多的质疑
就像一束光芒
在一个鲜花怒放的白天
折射出更多的光芒

Poem on Democracy

(translated into Chinese by Tung Tung Chan)

什么是
民主？

她是
真相中
的真相。

她是
有可能实现的
真相
因为她根植于
互不相同
互相矛盾
却又
互相依存的
真相。

她是
多元主义
是许多光
渗透在
阴影处
好让黑夜
绽放
柔柔地发光

影
的光和
光
的影，

在
多元主义
以外
没有
真相：
问题紧随
答案，
问题紧随
置疑。
光后
又追随新的
光
照亮绽放的天明
一首关于民主的诗

Contents

1	Introduction: How to Conceptualize Democracy, Quality of Democracy in Global Comparison and Democracy as Innovation Enabler	1
1.1	The Research Questions	2
1.2	Conceptualization of Democracy and Quality of Democracy: The Basic Quintuple-Dimensional Structure of Democracy	12
1.3	Conceptual Research Design and Methodic Framework of Analysis	38
1.4	Preview of Coming Sections and Chapters of Analysis	50
1.5	Resume: How Innovative Is the Here Presented Approach of Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy and Quality of Democracy in Global Comparison and of Democracy as Innovation Enabler?	52
	References	62
2	The Empirical Macro-Model: How to Measure Democracy and the Quality of Democracy in Global Comparison	75
2.1	Country Sample and Total Sample of 160 Countries	75

2.2	Method and Methodology of the Applied Framework of Analysis	80
2.3	Possible Empirical Definition of Democracies, Semi-democracies and Non-democracies	88
2.4	Identification of Countries and Country Groups for the Comparative Analysis of Freedom, Equality, Sustainable Development, and Self-Organization (Political Self-Organization)	90
	References	110
3	Comparative Empirical Analysis of the OECD Countries: Freedom, Equality and Sustainable Development in the OECD Countries (2002–2016)	115
	References	148
4	Comparative Empirical Analysis of the Non-OECD Countries: Freedom, Equality and Sustainable Development in the Non-OECD Countries (2002–2016)	151
	References	196
5	Comparative Empirical Analysis of Global Trends of the OECD and Non-OECD Countries and of the Whole World: Freedom, Equality and Sustainable Development in the World (2002–2016)	199
	References	225
6	The Basic Dimension (Basic Conceptual Dimension) of Self-Organization (Political Self-Organization): Government/Opposition Cycles and Political Swings (Political Left/Right Swings), Peaceful Person Change of Head of Government and Peaceful Party Change of Head of Government in Global Comparison (2002–2016 and 1990–2017)	227
	References	278

7 Conclusion: Summary and Formulation of Hypotheses for Further Research on Democracy, Quality of Democracy in Global Comparison and Democracy as Innovation Enabler	281
7.1 Conclusion: Summary of Comparison of Countries and Country Groups Over the Dimensions of Freedom and Equality (2002–2016)	283
7.2 Outlook: Formulation of Hypotheses for Further Research on Democracy and Quality of Democracy in Global Comparison	312
7.3 Resume of the Conclusion	340
References	344
Appendix to the Conceptualization and Measurement of Democracy and Quality of Democracy in Global Comparison/Indicators and Dimensions	351
Appendix A.1 Documentation of the Complete Country Sample: 160 Countries (Years 2002–2016)	353
Appendix A.2 Documentation of the Indicators: Transformed Scores (Rescaled to 0–100) of the 160 Countries (years 2002–2016)	355
Appendix A.3 Overview and Summary: Documentation of the Transformed (Rescaled) Indicators and Aggregated Dimensions (Subdimensions) for Identified Countries and Country Groups (Years 2002–2016)	471
References	481
Index	501

Acronyms

AIDS	Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
BREXIT	British Referendum to exit the EU (held on June 23, 2016)
BRIC	Brazil, Russia, India and China
CIA	Central Intelligence Agency
CO2 Em low	CO2 Emissions (by tendency decreasing)
Cs	Countries
DEVELOP non-pol	Non-Political Sustainable Development
ECO Free	Economic Freedom
Edu Tert	Tertiary Education
EQUAL GEN	Gender Equality
EQUAL INC	Income Equality
EU	European Union
FREE ECO	Economic Freedom
FREE POL	Political Freedom
FYR	Former Yugoslav Republic
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GDP p Cap	GDP per Capita
GEN Equal	Gender Equality
GNI	Gross National Income
HDI	Human Development Index (UNDP)

