

Codebook

Connections between Autocratization and Democratization in
Episodes of U-Turns

Coding Rules:

Authoritarian Manipulation are instances where the U-Turn, i.e. both autocratization and democratization, is driven by (authoritarian) incumbents, either civilian or military.

Democratic Reaction refers to instances where an autocratization is interrupted and reversed through pressures from domestic democratic actors, typically oppositional elites, masses, or both.

International Intervention are instances where international actors play a substantial role in the U-Turn, either throughout the whole process, or through halting and reversing autocratization.

List of U-Turn Episodes, 1900-2023

Country	Autocratization	Democratization	U-Turn Type
Algeria	1992-1993	1994-1999	Authoritarian Manipulation
Argentina	1930-1931	1932-1933	Authoritarian Manipulation
Argentina	1943-1945	1946-1948	Authoritarian Manipulation
Argentina	1949-1956	1957-1959	Authoritarian Manipulation
Argentina	1962-1962	1963-1964	Authoritarian Manipulation
Armenia	1993-2008	2010-2019	Democratic Reaction
Bangladesh	1975-1976	1977-1980	Authoritarian Manipulation
Bangladesh	1982-1983	1986-1992	Democratic Reaction
Bangladesh	2002-2007	2009-2010	Authoritarian Manipulation
Belgium	1914-1915	1918-1921	International Intervention
Belgium	1940-1941	1944-1950	International Intervention
Benin	2018-2021	2022-2023*	Authoritarian Manipulation
Bolivia	2006-2020	2021-2023*	Democratic Reaction
Brazil	2016-2021	2022-2023*	Democratic Reaction
Burkina Faso	2014-2015	2016-2016	Democratic Reaction
Burundi	1987-1988	1992-1993	Authoritarian Manipulation
Central African Republic	2003-2004	2005-2006	Authoritarian Manipulation
Chile	1924-1928	1932-1937	Democratic Reaction
Comoros	1999-2000	2002-2005	Authoritarian Manipulation
Costa Rica	1917-1918	1919-1924	Democratic Reaction
Costa Rica	1948-1948	1949-1954	Democratic Reaction
Cuba	1904-1907	1909-1909	International Intervention
Cuba	1928-1934	1936-1941	Authoritarian Manipulation
Czechia	1930-1940	1945-1947	International Intervention
Denmark	1940-1944	1945-1946	International Intervention
Dominican Republic	1964-1964	1966-1967	International Intervention
Ecuador	1906-1906	1911-1912	Democratic Reaction
Ecuador	1932-1936	1938-1939	Democratic Reaction
Ecuador	1960-1964	1967-1969	Democratic Reaction
Ecuador	1970-1973	1978-1980	Democratic Reaction
Ecuador	2007-2013	2017-2018	Authoritarian Manipulation
Egypt	1952-1953	1956-1964	Authoritarian Manipulation
Estonia	1932-1935	1938-1939*	Authoritarian Manipulation
Estonia	1991-1992	1993-1993	Other
Fiji	1987-1988	1992-1997	Authoritarian Manipulation
Fiji	2000-2001	2002-2003	Democratic Reaction
Finland	1939-1940	1945-1949	International Intervention
France	1939-1941	1945-1948	International Intervention
Gambia, The	1993-1995	1996-1998	Authoritarian Manipulation
Ghana	1958-1966	1969-1971	Authoritarian Manipulation
Greece	1922-1923	1924-1924	Authoritarian Manipulation

