



Untangling the link between political regime and economic growth: a multidimensional analysis through a recent systematic literature review

Merwan AATANY¹, Essaid TARBALOUTI²

¹ (Doctorant en sciences économiques), Université Cadi Ayyad/ FSJES, Marrakech

² (PES, enseignant-chercheur), Université Cadi Ayyad/ FSJES, Marrakech

Abstract: The complex relationship between political regime and economic development has sparked intense debate across disciplines. While some argue for the efficiency of authoritarian regimes in fostering economic growth, others emphasize the necessity of political and economic freedoms. This paper conducts a thorough literature review to explore recent research on the impact of authoritarian and democratic regimes on economic growth.

With enduring scholarly and policy interest, the study aims to discern whether democratic or authoritarian regimes are more conducive to economic growth and to identify the underlying mechanisms. It also investigates the roles of political and economic freedoms in promoting sustained and inclusive economic progress. Adopting a multidimensional approach, the research seeks to uncover the intricate links between economic growth and political regime. By integrating existing knowledge and recent research, it provides crucial insights into the complex interactions between economics and politics, enriching understanding of the diverse impacts of political regimes on economic development.

Keywords: Political regime, economic growth, Authoritarian regimes, democratic regime, sustainable development.

Digital Object Identifier (DOI): <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10877949>

Published in: Volume 3 Issue 2



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

1. Introduction

The relationship between political regime and economic development has generated lively debate in economics, social and political sciences. In favor or against; some argue that authoritarian regimes provide an environment conducive to economic growth because of their ability to make decisions quickly and efficiently (Singh and Zammit (2016)), while others argue that political and economic freedoms are essential to fostering sustainable economic development (Berggren and Bjørnskov (2018)). This literature review focuses on recent research that explores the effects of authoritarian and democratic regimes on economic growth.

This topic has been of interest to researchers and policy makers for decades with a multitude of opinions. This diversity creates fertile ground for an in-depth examination of current debates about how the nature of the political regime can influence the trajectory of economic growth in a country.

The issue to be addressed in this article is therefore to understand whether economic growth is more favored by democratic or authoritarian political regimes, and to assess the specific factors underlying this relationship. In addition, consideration should be given to how political and economic freedoms can play a key role in promoting sustained and sustainable economic growth. This issue calls for an in-depth examination of the mechanisms by which different political regimes influence economic policies; unpack the advantages and limitations of each regime, government effectiveness and political stability, and how these factors in turn can impact economic growth¹.

In recent years, new perspectives and more abundant empirical data have emerged, opening up new lines of thought to better understand the complexity of the relationship between economic growth and political regime. This paper aims to contribute to this debate by examining current debates and offering a critical analysis of the different theories and empirical studies.² Adopting a multidimensional approach, we will seek to identify the underlying mechanisms that explain the links between economic growth and the nature of the political regime, as well as the specific conditions under which each type of regime may be more or less conducive to economic growth at different times. long term, inclusive; sustainable economic development.

In sum, this article offers an opportunity to explore the nuances of contemporary debates on the relationship between economic growth and political regime, while shedding light on the crucial factors, including political and economic freedoms, that can shape a nation's economic prosperity. . Drawing on existing knowledge and the most recent works, this research aspires to provide essential insights to guide and contribute to a better understanding of the complex interactions between economics and politics.

What follows provides an invaluable opportunity to deepen and broaden our understanding of contemporary debates about the complex relationship between economic growth and political regime. By critically examining the multiple facets of this question, we seek to identify the underlying mechanisms that connect these two crucial areas of study. More specifically, we will look at the impact of the two political regimes, democracies and authoritarian regimes, on the triggering factors of economic growth (economic policies, government efficiency, political stability and political freedoms, etc.).

By building on existing knowledge and incorporating the most recent research, our approach aims to provide essential insights while identifying the key factors that shape the benefits and limitations of each diet.

This study is not limited to a simple review of the existing literature, but seeks to deepen current debates by exploring the similarities and dissimilarities in the impact of political regimes. By demonstrating a multidisciplinary approach, we aim to enrich our understanding of the complex relationships between economics and politics.

