



КИЇВСЬКИЙ НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ
ІМЕНІ ТАРАСА ШЕВЧЕНКА

НАВЧАЛЬНО-НАУКОВИЙ ІНСТИТУТ
ПУБЛІЧНОГО УПРАВЛІННЯ ТА ДЕРЖАВНОЇ СЛУЖБИ



НЕЗАЛЕЖНОСТІ УКРАЇНИ: ДОСЯГНЕННЯ, ВИКЛИКИ, ПЕРСПЕКТИВИ

Матеріали міжнародної науково-практичної конференції
(Київ, 10 вересня 2021 р.)

За загальною редакцією
Л. Г. Комахи, О. М. Андрєєвої, В. А. Гошовської

Київ
2021

Jan-Urban Sandal,

Doctor of Philosophy, Professor, Rector and Owner, Fil. Dr. Jan-U. Sandal Institute

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8072-0822>

Ян-Урбан Сандал,

доктор філософських наук, професор, ректор Інституту Яна-Урбана Сандала (Норвегія)

DEMOCRACY AND ECONOMIC GROWTH: SOME CLASSICAL APPROACHES

ДЕМОКРАТІЯ ТА ЕКОНОМІЧНЕ ЗРОСТАННЯ: ДЕЯКІ КЛАСИЧНІ ПІДХОДИ

Перспективи парламентаризму в парламентсько-президентській формі правління з часом висловлюються по-різному, а також вирішують різні виклики. У цих тезах здійснено аналіз зародження сучасної демократії та політичного порядку від давніх часів до сьогодення на основі деяких класичних підходів. Інновації, підприємництво, економічне зростання, загальне благо та воля людей, права власності та кантійська моральна філософія детально обговорюються з особливим акцентом на традиції економічного аналізу Сей-Шумпетера-Сандала. Успішне підприємництво за своєю природою є силою, яка пропагує демократичний спосіб життя та демократичні цінності.

Ключові слова: демократія, парламентаризм, інновації, демократичні цінності, неолітична революція.

Even thou the European form of parliamentarism dates back to the twelfth century, the eighteen-century philosophy of democracy may constitute the classic doctrine, according to Joseph A. Schumpeter: «the democratic method is that institutional arrangement for arriving at political decisions which realizes the common good by making people itself decide issues through the election of individuals who are to assemble in order to carry out its will» [5, p. 250]. This specific democratic method deals with two main issues; the common good and the will of the people.

The common good does not necessarily cover the definition or content of the good life as expressed by Aristotle, which is that the end and purpose of the polis is the good life, or Adam Smith, stating that good life equals material goods, intellectual and moral excellences of character. There is no such thing as the common good that all people could agree on or be forced to agree on by rational arguments or violations, mainly because different group belongings have different value systems and thus different wants and desires.

The will of the people is not necessarily the wills of the individuals. When the idea of the common good fails to serve the individuals, the will of the people does likewise. The founding fathers of the modern eighteen-century understanding of what democracy is and should be, failed to look beyond the ironmongers worldview. No one could predict what the world would be like two and a half centuries in the future.

The modern democratic model is supposed to uphold the will of the people for the common good and is based on respect for the democratic process and its selected representatives. The common good based on the democratic process must claim ethical dignity to achieve a meaningful and just society. However, the effectiveness of parliamentarism is usually not so high that not all good men's opinions can be held roughly to the same outcome. On the contrary, decision making in parliamentary is based on the allocation of votes, while individuals in their professions usually make judgmental decisions.

Economic growth, which constitutes the basics of a democratic society, depends on property rights, the security for the entrepreneur that his production means, equity, credits, intellectual rights

etc. are guaranteed by an autonomous rule of government. There are different views of the moral ethics of property rights. Property rights are a common good according to John Locke who states that God had made the earth and all inferior creatures common to all men, while Jeremy Bentham proposes that property and law are born together and die together. Mark E. Warren points to one of the very essence of the democratic problems and challenges namely that too great a resource mix between power, money and «normative means» could have negative effects on democracy and concludes that regulation, intervention and selective support would be needed to achieve democratic goals.

Institutional arrangements through elections of individuals unite the essence of prospects of parliamentarism in the parliamentary-presidential form of government, at least as long as the purposes, governing contents and dignity of political players are acceptable to the common person. This acceptance reflects the Kantian moral philosophy, understood as acting in accordance with one's moral duty rather than one's desires. Our question is not how it works, but rather whether it works.