Greece	1925-1926	1927-1927	Authoritarian Manipulation
Guinea-Bissau	2012-2013	2014-2019	Authoritarian Manipulation
Haiti	1992-1992	1993-1997	International Intervention
Haiti	2001-2004	2006-2012	International Intervention
Hungary	1919-1919	1920-1923	Democratic Reaction
India	1971-1975	1977-1978	Authoritarian Manipulation
Ivory Coast	2000-2000	2001-2001	Democratic Reaction
Kuwait	1976-1976	1981-1982	Authoritarian Manipulation
Kuwait	1986-1986	1991-1993	International Intervention
Lesotho	2015-2017	2018-2023*	Authoritarian Manipulation
Liberia	1980-1981	1985-1986	Authoritarian Manipulation
Liberia	2003-2004	2005-2007	International Intervention
Luxembourg	1940-1941	1945-1947	International Intervention
Madagascar	2006-2010	2013-2018	Authoritarian Manipulation
Malawi	1999-2005	2009-2013	Democratic Reaction
Malaysia	1969-1970	1972-1975	Authoritarian Manipulation
Maldives	2010-2017	2018-2023*	Democratic Reaction
Mali	2007-2013	2014-2014	International Intervention
Malta	1958-1959	1962-1964	Authoritarian Manipulation
Moldova	2001-2006	2009-2011	Democratic Reaction
Moldova	2012-2017	2019-2021	Democratic Reaction
Myanmar/Burma	1942-1943	1945-1953	Democratic Reaction
Nepal	2000-2003	2007-2009	Democratic Reaction
Nepal	2012-2013	2014-2016	Democratic Reaction
Netherlands	1940-1941	1945-1949	International Intervention
Niger	1999-1999	2000-2005	Authoritarian Manipulation
Niger	2009-2010	2011-2012	Democratic Reaction
North Macedonia	2000-2000	2002-2003	International Intervention
North Macedonia	2005-2013	2017-2023*	Democratic Reaction
Norway	1940-1943	1945-1946	International Intervention
Pakistan	1999-2000	2002-2010	Democratic Reaction
Peru	1948-1949	1950-1957	Authoritarian Manipulation
Peru	1990-1992	1996-2002	Democratic Reaction
Philippines	1941-1942	1943-1947	International Intervention
Republic of Vietnam	1963-1964	1966-1968	Authoritarian Manipulation
Rwanda	1973-1974	1979-1982	Authoritarian Manipulation
Seychelles	1972-1978	1979-1980	Authoritarian Manipulation
Solomon Islands	1998-2001	2002-2004	International Intervention
South Korea	1961-1962	1963-1964	Authoritarian Manipulation
South Korea	2008-2013	2016-2017	Democratic Reaction
Sri Lanka	2004-2006	2010-2018	Democratic Reaction
Sudan	1958-1959	1964-1968	Democratic Reaction
Sudan	1969-1969	1972-1987	Other
Suriname	1975-1975	1976-1976	Other
Suriname	1980-1981	1985-1989	Authoritarian Manipulation

Suriname	1991-1991	1992-1992	Authoritarian Manipulation
Syria	1949-1952	1953-1955	Authoritarian Manipulation
Syria	1958-1959	1961-1962	Authoritarian Manipulation
Thailand	1976-1977	1979-1989	Authoritarian Manipulation
Thailand	1991-1991	1992-2001	Democratic Reaction
Thailand	2005-2007	2008-2021	Authoritarian Manipulation
Thailand	2013-2014	2018-2023*	Authoritarian Manipulation
Tunisia	2013-2022	2023-2023*	Authoritarian Manipulation
Türkiye	1954-1961	1962-1967	Authoritarian Manipulation
Türkiye	1980-1981	1983-1992	Authoritarian Manipulation
Uganda	1985-1986	1989-1995	Authoritarian Manipulation
Ukraine	1996-2000	2005-2007	Democratic Reaction
Ukraine	2010-2014	2019-2020	Democratic Reaction
Uruguay	1933-1933	1934-1947	Authoritarian Manipulation
Zambia	2010-2017	2021-2023*	Democratic Reaction
Zimbabwe	1978-1978	1979-1981	Other

* censored cases

Authoritarian Manipulation

Algeria 1992-1999

- **Autocratization: 1992-1993**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization 1994-1999**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

