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Poast and Urpelainen’s book is comprehensive guide for scholars, policy analyst and a democratic consolidation practitioner who has provided empirical cases from Europe, America and Africa in a one read. In the ongoing system where liberalism is under threat keeping in view post Brexit scenario, this read is a great hope for rising democracies to nurture creating their own IOs with the assistance of established democracies. This provides a great deal of knowledge about domestic governance and the role of international organizations in strengthening it. The issue author describe is there is non-clarity in mechanism - either...
democratization encourages the formation of IOs or increased global substantiation in form of IOs enhances democratic norms in society? The basic aim of the study is to investigate the unclear mechanism so far as the association between emerging number of democracies and IOs is concerned; and the general idea of the book also revolve around the links between IOs and democratizing states and between IOs and democratic consolidation and also explaining the major role performed by democratizing states in creation of innumerable IOs. (Poast & Urpelainen, 2018, p.5)

So far as the structure of the Poast and Urpelainen’s writing is concerned the first part consists of theory regarding why transitional democracies create own IOs? Furthermore, it also include the IOs membership help such democracies strengthen their democratic consolidation process over time which ultimately itself cause reversal of military coups. However, the part two consists of quantitative analysis of aforementioned assertions at first hand asserting democratization is associated with state forming new IOs not joining the old ones and how IO’s affect democratic consolidation in a positive or negative manner. As the research strategy is mainly based on a mixed method approach therefore, part three contains qualitative analysis about author’s quantitative claims in previous part. The authors found the relationship between democratization and state creating new IOs in the quantitative analysis based on two tests. On the other hand, for the sake of deep down analysis and mechanism of aforementioned association they looked into qualitative analysis of an empirical case. The Baltic state experience with IOs membership and forming new IO is included for the sake of democratic consolidation and some Sub-Saharan African and American case studies are also included. Finally, the concluding part describes the relationship between global governance and the spread of democracy where IOs perform a role of technical assistance and tools to democratic consolidation process over time. (Poast & Urpelainen, 2018, p.18).

since the claims and arguments of the authors are analyzed through statistical analysis of whether there is an association or not between old or new IOs and democratic association and these statistical tests are also verified with the help of qualitative analysis studying some case studies consequently, it seems there is a huge similarity and synergy of thoughts in text no matter it is start, middle part or end. This is to say as every evidence is aimed at proving one truth and demonstrate clarity. According to the author’s argument although institutions have a minimal influence on state behavior and not a panacea but they assist in democratic consolidation process with the passage of time. They assert IOs assist transitional democracies in the form of technical assistance and public goods to establish and strengthen democratic consolidation process. However, these may not prevent forceful democratic instability and military coups. How IOs assist in democratic consolidations the question is answered in this way.

The authors explain the Russian external threat to Baltic States post independence as a major obstacle to their democratic consolidation process. They therefore, formed their own peacekeeping-oriented and regional security IO, Baltic Batalian (BALTBAT) with Nordic cooperation. (Poast & Urpelainen, 2018, p.129) these states improved their security situation with the help of this new IO as NATO was not geographically suitable at that time to support such action more than Nordic states. (Poast & Urpelainen, 2018, p.136). Poast and Urpelainen explained three benefits of forming BALTBAT as an organization through which technical assistance has been given to Baltic States, an economical way of getting assistance from western established democracies and a smooth path to enter into a lucrative NATO. Hence Baltic experience proved the theory of the authors in terms of democratizing state forming new IO to solve internal governance and international cooperation and they form it to demonstrate established IOs they are eligible and worthy to participate. (Poast & Urpelainen, 2018, p.157). However, merely security situation does not fall under the category of democratic consolidation process of a democratizing state. There are some other factors as well which need attention of the writers.

The authors have well provided with a basic step towards the inauguration of democratic consolidation covering two distinct geographical regions and comparing different cases in both regions and not the deeper root growth of such consolidation for that matter. Undoubtedly, this may be utilized in contemporary context yet there is a small shortcoming in regards to various issues the contemporary democracies face in terms of migration issues and managing different ethnicities. It needs a more holistic and deeper down approach known democratic consocialism. No matter how deeper and accurate analysis is keeping in view empirical evidence it does not demonstrate to be a one-fits-all formula in terms of
generalisability as the environment and political culture varies from state to state and region to region.

In conclusion finding out the results of the authors, Poast and Urpelainen asserted a noticeable connection between growth of democracies and the growth of IOs which they proved very well through quantitative and qualitative analysis simultaneously using mixed method approach. They also lay stress on issue the lack of institutional capacity as an obstacle in the way of joining lucrative IOs based on their conditions which was so precise in case of Baltic States geographically adjacent to Nordic states and they sought assistance from them in making BALTBAT. According to them Unique government issues require unique IOs and forming new IOs have internal and external incentives for a transitional democracy e.g. a stepping stone towards membership in established IOs in terms of Baltic experience as an empirical instance from BALTBAT to NATO within ten years. For this reason, IOs does matter a lot keeping view varied circumstances of various states and leaders as per their structure and nature of democracy. (Poast & Urpelainen, 2018.p.188)

Poast and Urpelainen show that IO might have a positive effect on member states in terms of reputation and legitimization. Their Baltic experience evidence supports this view. Democratic consolidation requires institutional transformation and institutional transformation takes time especially for autocratic democratizing states which might be done with socialization one element of underlying mechanism of democratization provided by Pevehouse. However, the author’s argument is against this element; and considers IOs as product of democratization. (Poast & Urpelainen, 2018.p.193)

They suggested established democracies must support the democratization of new democracies in supporting and encouraging those forming new IOs and providing them with technical assistance. For instance, EU may support democratic consolidation in countries Ukraine and Serbia. Additionally, they guide IOs might support democratic consolidation but this is the one way and there is still need to know more ways. (Poast & Urpelainen, 2018.p.200). Another option might be consociational theory which empirically grounded normative theory aimed at providing a democratic solution to confronted and diverse – political and democratizing system sometimes emerged out of autocracies or colonial subjugations. Despite of varied concerns due to consociational aspects they interact equally in a plural society in terms of coalition, mutual veto for minority rights and a high degree of autonomy for each department. Netherland, Austria, Balgium and Switzerland are experienced example of such stance. However, it is also not feasible and suitable for every case and might not be generalized its applicability without research on other cases. (Mushtaq, Muhammad, & Alqama, 2011)

As has been mentioned before, there has been a synergy in writing of authors, they have described the issue in the start, tested it quantitatively and qualitative in the middle and guided the relevant accurate conclusion in the end well.
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