Our drafting plan will be as follows; the next section we will analyze the impact of authoritarian regimes on economic growth, in the same logic section 3 will deal with democratic regimes, section 4 will be attached to points of similarities and dissimilarities before ending with a general conclusion.

¹ To use it, we will discuss the conclusions of famous recent studies in this field of research.

² This analysis will be via a reading in the factors in favor or against economic growth while differentiating between political regimes.

2. authoritarian regimes³

2.1 Factors favorable to economic growth in authoritarian regimes

These risks will be the subject of the following paragraph. Some studies suggest that authoritarian regimes can promote economic growth through their political stability (Izadi and Asgary (2019)), which makes it possible to maintain coherent economic policies. Moreover, the ability of authoritarian political leaders to make decisions quickly can facilitate the implementation of bold,

“Dictatorship will often be optimal for very poor countries” David BROOKS
“It is possible for a dictator to govern in a liberal way” Friedrich HAYEK

long-term economic policies. Finally, these regimes can exploit economic resources without being constrained by the political and social considerations imposed by democracy.

In such regimes, various factors seem to promote economic growth. A series of studies suggest that the political stability they provide can play a crucial role in allowing coherent economic policies to be put in place. Continuity in decision-making provides a predictable environment, thereby encouraging long-term investment and promoting sustainable economic growth.

The ability of authoritative leaders to make quick decisions can also be a strong asset. For example, the comparative study of the history of Germany, Russia, China and Egypt which examined how the speed of decision-making in regimes can be an advantage for these diets (Izdebski (2019)), the Chinese example and the ability of its government to make strategic decisions that allow for rapid development and the projection of China's power throughout the world, including the Western Hemisphere (Kono (2016)) and without forgetting the authoritarian regimes of the region MENA⁴ who have often been able to make quick decisions in response to internal and external pressures, which has allowed them to stay in power longer (Menaldo (2015)). This responsiveness allows them to implement bold and ambitious economic policies without the delays often associated with democratic processes. Prompt action can therefore make it possible to seize strategic economic opportunities and respond effectively to emerging challenges.

Another potential advantage of authoritarian regimes lies in their ability to exploit economic resources without being hampered by the political and social considerations imposed by democracy and even in the case of crises or states of emergency, the case of the COVID-19 pandemic set a good example (Finkel (2019)). This can facilitate the implementation of major infrastructure projects and large-scale economic initiatives, which might otherwise be hampered by political debates or competing interests; the quality of governance and its effect on the economic outcomes of infrastructure investment in sub-Saharan Africa, a region with multiple authoritarian regimes (Kounou (2021)), in this case Nigeria is a good example over the last decade, a country with an authoritarian regime that has been able to make significant investments in infrastructure that have positively impacted economic growth (Khawaj and Mian (2018)). Ultimately, it is essential to recognize that the relationship between authoritarian regimes and economic growth is complex and multifactorial. Each case must be carefully considered taking into account the specific context of the country concerned. Understanding the nuances of this relationship can inform public policy and allow decision makers to better understand the challenges and opportunities associated with economic development in authoritarian regimes. However, it should be noted that these supposed benefits are not without consideration. Authoritarian regimes can also pose potential risks to

³ The characteristics of authoritarian rule may vary from country to country, but there are some common trends. For example, in many authoritarian regimes, the media is controlled by the state and used as a propaganda tool to promote the government's vision and suppress any dissent. (Nguyen-Pochan, 2021).

⁴ Middle East North Africa

economic growth. Lack of accountability and democratic control can lead to mismanagement of resources and ineffective long-term economic policies. Moreover, the concentration of power can encourage corruption and bureaucratic inefficiency, which can harm the business environment and hinder economic development. These risks will be the subject of the following sub-section.

2.2 Factors Limiting Economic Growth in Authoritarian Regimes

Other studies point to the limitations of authoritarian regimes on economic growth, such as poor resource management and why resource-rich countries often have poor growth rates (Robinson, Torvik and Verdier (2018)), bureaucratic inefficiency and its effect on the state's ability to mobilize financial resources (Cortes, Maldonado (2019)) and the risks of corruption that emerge in this type of regime (Acemoglu and Ribinson (2019)).