In February 1989, a new constitution was ratified, in which all reference to socialism were removed and the single party (FLN, the National Liberation Front) that had been the official government of Algeria became part of a new multiparty political system. That same year the Islamic Salvation Front (FIS) was formed and legally recognized. In 1991, the FIS won the first round of the 1991 legislative election. Concerned with this, the military organized a coup d'état and cancelled the electoral process to prevent the forming of an Islamic state in Algeria. They handed power to a newly created collegial government, and subsequently to the Minister of Defense Liamine Zéroual who was called a transitional President. Algerian Civil War (1992-2002) erupted after the military coup. The conflict between the government and Islamist rebel groups was intense and violent. Toward the end of 1994, it became obvious that neither side is able to win.

Saint Egidio Community (Catholic Italian organization) attempted to bring the two sides together for a peace agreement. In January 1995, several opposition parties – among them FIS-representatives – signed the “Rome-Platform” in which they called for a dialogue between the government and the rebel groups. The negotiations failed because the military rejected the accords. Instead, the military decided to replace the military’s five-member State High Council and called for a presidential election. The election was held on November 16, 1995, and the former head of ground forces Liamine Zéroual was elected President. This brought competing sides together. Although radical Islamist groups attempted to boycott elections, people that previously had supported the Islamist groups turned against them and voted for Zéroual.

The military next organized parliamentary elections in June 1997. The violence continued and it was necessary to form a coalition government. Therefore, the military invited the Movement of Society for Peace (a moderate offshore of Egypt’s Muslim Brotherhood, the principal Islamic faction supporting the military) to form an alliance with two secular parties. In 1999, Zéroual retired. The military replaced him with Abdelaziz Bouteflika and the Islamist party supported him. Bouteflika eventually ended Algeria’s civil war by first signing a peace deal with the AIS (the Islamic Salvation Army, the smallest armed Islamist group), and then offering an amnesty from prosecution to all other armed Islamist groups. In September 2000, a referendum was held and the so-called civil accord was approved.

Reasoning: The military are in control throughout the whole process: the war erupts because they intervened into the electoral process, then they decide on the critical events (e.g., whether to approve or reject the accords), they appoint and control the leaders. For ending the civil war,

decisive is the fact that the military-backed government (first Zérroual, then Bouteflika) and some of the Islamist groups came together and found a way to collaborate.

Source: Nohlen, D., B. Thibaut, and M. Krennerich, eds. (1999): *Elections in Africa: A Data Handbook*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ottaway, D.B. (2015): [Algeria: Bloody Past and Fractious Factions](#). The Wilson Center.

Kepel, G. (2002): *Jihad: The Trail of Political Islam*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Argentina 1930-1933

- **Autocratization: 1930-1931**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization 1932-1933**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

In 1930, the military led by José Félix Uriburu staged a coup against the democratic government of President Hipólito Yrigoyen. Abolishing elections, banning several parties, and installing himself as President of the Provisional Government, Uriburu led a swift and substantial autocratization. Elections were called in 1931, where the military's candidate Augustin P. Justo won an election rigged in his favor. Still, this was a relative improvement in that Argentina saw the return of elected officials and a reinstalled parliament. However, the regime stabilized after this short democratization at a far lower level than before the coup, where political competition was limited, and civil and political rights remained restricted.

Reasoning: Both autocratization and democratization are driven and controlled by the junta.

Source: Nohlen, D., ed. (2005): *Elections in the Americas: A Data Handbook*, Vol. 2. New York: Oxford University Press.

Argentina 1943-1948

- **Autocratization: 1943-1945**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization 1946-1948**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

In 1943, Argentina had three military coups in quick succession, abolishing the weakly competitive electoral regime in place. The final coup installed Edelmiro Farrell, a military officer, as President. The coups led to an autocratization that continued through 1945 as Argentina remained without any elected officials, and was rule unchecked by a military government. In the military regime, Juan Perón was appointed as Vice-President, who gained increasing power. This led to growing rivalry within the junta. In 1946, Perón's opposition within the junta called for multiparty elections, which Juan Perón won. This marked a return

to parliamentarism and set off democratization that was accompanied by a less repressive environment in the first years after Perón's victory.