HDI-r	Human Development Index “re-engineered” or “re-designed”
HDI re-des	Human Development Index “re-engineered” or “re-designed”
IDEA	International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance
IMF	International Monetary Fund
INC Equal	Income Equality
LA	Latin America
Life Exp	Life Expectancy
LLL	Lifelong Learning
MIPEX	Migrant Integration Policy Index
MIT	Massachusetts Institute of Technology
NIC	Newly Industrialized Country
NICs	Newly Industrialized Countries
NIE	Newly Industrialized Economy
NIEs	Newly Industrialized Economies
NON-POL	Non-political
Nord	Nordic
Nordic Cs	Nordic Countries
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development
PDR	People’s Democratic Republic
POL Free	Political Freedom
PPP	Purchasing Power Parity
QoD	Quality of Democracy
RB	República Bolivariana
REP	Republic
SD	Sustainable Development
SD comprehensive	Comprehensive Sustainable Development
SD non-pol	Non-Political Sustainable Development
SIPRI	Stockholm International Peace Research Institute
Tech Diff	Technology Diffusion
Tert Educ	Tertiary Education
UK	United Kingdom
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
US	United States (of America)
USA	United States of America

WDI	World Development Indicators (World Bank)
WEF	World Economic Forum
WID	World Inequality Database
WMO	World Meteorological Organization
WRs	Welfare Regimes

List of Figures

Fig. 1.1	Measurement of democracy and of quality of democracy (types of measurement) (<i>Source</i> Author's own conceptualization)	6
Fig. 1.2	Measurement of democracy and of quality of democracy (types of measurement) (<i>Source</i> Author's own conceptualization)	7
Fig. 1.3	Conceptualization of democracy and different stages of empirical analysis (<i>Source</i> Author's own conceptualization)	9
Fig. 1.4	Possible evolution of democracy in different stages (conceptual stages) or in different ideal-typical categories (simplified model) (<i>Source</i> Author's own conceptualization)	19
Fig. 1.5	Minimalist versus maximalist concepts and theories of democracy and quality of democracy (<i>Source</i> Campbell 2008, p. 22)	27
Fig. 1.6	Minimalist versus maximalist concepts and theories of democracy and quality of democracy in context of multilevel governance (architectures) (<i>Source</i> Author's own conceptualization and visualization based on Fig. 1.5 and Campbell (2008, p. 22), Carayannis and Campbell (2010, p. 62), and Carayannis et al. (2012, p. 4))	28

Fig. 1.7	The basic quintuple-dimensional structure of democracy and the quality of democracy (<i>Source</i> Author's own conceptualization and visualization based on Campbell (2008, p. 32; 2012, p. 296) and Campbell and Carayannis (2013b) and for the dimension of "control" based on Lauth (2004, pp. 32–101))	33
Fig. 1.8	A possible matrix structure of basic dimensions of democracy and quality of democracy and architectures of input, throughput and output (outcome) (<i>Source</i> Author's own conceptualization and visualization based on Campbell (2008, p. 32; 2012, p. 296) and Campbell and Carayannis (2013b) and for the dimension of "control" based on Lauth (2004, pp. 32–101) (see also Fig. 1.7 in the introduction))	37
Fig. 1.9	The abstract design structure of dimensions, subdimensions and assigned indicators (<i>Source</i> Author's own conceptualization and visualization)	39
Fig. 1.10	Dimensions, subdimensions and assigned indicators of the conceptual research design and methodic framework of analysis (<i>Source</i> Author's own design. <i>Notes a</i> "Gini Index" and "Gini Coefficient" are two different names for the same measure; WDI = World Development Indicators (released by World Bank). b WDI = World Development Indicators (released by World Bank); Depending on the analytical design, the government-opposition-cycles (political swings) may also the aligned to the dimension of control)	40
Fig. 1.11	The quadruple and quintuple helix innovation systems (<i>Source</i> Author's own conceptualization based on Carayannis and Campbell (2014, p. 15), and adapted from Carayannis and Campbell (2009, p. 207). See also Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff (2000))	61
Fig. 2.1	World population in billions (2002–2016) (<i>Source</i> World Development Indicators WDI (World Bank 2018))	77
Fig. 2.2	Different country groups as a % of world population (2002–2016). World 122 = all countries with no complete data missings in the model	78