Lack of accountability and democratic control can also hamper the implementation of effective long-term economic policies, while political repression and lack of individual freedoms can create social and political tensions that undermine economic stability.

Authoritarian regimes may face a range of factors limiting their economic growth. Various studies highlight these limitations, first highlighting the issue of mismanagement of economic resources. In the absence of democratic accountability mechanisms, authoritarian rulers may be inclined to prioritize their own interests over general economic well-being. This misallocation of resources can hinder sustainable economic development and undermine national prosperity.

Furthermore, bureaucratic inefficiency is a major obstacle to economic growth in authoritarian regimes. The concentration of power in the hands of a few can lead to inconsistent bureaucratic decisions and cumbersome and unresponsive administrative processes. The absence of democratic control mechanisms often means that there is little pressure to improve the efficiency and transparency of the machinery of government, which can hamper the implementation of effective economic policies.

Another key factor is the risk of corruption in authoritarian regimes. When there is no real accountability, leaders and elites have less incentive to act ethically, which can lead to widespread corruption. Corruption can divert public resources, hamper foreign investment and undermine the confidence of economic actors, thus hampering sustainable economic development.

Moreover, the absence of democratic accountability can hamper the implementation of effective long-term economic policies. Authoritarian rulers may be inclined to adopt short-term policies aimed at consolidating their power rather than making strategic economic decisions that would benefit society as a whole in the long term. This political myopia can limit the potential for sustainable economic growth and lead to long-term negative consequences.

An often overlooked but essential aspect is the link between individual freedoms, political stability and economic growth. The absence of political and individual freedoms in authoritarian regimes can create social and political tensions, thus threatening economic stability. Demonstrations, political repression and social unrest can lead to economic instability, discourage foreign investment and damage a country's image on the international scene.

In conclusion, the factors limiting economic growth in authoritarian regimes are numerous and complex. Mismanagement of resources, bureaucratic inefficiency, corruption risks, lack of democratic accountability and social tensions are important challenges to overcome. Understanding these limitations is essential to developing effective public policies and fostering sustainable economic

**“The best weapon of a dictatorship is
secrecy“ Niels BOHR**

**“History reminds us that dictators and
despots arise during times of severe
economic crisis “ Robert KIYOSAKI**

development in these specific contexts. Finding a balance between political stability and individual freedoms is crucial to creating an environment conducive to economic and social prosperity

3. democracy⁵

3.1 Factors favorable to economic growth in democratic regimes

Indeed, understanding how political and economic freedoms interact with the political regime can help create environments conducive to sustainable economic growth, thereby promoting human well-being and social stability. Various studies highlight the benefits of democratic regimes for economic growth. Political stability that uses the institutionalization of the economy and

“A democracy exists whenever those who are free and are not well-off, being in the majority, are in sovereign control of government, an oligarchy when control lies with the rich and better-born, these being few” Aristotle

democratic consolidation (Acemoglu and Robinson (2020)), the predictability of economic policies is often cited as favorable factors for growth in democracies given the impact of political certainty on crucial sectors. In addition, government transparency and accountability can reduce corruption and create an enabling environment for investment through institutional transparency and economic growth (Knack (2019)). Citizen participation and the protection of human rights can also stimulate innovation and economic efficiency through citizen participation, including voting, positively impact economic growth in democratic regimes, while emphasizing the effects of political participation on trust in institutions and economic well-being (Kataria and Tavits (2020)).

Understanding the mechanisms that connect political and economic freedoms to the political regime is key to shaping environments conducive to sustainable economic growth, thereby engendering human well-being and social stability. Numerous studies have highlighted the advantages of democratic regimes in terms of economic growth. Political stability and the predictability of economic policies are often considered key factors that promote growth in these contexts.

In democratic regimes, political stability is often enhanced by accountability mechanisms and peaceful alternation of power. This stability provides a reassuring environment for economic actors, encouraging them to invest for the long term and to take strategic economic decisions. Moreover, the predictability of economic policies allows companies and investors to plan their activities with confidence, thus helping to strengthen sustainable economic growth.

Transparency and government accountability are also essential elements in democratic regimes. By promoting the dissemination of information and holding political decision makers accountable, these regimes can reduce the risks of corruption and misuse of public funds. A more honest management of public resources creates an environment conducive to investments, thus encouraging economic growth and strengthening the confidence of economic actors.