One of the main explanations why nations fail is given by Acemoglu and Robinson in their analyzes on the subject based on a simple theory to explain the main contours of economic and political development around the world since the Neolithic Revolution. «Inclusive economic institutions that enforce property rights, create a level playing field, and encourage investments in new technologies and skills are more conducive to economic growth than extractive economic institutions that are structured to extract resources from the many to the few and that fail to protect property rights or provide incentive for economic activity. Inclusive economic institutions are in turn supported by, and support, inclusive political institutions, that is, those that distribute political power widely in a pluralistic manner and are able to achieve some amount of political centralization so as to establish law and order, the foundations of secure property rights, and an inclusive market economy. Similarly, extractive economic institutions are synergistically linked to extractive political institutions, which concentrate power in the hands of the few, who will then have incentives to maintain and develop extractive institutions for their benefit and use the resources they obtain to cement their hold on political power» [1, p. 429–430].

We are still left with the moral aspect of the individuals' freedom. Does economic growth and development arise from political decisions and political actions to show something to be right or reasonable, or from the individual entrepreneurship in an open economy? What is the source of innovations as opposed to the processes of inventions, new products and new methods? Only entrepreneurs can make innovations, governments cannot [3]. Referring to the new social class system, which reflects social norms and social status of individuals in the world today, the entire political system and all their functioning members are located in the static part of the economy in contrast to the few individuals globally who promote dynamic economic change and democratic achievements and dissemination across the world [4].

The private sector growth challenges the strong state. The eighteen-century thinking on democracy and presidential-parliamentarism does not automatically catch up with the legitimate demand to increase and secure the individual freedoms the way the world has evolved the last two to three decades, not least based on the post-World War II invention of human rights laws. Francis Fukuyama points to the many failings of modern democracies and specially the weakness of not being able to make difficult decisions to ensure their long-term economic and political survival: “While liberal democracy may be regarded today as the most legitimate form of government, its legitimacy is conditioned on performance. That performance depends in turn on its being able to maintain an

adequate balance between strong state action when necessary and the kinds of individual freedoms that are the basis of its democratic legitimacy and that foster private-sector growth” [2, p. 481–482].

Modern democracy is one of the results of economic growth. Economic growth is based on innovation carried out by entrepreneurs. Successful entrepreneurship is a contrasting response to the Neolithic Revolution mainly because innovation breaks down the structural barriers between people, social classes, and sediment power structures and is by nature a power that promotes democratic way of living and values.

References

1. Acemogly, D. and Robinson, J. A. (2012), *Why nations fall*. London: PROFILE BOOKS LTD. 529 pages.
2. Fukuyama, F. (2011), *The Origins of Political Order: From Prehuman times to the French Revolution*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux. 585 pages.
3. Sandal, J-U. (2003), *Jakten på Entreprenøren. Kan Joseph A. Schumpeters teori benyttes til å indentifisere og differensiere entreprenører i det 21. århundre?* Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell International. 226 pages.
4. Sandal, J-U. (2017), How innovation maintains and develops democracy. *Economic Annals-XXI Journal*. Volume 165, Issue 5-6, Pages: 23-26 October 11, 2017, <https://doi.org/10.21003/ea.V165-05>.
5. Schumpeter, J. A. (1942), *Capitalism, socialism and democracy*. New York: Harper & Brothers. 431 pages.

Наукове видання

30 РОКІВ НЕЗАЛЕЖНОСТІ УКРАЇНИ: ДОСЯГНЕННЯ, ВИКЛИКИ, ПЕРСПЕКТИВИ

Матеріали міжнародної науково-практичної конференції
(Київ, 10 вересня 2021 року)

За загальною редакцією
Л. Г. Комахи, О. М. Андрєєвої, В. А. Гошовської

Підп. до друку 25.10.2021.
Формат 60х84/8. Обл.-вид. арк. 25,64. Ум.-друк. арк. 38,13.

Видавець
Навчально-науковий інститут публічного управління та державної служби
Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка
Навчальна лабораторія методичного
та видавничого забезпечення навчального процесу
03057, Київ, вул. Антона Цедіка, 20.