Fig. 2.3	Different country groups as a % of world population (2002–2016). World 122 = all countries with no complete data missings in the model	79
Fig. 2.4	Dimensions, subdimensions and assigned indicators of the conceptual research design and methodic framework of analysis: the different weight measures (<i>Source</i> Author's own design. <i>Notes a</i> "Gini Index" and "Gini Coefficient" are two different names for the same measure; WDI = World Development Indicators (released by World Bank). <i>b</i> WDI = World Development Indicators (issued by World Bank); Depending on the analytical design, the government-opposition-cycles (political swings) may also the aligned to the dimension of control)	81
Fig. 3.1	Political freedom in the OECD and OECD countries (2002–2016): Nordic countries, USA, EU15, EU28 and Japan. Scale range 0–100: 0 = (theoretical) minimum, 100 = empirical maximum (<i>Source</i> Author's own calculation and visualization)	116
Fig. 3.2	Economic freedom in the OECD and OECD countries (2002–2016): Nordic countries, USA, EU15, EU28 and Japan. Scale range 0–100: 0 = (theoretical) minimum, 100 = empirical maximum (<i>Source</i> Author's own calculation and visualization)	117
Fig. 3.3	Income equality in the OECD and OECD countries (2002–2016): Nordic countries, USA, EU15, EU28 and Japan. Scale range 0–100: 0 = (theoretical) minimum, 100 = empirical maximum (<i>Source</i> Author's own calculation and visualization)	118
Fig. 3.4	Gender Equality in the OECD and OECD countries (2002–2016): Nordic countries, USA, EU15, EU28 and Japan. Scale range 0–100: 0 = (theoretical) minimum, 100 = empirical maximum (<i>Source</i> Author's own calculation and visualization)	119
Fig. 3.5	Human development (HDI re-designed) in the OECD and OECD countries (2002–2016): Nordic countries, US, EU15, EU28 and Japan. Scale range 0–100: 0 = (theoretical) minimum, 100 = empirical maximum (<i>Source</i> Author's own calculation and visualization)	120

- Fig. 3.6 Sustainable development (non-political) in the OECD and OECD countries (2002–2016): Nordic countries, USA, EU15, EU28 and Japan. Scale range 0–100: 0 = (theoretical) minimum, 100 = empirical maximum (*Source* Author’s own calculation and visualization) 121
- Fig. 3.7 Sustainable development (non-political and political) in the OECD and OECD countries (2002–2016): Nordic countries, USA, EU15, EU28 and Japan. Scale range 0–100: 0 = (theoretical) minimum, 100 = empirical maximum (*Source* Author’s own calculation and visualization) 122
- Fig. 3.8 Life expectancy (sustainable development) in the OECD and OECD countries (2002–2016): Nordic countries, USA, EU15, EU28 and Japan. Scale range 0–100: 0 = (theoretical) minimum, 100 = empirical maximum (*Source* Author’s own calculation and visualization) 123
- Fig. 3.9 Tertiary education (“SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT”) in the OECD and OECD countries (2002–2016): Nordic countries, USA, EU15, EU28, and Japan. Scale range 0–100: 0 = (theoretical) minimum, 100 = empirical maximum (*Source* Author’s own calculation and visualization) 124
- Fig. 3.10 GDP per capita (SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT) in the OECD and OECD countries (2002–2016): Nordic countries, USA, EU15, EU28, and Japan. Scale range 0–100: 0 = (theoretical) minimum, 100 = empirical maximum (*Source* Author’s own calculation and visualization) 125
- Fig. 3.11 (Lower) CO₂ emissions (SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT) in the OECD and OECD countries (2002–2016): Nordic countries, USA, EU15, EU28, and Japan. Scale range 0–100: 0 = (theoretical) minimum, 100 = empirical maximum (*Source* Author’s own calculation and visualization) 126
- Fig. 4.1 Political Freedom in the non-OECD countries and world regions (2002–2016): Latin America (LA), Asia, Russia and Nigeria. Scale range 0–100: 0 = (theoretical)