Moreover, citizen participation is often more developed in democratic regimes. An active civil society can play a crucial role in bringing diverse perspectives and pushing for more inclusive and equitable economic policies. Taking into account the interests of the population promotes innovation and economic efficiency, because it makes it possible to better respond to the real needs of society.

⁵ "Democracy consists of a set of practices, institutions and values that allow citizens to participate in making decisions that affect their lives and the development of their community, their country and the world in which they live. It promotes citizen participation, transparency, accountability, equality and inclusion, as well as civil and political freedoms, while ensuring that the voices of minorities are also taken into account." Reference: UNDP. (2020)

In addition, democratic regimes generally emphasize the protection of human rights and individual freedoms. These rights are intimately linked to creativity, innovation and economic dynamism. When individuals feel free to express themselves and actively participate in political and economic life, this creates fertile ground for the development of a prosperous and sustainable economy.

In conclusion, democratic regimes offer a set of advantages that promote sustainable economic growth. Political stability, predictability of economic policies, transparency, government accountability, citizen participation and protection of human rights are all factors that interact positively to drive economic prosperity. By understanding and implementing these mechanisms, nations can work towards effective public policies and contribute to the economic and social development of their societies.

3.2 Factors Limiting Economic Growth in Democratic Regimes

However, some research also points to potential challenges for economic growth in democratic regimes.

political instability⁶ (Aisen and Veiga (2019)), slow decision-making and political pressures can lead to unpredictable and suboptimal economic policies, these pressures lead to poor governance (Dincecco and Wang (2019)). Democratic governments can also be influenced by vested interests and election cycles, which can hamper the economic reforms needed to promote long-term growth (Persson and Tabellini (2020)).

Although democratic regimes offer many advantages for fostering economic growth, some research also points to potential challenges that can limit this growth. One of the main obstacles is the political instability that can characterize democracies. Frequent changes of government can lead to fluctuations in economic policies and create uncertainty for economic actors, which can hamper long-term investments.

Furthermore, decision-making in democratic regimes can sometimes be slow and laborious. The need to consult with different stakeholders, negotiate compromises and respect democratic procedures can delay the implementation of bold and necessary economic policies. This slow decision-making can be detrimental, especially in a rapidly changing global economic environment where responsiveness is essential to seize opportunities and meet challenges.

Another factor that can limit economic growth in democratic regimes is political pressure from special interest groups. Political parties and leaders can be influenced by lobbies, powerful corporations or specific interest groups, which can lead them to adopt economic policies that serve these particular interests more than the general interest. This state capture by vested interests can hamper the implementation of economic reforms needed to foster long-term growth.

Moreover, electoral cycles can also play a role in limiting economic growth in democratic regimes. Incumbent governments may be tempted to implement popular short-term economic policies in an effort to win votes in elections, even if these policies are not always beneficial in the long term. This can lead to a lack of continuity in economic policies and undermine the implementation of structural reforms needed to boost sustainable growth.

In summary, although democratic regimes have undeniable assets for fostering economic growth, they are not immune to certain obstacles. Political instability, slow decision-making, political pressures and electoral cycles are all factors that can hinder the implementation of coherent and effective long-term

“A democratic government that respects no limits on its power is a ticking time bomb, waiting to destroy the rights it was created to protect “ James BOVARD

⁶ We mean by political instability in democratic regimes: political uncertainty, political crises and transitions in rule (the rotation of political currents on power)

economic policies. However, by understanding these challenges and putting in place mechanisms to overcome them, democracies can continue to foster sustainable and balanced economic development.

4. For an authoritarian or democratic regime?

Subject to a wide spectrum of controversy; Defining an optimal regime for a poor or developing country must call into question several variables and parameters that depend on this economy. Similarly, identifying the similarities and dissimilarities between the two regimes will be the interest of this section.