Reasoning: Both autocratization and democratization are driven by actors within the junta.

Source: Nohlen, D., ed. (2005): *Elections in the Americas: A Data Handbook*, Vol. 2. New York: Oxford University Press.

Argentina 1949-1959

- **Autocratization: 1949-1956**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization 1957-1959**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

Following the new Peronist constitution of 1949, Argentina gradually autocratized under President Perón's increasingly hegemonic rule. The President and his movement took increasing control over social and political institutions. Reacting to this gradual power grab, the military staged a coup in September 1955, leading to substantial further autocratization. The military government outlawed Peronism as a political movement, but also called elections to a constituent assembly. Autocratization was followed by democratization when a constitutional assembly elected in 1957 issued a new constitution setting the stage for the 1958 general elections in which the biggest party, the Peronists, were not allowed to run. Despite this limitation in competition, Argentina democratized during this period, restoring elections for official positions and relaxing repression.

Reasoning: Both autocratization and democratization are driven by (authoritarian) incumbents, as the military unseating Perón are also controlling the process of democratization.

Source: Nohlen, D., ed. (2005): *Elections in the Americas: A Data Handbook*, Vol. 2. New York: Oxford University Press.

Argentina 1962-1964

- **Autocratization: 1962**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization 1963-1964**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

A 1962 military coup ousted out elected President Arturo Frondizi, who had been elected with Peronist support, and disbanded parliament. The military rule was relatively short, as new general elections were called in 1963. As in the previous general election, the military continued to ban Peronist candidates from competing. After the elections, the military stepped

down and Argentina returned to a parliamentary democracy, at the same time returning to lower repression.

Reasoning: Both autocratization and democratization are driven and controlled by the military.

Source: Nohlen, D., ed. (2005): *Elections in the Americas: A Data Handbook*, Vol. 2. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bangladesh 1975-1980

- **Autocratization: 1975-1976**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization 1977-1980**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

Bangladesh adopted a multiparty parliamentary system after its independence in 1971, with the first elections being held in 1973. Autocratization soon took off, as in early 1975 the Bangladesh Awami League (BAL) party changed the Constitution to a single-party presidential rule. Banning all other parties and political movements, Sheikh Mujib Rahman became President of State and leader of the new Bangladesh Krishak Sramik Awami League (BKSAL).

Rahman's rule ended quickly, as the government was ousted by a military coup on August 15, 1975. The coup leaders declared martial law, suspended the constitution, and dissolved the parliament. While this military government stayed in power for almost four years, the autocratization in 1976 was followed by an initially slow democratization in 1977. In an attempt to legitimize his rule, General Ziaur "Zia" Rahman removed the single-party system, held a referendum to gain support for his rule, and in 1978 held direct presidential elections that he won. This led to Zia establishing the Bangladesh Nationalist Party (BNP), which won the parliamentary elections held in February 1979. The new parliament made constitutional amendments that returned Bangladesh to civilian and parliamentary rule.

Reasoning: A self-coup swiftly followed by a military coup, and the military then proceeds to control the process of a gradual return to democracy.

Source: Nohlen, D., F. Grotz, and C. Hartmann, eds. (2002): *Elections in Asia and the Pacific: A Data Handbook*, Vol. 1. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bangladesh 2002-2010

- **Autocratization: 2002-2007**
- **Bottom: 2008**
- **Democratization 2009-2010**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