	minimum, 100 = empirical maximum (<i>Source</i> Author's own calculation and visualization)	152
Fig. 4.2	Economic Freedom in the non-OECD countries and world regions (2002–2016): Latin America (LA), Asia, Russia and Nigeria. Scale range 0–100: 0 = (theoretical) minimum, 100 = empirical maximum (<i>Source</i> Author's own calculation and visualization)	153
Fig. 4.3	Economic Freedom in the non-OECD countries and world regions (2002–2016): Latin America (LA), Asia, Russia and Nigeria. Scale range 0–100: 0 = (theoretical) minimum, 100 = empirical maximum (<i>Source</i> Author's own calculation and visualization)	153
Fig. 4.4	Income Equality in the non-OECD countries and world regions (2002–2016): Latin America (LA), Asia, Russia and Nigeria. Scale range 0–100: 0 = (theoretical) minimum, 100 = empirical maximum (<i>Source</i> Author's own calculation and visualization)	154
Fig. 4.5	Gender Equality in the non-OECD countries and world regions (2002–2016): Latin America (LA), Asia, Russia and Nigeria. Scale range 0–100: 0 = (theoretical) minimum, 100 = empirical maximum (<i>Source</i> Author's own calculation and visualization)	154
Fig. 4.6	Human Development (HDI redesigned) in the non-OECD countries and world regions (2002–2016): Latin America (LA), Asia, Russia and Nigeria. Scale range 0–100: 0 = (theoretical) minimum, 100 = empirical maximum (<i>Source</i> Author's own calculation and visualization)	156
Fig. 4.7	Sustainable Development (non-political) in the non-OECD countries and world regions (2002–2016): Latin America (LA), Asia, Russia and Nigeria. Scale range 0–100: 0 = (theoretical) minimum, 100 = empirical maximum (<i>Source</i> Author's own calculation and visualization)	156
Fig. 4.8	Sustainable Development (non-political and political) in the non-OECD countries and world regions (2002–2016): Latin America (LA), Asia, Russia and Nigeria. Scale range 0–100: 0 = (theoretical) minimum, 100 = empirical maximum (<i>Source</i> Author's own calculation and visualization)	157

Fig. 4.9	Life expectancy (Sustainable Development) in the non-OECD countries and world regions (2002–2016): Latin America (LA), Asia, Russia and Nigeria. Scale range 0–100: 0 = (theoretical) minimum, 100 = empirical maximum (<i>Source</i> Author’s own calculation and visualization)	157
Fig. 4.10	Tertiary education (“Sustainable Development”) in the non-OECD countries and world regions (2002–2016): Latin America (LA), Asia, Russia and Nigeria. Scale range 0–100: 0 = (theoretical) minimum, 100 = empirical maximum (<i>Source</i> Author’s own calculation and visualization)	158
Fig. 4.11	GDP per capita (Sustainable Development) in the non-OECD countries and world regions (2002–2016): Latin America (LA), Asia, Russia and Nigeria. Scale range 0–100: 0 = (theoretical) minimum, 100 = empirical maximum (<i>Source</i> Author’s own calculation and visualization)	158
Fig. 4.12	(Lower) CO ₂ emissions (Sustainable Development) in the non-OECD countries and world regions (2002–2016): Latin America (LA), Asia, Russia and Nigeria. Scale range 0–100: 0 = (theoretical) minimum, 100 = empirical maximum (<i>Source</i> Author’s own calculation and visualization)	159
Fig. 5.1	Comparison of the OECD (OECD35) with the world (world122) across dimensions and indicators (2002–2016). Scale range 0–100: 0 = (theoretical) minimum, 100 = empirical maximum (<i>Source</i> Author’s own calculation and visualization)	201
Fig. 5.2	Comparison of the OECD (OECD35) with the world (world 110) across dimensions and indicators (2002–2016). Scale range 0–100: 0 = (theoretical) minimum, 100 = empirical maximum (<i>Source</i> Author’s own calculation and visualization)	202
Fig. 5.3	Development of the world (world122) across dimensions and indicators (2002–2016). Scale range 0–100: 0 = (theoretical) minimum, 100 = empirical maximum (<i>Source</i> Author’s own calculation and visualization)	203

Fig. 5.4	Comparison of score values (levels) for the world (world 122) for the early 2000s and late 2010s (2002 and 2016). Scale range 0–100: 0 = (theoretical) minimum, 100 = empirical maximum (<i>Source</i> Author's own calculation)	204
Fig. 5.5	Growth rates of score values (levels) for the world (world 122) for the 2000s and 2010s by comparing 2002 and 2016 (<i>Source</i> Author's own calculation)	205
Fig. 5.6	Comparison of score values (levels) for the OECD (OECD35) and the world (world 122) for late 2010s (2016). Scale range 0–100: 0 = (theoretical) minimum, 100 = empirical maximum (<i>Source</i> Author's own calculation)	210
Fig. 5.7	Comparison of distance (gap) of score values (levels) for the OECD (OECD35) ahead of the world (world 122) for the early 2000s and late 2010s (2002 and 2016) (<i>Source</i> Author's own calculation)	211
Fig. 5.8	Growth rates of score values (levels) for the OECD (OECD35) and the world (world 122) for the 2000s and 2010s by comparing 2002 and 2016 (sorted by OECD) (<i>Source</i> Author's own calculation)	212
Fig. 5.9	Growth rates of score values (levels) for the OECD (OECD35) and the world (world 122) for the 2000s and 2010s by comparing 2002 and 2016 (sorted by world) (<i>Source</i> Author's own calculation)	213
Fig. 6.1	Political swings, political left/right swings (<i>Source</i> Author's own conceptualization and visualization)	228
Fig. 6.2	The conceptual overlapping of government/opposition cycles and political (left/right) swings (<i>Source</i> Author's own conceptualization and visualization)	229
Fig. 6.3	Average frequency of person change and party change of head of government based on a ranking of countries (151 countries) in reference to political freedom (for the fifteen-year period 2002–2016) (<i>Source</i> Author's own calculations and visualization based on Table 6.5)	274
Fig. 7.1	Average means for the score values of the United States and the EU (EU15) for the dimensions of Freedom and Equality (whole period 2002–2016). Scale range 0–100:	