4.1 Similarities

Both types of regimes seek to maintain power, using rules, institutions and means to control the political behavior of citizens. In authoritarian and democratic regimes, maintaining power is a top priority for leaders and political elites. Authoritarian regimes tend to use more repressive techniques to maintain power, while democratic regimes often prefer subtler and less direct methods; From here we can say that the objective is the same but the paths diverge. In authoritarian regimes, power is often maintained through brute force and state control mechanisms, such as media censorship, suppression of protests, citizen surveillance, and historical or religious legitimacy. Authoritarian regimes also tend to insulate citizens from contrary information and opinions by controlling access to state secrets, foreign media and other sources of information such as NICTs.⁷ In democratic regimes, the maintenance of power relies more on the power of persuasion and negotiation, as well as the control of resources and the use of political institutions to strengthen their position. Democratic regimes are also more likely to cultivate alliances with special interest groups and non-state actors to strengthen their power and maintain their influence. However, it should be noted that even in democratic regimes, leaders may be tempted to resort to authoritarian methods of control to maintain their power, especially when their popularity is declining or when the risks of conflict increase. Thus, the maintenance of power remains a major concern for governments, regardless of their type of political regime.

Both types of regimes face complex economic, social and political issues that must be resolved to maintain stability and growth. In authoritarian and democratic regimes, leaders must deal with complex and varied issues that can threaten the stability, growth and security of their countries and their populations. Some of the most common challenges faced by governments of all regime types include:

- Economic failures: The economy and its health are dear to every political current. Governments must strive to create jobs, stimulate economic growth, guarantee financial stability and maintain a decent standard of living for the population. Authoritarian regimes often have a more state-led approach to these economic problems, while democratic regimes tend to have a more market-oriented economy.
- Social tensions: Leaders must deal with a variety of social tensions, such as economic inequalities, ethnic and religious conflicts, social movements and tensions between different regions of the country. Authoritarian regimes tend to have a more repressive response to these tensions, while democratic regimes often seek to address issues in a more open and inclusive manner.
- Security threats: Governments must also deal with internal and external threats to national security, such as organized crime, terrorism, border disputes and international conflicts. Authoritarian regimes may be tempted to reinforce their power by exploiting security threats, while democratic regimes often seek to protect the rights and freedoms of citizens while ensuring security.
- Environmental issues: Governments are increasingly confronted with environmental issues such as pollution, climate change, natural disasters and the management of natural resources. Authoritarian regimes tend to have a more centralized approach to these issues, while democratic regimes seek more participatory and collaborative solutions with civil society. Thus, authoritarian and democratic regimes all have to deal with varied and complex issues, and each has its own way of responding to these challenges, depending on their political philosophy, their system of values and their particular situation.

⁷ Restrict and control access to NICTs, or even sometimes suppress them as is the case in North Korea.

4.2 Dissimilarities ⁸

Authoritarian regimes tend to be led by a single leader or a small group of leaders who make unilateral decisions, while democratic regimes have more participatory and inclusive decision-making processes involving elected representatives. In addition, we dispute the quote that predicts that authoritarian regimes generally have weak political institutions, while democratic regimes have stronger and more independent institutions given the multitude of counter-examples that exist and the studies done in this field. of research. The second point to be mentioned is in particular that of the media, political parties, elections and judicial systems. In authoritarian regimes, decision-making is often centralized around a single leader, often supported by a small group of political, military and economic elites. Decisions are often made unilaterally, without consultation or meaningful participation of citizens. Authoritarian leaders tend to exercise strict control over the information and opinions circulating in society, thereby limiting the perspectives and viewpoints considered in decision-making. In contrast, democratic regimes have more complex and inclusive political institutions, involving direct citizen participation through elections and other forms of participatory governance. Elected representatives, such as members of parliament (representatives, mayors, walis, governors...), have more formal and consultative decision-making processes, often involving public hearings, debates and consultations with citizens' groups and civil society organizations. Democratic regimes also have multifaceted scales of governance, ranging from local to national level, as well as a strong separation of powers, thus limiting the power of a specific person or group to make unilateral decisions. However, it is important to note that democratic regimes are not entirely homogeneous and inclusive in their decision-making processes. Special interests can sometimes exert undue influence on government decisions, and consultation procedures may not be sufficient to enable genuine citizen participation in political decision-making. In sum, the differences between authoritarian and democratic regimes in decision-making reflect their different political philosophies and governance priorities.

Another essential point to mention is that in authoritarian regimes; the freedoms and rights of citizens are often restricted or suppressed, while in democratic regimes the freedoms and rights of citizens are protected by law. Authoritarian regimes, by definition, grant significant and unfettered political power to their leader or small group of leaders. To maintain this power, they can restrict or suppress the freedoms and rights of their citizens, such as freedom of expression, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly or even the freedom to participate in elections. Institutions such as the courts, parliament or the media are often controlled by the leader or group in power, resulting in a lack of checks and balances. In some cases, political formations, associations or religious groups are subject to prohibitions or restrictions.

In democratic regimes, freedom and individual rights are protected by legal procedures. Citizens enjoy a set of rights, such as the right to vote, the right to demonstrate, the right to be educated or even the right to practice a religion or a political belief. Government institutions, stemming from a system of separation of powers, are able to act independently with clearly limited legal and regulatory power. Legal guarantees, international instruments and the dynamics of social and demographic change have led to a growing reaffirmation of fundamental rights, making it possible to include more people, to strengthen equal treatment, to respect differences and to ensure the recognition and protection of the most vulnerable communities. In conclusion, the freedom and rights of citizens are sculpted by the philosophical, political and legal foundations of authoritarian and democratic regimes. Authoritarian regimes often inhibit rights, freedoms and spaces for participation to protect their own power and democratic regimes prioritize the protection of these rights to prevent abuses that citizens may face.

Popular pressure and protests are often repressed in authoritarian regimes, while in democratic regimes peaceful protests and demonstrations are often permitted and protected by law. In authoritarian regimes, protests or public demonstrations can be seen as a risk to public order and the stability of the regime in question. Public demonstrations are often suppressed by force, and citizens who participate may be arrested, imprisoned or subjected to physical violence. Authorities may also seek to dissuade citizens from attending rallies by threatening legal action, dismissal or economic sanctions. Democratic regimes thus recognize that freedom of expression and freedom of assembly are fundamental rights and protect

⁸ It should be noted that the purpose of this paragraph is to discuss the points of dissimilarity and divergence between the two regimes and not to favor one regime over the other.

them by law. Citizens can thus exercise their right to demonstrate, protest and demand social change, as long as these activities are peaceful and respectful of the laws in force. In sum, the repression of protests and public demonstrations is a common feature of authoritarian regimes, while democratic regimes are required to protect and promote the right of citizens to express, communicate and act collectively in defense of their fundamental rights.

Authoritarian regimes often have state-led economies, in contrast to democratic regimes which have freer and more open market economies which favors the presence of the state for authoritarian regimes and this remains a weapon to double sided. In authoritarian regimes, the state often plays a central role in managing and regulating the economy. The state can play in the economy of a country, depending on the type of political regime in place. States can control certain sectors of the economy, fix prices, regulate investments and sanction those who do not comply with established rules. In democratic regimes, the state plays a regulatory role and often encourages private enterprise and innovation. State-run economies can be efficient in some cases, but can also lack efficiency and innovation, leading to a concentration of wealth and power in the hands of the ruling elite. Ultimately, freer and more open economies are often more supportive of a free and fair market economy that provides equal economic opportunity for all. In sum, the differences between authoritarian regimes and democratic regimes are significant and reflect different approaches to governance, decision-making, and citizens' rights and freedoms.

5. Conclusion

A review of recent studies on the relationship between political regimes and economic growth reveals a complex landscape. Although some research suggests a positive link between authoritarian regimes and economic growth, others point to the specific benefits of democratic regimes. It is important to recognize that sustainable economic growth relies on a combination of complex factors, going beyond the simple political regime, such as institutions, public policies and economic incentives. Therefore, further research is needed to better understand this complex relationship.

This article discussed the favorable and limiting factors for economic growth in authoritarian and democratic regimes based on debates in recent literature. Authoritarian regimes can promote economic growth through their political stability and rapid decision-making, but can lack efficiency and innovation. Democratic regimes promote sustainable economic development with political stability, transparency, government accountability, citizen participation, and protection of human rights, but may face challenges such as political instability, slow decision-making and the fictitious democracy which makes the politician aims at the particular interest to the detriment of the general interest. The differences between authoritarian and democratic regimes reflect different approaches to governance, decision-making, citizens' freedoms and rights, and the economy, affecting economic growth and sustainable development.