	0 = (theoretical) minimum, 100 = empirical maximum (<i>Source</i> Author's own calculation)	289
Fig. 7.2	Average means for the score values of the United States and the EU (EU15) for the dimensions of Freedom and Equality (whole period 2002–2016). Scale range 0–100: 0 = (theoretical) minimum, 100 = empirical maximum (<i>Source</i> Author's own calculation)	290
Fig. 7.3	Average means for the score values of the United States and the EU (EU15 and EU28) for the dimensions of Freedom and Equality (whole period 2002–2016). Scale range 0–100: 0 = (theoretical) minimum, 100 = empirical maximum (<i>Source</i> Author's own calculation)	292
Fig. 7.4	Average means for the score values of the United States and Nordic Countries for the dimensions of Freedom and Equality (whole period 2002–2016). Scale range 0–100: 0 = (theoretical) minimum, 100 = empirical maximum (<i>Source</i> Author's own calculation)	295
Fig. 7.5	Average means for the score values of the OECD (OECD35) and the world (world 122) for the dimensions of Freedom and Equality (whole period 2002–2016). Scale range 0–100: 0 = (theoretical) minimum, 100 = empirical maximum (<i>Source</i> Author's own calculation)	296
Fig. 7.6	Average means for the score values of the OECD, Nordic Countries, U.S., and the world (world 122) for the dimensions of Freedom and Equality (whole period 2002–2016). Scale range 0–100: 0 = (theoretical) minimum, 100 = empirical maximum (<i>Source</i> Author's own calculation)	299
Fig. 7.7	Average means for the score values of the OECD, Nordic Countries, U.S., and the world (world 122) for the dimensions of Freedom and Equality (whole period 2002–2016). Scale range 0–100: 0 = (theoretical) minimum, 100 = empirical maximum (<i>Source</i> Author's own calculation)	300
Fig. 7.8	Average means for the score values of Latin America and Asia (Asia 15) for the dimensions of Freedom and Equality (whole period 2002–2016). Scale range 0–100: 0 = (theoretical) minimum, 100 = empirical maximum (<i>Source</i> Author's own calculation)	305

Fig. 7.9	Average means for the score values of China and India for the dimensions of Freedom and Equality (whole period 2002–2016). Scale range 0–100: 0 = (theoretical) minimum, 100 = empirical maximum (<i>Source</i> Author’s own calculation)	308
Fig. 7.10	Average means for the score values of China, India and Russia for the dimensions of Freedom and Equality (whole period 2002–2016). Scale range 0–100: 0 = (theoretical) minimum, 100 = empirical maximum (<i>Source</i> Author’s own calculation)	310
Fig. 7.11	The Quadruple and Quintuple Helix innovation systems in relation to society, economy, democracy and social ecology (<i>Source</i> Author’s own conceptualization based on Carayannis and Campbell [2014, p. 15], Carayannis et al. [2012, p. 4], and adapted from Carayannis and Campbell [2009, p. 207]. See also Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff [2000])	343

List of Tables

Table 6.1	Head of government (de facto head of government) of 151 countries in mid-2018 (as of April 30, 2018)	244
Table 6.2	Peaceful person change of head of government (de facto head of government): number of years with at least one peaceful person change (per year), 1990–2017	251
Table 6.3	Peaceful party change of head of government (de facto head of government): number of years with at least one peaceful party change (per year), 1990–2017	257
Table 6.4	Comparison of political freedom (dimension) with person change and party change of head of government (de facto head of government): countries ranked by average (mean) of political freedom (2002–2016)	266
Table 6.5	Average frequency of person change and party change of head of government (de facto head of government) based on a ranking of countries in reference to political freedom (for the years 2002–2016)	273
Table 6.6	Correlation of “political freedom” with “person change of head of government” and “party change of head of government”	276