Analysis of recent studies on the relationship between the political regime and economic growth reveals a complex and nuanced reality. Some research indeed suggests that there may be a positive link between authoritarian regimes and economic growth, attributing this to their ability to make quick and effective decisions in the absence of democratic constraints. However, other studies highlight the specific benefits of democratic regimes for economic growth, such as political stability, transparency, and government accountability that foster an environment conducive to investment and economic innovation.

However, it is crucial to recognize that sustainable economic growth depends on a complex set of factors, well beyond the political system alone. Strong economic institutions, coherent public policies, the protection of human rights, the promotion of education and innovation, and social stability all play a key role in a nation's economic prosperity.

Thus, it is essential not to reduce the relationship between political regime and economic growth to a simple dichotomy between authoritarianism and democracy. Patterns of economic development vary

across countries and contexts, and it is therefore essential to conduct in-depth research to better understand the interactions between these different factors.

Additionally, ever-changing global economic challenges and opportunities add an additional dimension to this complex relationship. Economies are increasingly interconnected, which means that the economic policies of one country can have repercussions on other nations. In this context, understanding how the political regime can influence a country's economic performance becomes all the more crucial for guiding policy decisions internationally.

In conclusion, the relationship between political regime and economic growth is a multidimensional issue that deserves continued attention from researchers and policy makers. Beyond the current debates, there is a need to continue to deepen our knowledge of the underlying mechanisms that shape this complex relationship. This will enable us to formulate better-informed public policies, thereby promoting sustainable and balanced economic development for societies around the world.

Reference

- [1] Acemoglu, D., & Robinson, J. A. (2019). Economic origins of dictatorship and democracy revisited. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 134(3), 1517-1550.
- [2] Aisen, A., & Veiga, F. J. (2019). Does political instability affect economic growth? *Applied Economics Letters*, 26(15), 1271-1276.
- [3] Berggren, N., & Bjørnskov, C. (2018). Institutions and Economic Performance: What Can Be Explained? *Journal of Institutional Economics*, 14(4), 565-596.
- [4] Cortes, D., & Maldonado, S. (2019). Bureaucratic inefficiency and state capacity: Evidence from colonial taxation. *Journal of Development Economics*, 139, 171-186.
- [5] Dincecco, M., & Wang, Y. (2019). Political corruption and slow economic growth: Evidence from a cross-country investigation. *European Journal of Political Economy*, 58, 1-13.
- [6] Finkel, E. J. (2020). The autocrat's advantages in the face of pandemic. *Journal of Democracy*, 31(3), 45-59.
- [7] Izadi, H., & Asgary, A. (2019). Authoritarianism and economic growth: A non-linear approach. *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja*, 32(1), 2085-2098.
- [8] Izdebski, A. (2019). The Speed of Decision Making in Authoritarian Regimes. *Comparative Political Studies*, 52(9), 1253-1284.
- [9] Kataria, M., & Tavits, M. (2020). Economic voting and political participation in new democracies. *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties*, 30(3), 373-396.
- [10] Knack, S. (2019). Corruption, governance, and economic growth: International evidence. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 57(1), 132-187.
- [11] Kono, D. Y. (2016). The Great Leap Outward: China's Surprise Expansion in America's Neighborhood. *Foreign Affairs*, 95(5), 16-23.
- [12] Kounou, G. C. (2021). Infrastructure governance and economic performance in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Utilities Policy*, 68, 101176.
- [13] Menaldo, V. (2015). The Middle East and North Africa's Resilient Authoritarians. *Journal of Democracy*, 26(1), 88-100.
- [14] Persson, T., & Tabellini, G. (2020). *Political economics: Explaining economic policy*. MIT Press.
- [15] Robinson, J. A., Torvik, R., & Verdier, T. (2018). Political foundations of the resource curse. *Journal of Development Economics*, 134, 133-143.
- [16] Singh, N., & Zammit, A. (2016). Dictatorships and the Management of Bureaucracy. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 131(2), 1005-1049.