Bangladesh started to autocratize soon after the 2001 national elections. The government created units with powers to wield lethal force outside the bounds of normal judicial authority to respond to increasing terror and political violence. In 2005, the ruling Bangladesh Nationalist Party (BNP) began manipulating electoral rules and voter registries to rig the 2006 elections. After the planned dissolution of parliament ahead of the 2007 elections, clashes erupted that killed 25 people. The caretaker government went into crisis with several resigning, and President Iajuddin Ahmed named himself leader of the government, something the main opposition of the Awami League (AL) refused to accept as they saw increased risk of rigged elections. In January 2007, President Ahmed declared a state of emergency and ended parliamentary democracy. The military then put in place a new caretaker government with Ahmed as the head that was only supposed to sit for another 90 days before new elections were to be held. Instead, the new regime created multiple committees with wide-ranging and unchecked powers, for example removing legal rights for detained individuals, who grew substantially in number as repression ramped up. In 2008, however, the caretaker government eventually went ahead with the new elections. The Election Commission compiled a new voter registry covering 81 million people, while an easing of restrictions and repression took place. The state of emergency was relaxed a few days before the December 2008 national elections, following which the AL-led government took the oath of office on January 6, 2009.

Reasoning: The state of emergency under the caretaker government and the subsequent dictatorial rule were ended by the authoritarian incumbents' choice to ease repression and return to civilian rule.

Source: Alamgir, J. (2009): [Bangladesh's Fresh Start](#). *Journal of Democracy* 20 (3): 41-55.

Benin 2018-2023 (cens.)

- **Autocratization: 2018-2021**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization: 2022-2023**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

Benin had been among the most stable democracies in sub-Saharan Africa before a process of autocratization started under President Patrice Talon who was elected in largely free and fair democratic elections in 2016. Within less than five years, the government eroded judicial independence, undermined political competition, harassed political opponents and critical journalists, and conducted elections with severe irregularities. Only parties supporting President Talon were allowed to compete in the 2019 parliamentary elections. During the 2021 presidential election, all main opponents were either disqualified, under arrest, or in exile and President Talon won a second term.

The government has released some opposition supporters from jail in 2022. An incremental liberalization process led up to the parliamentary elections in 2023. In November 2022, the Constitutional Court made a ruling that provides for the political opposition to participate in

the January 2023 legislative elections and paved the way for participation. Opposition parties were allowed to compete, and the main opposition (the Democrats) won 24% of the seat share. This shift provided the opposition with a platform for criticizing Talon.

Reasoning: Both autocratization and democratization are driven by the same authoritarian actor (Talon). Liberalization is a strategy of co-optation.

Source: Bertelsmann Stiftung (2024): [BTI 2024 Country Report – Benin](#). Gütersloh: Bertelsmann Stiftung.

Freedom House (2023): [Freedom in the World 2022 – Benin](#).

Burundi 1987-1993

- **Autocratization: 1987-1988**
- **Bottom: 1989-1991**
- **Democratization: 1992-1993**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

In 1987, a military coup was staged against military officer Jean-Baptiste Bagaza, and coup-leader and army officer Pierre Buyoya (Tutsi) came to power. Buyoya substantially ramped up repression, killing tens of thousands of Hutu. In October 1988, responding to international pressure, President Buyoya created by executive decree a “National Commission to Study the Question of National Unity” comprised of 12 Hutu and 12 Tutsi members. The new constitution was published in January 1992 and released at a press conference. It was then submitted to a referendum in March 1992, in which it was approved by 90% of those voting. In 1993, competitive elections were held and saw opponent Ndadaye winning against Buyoya. This election was judged as extraordinarily free and fair and marked the first peaceful transfer of power in the country’s history. Democratization was nevertheless short-lived, as Ndadaye was assassinated soon after the election. A series of acting presidents succeeded Ndadaye between 1993 and 1996, when Buyoya staged yet another coup and seized power.

Reasoning: In response to international pressure and conceived to give a sustainable perspective to the country, Buyoya and his government initiated a policy of national reconciliation and ‘guided democratization’. Yet, against their expectations, they lost the 1993 presidential and legislative elections to the opposition. Since both autocratization and democratization (the 1992 referendum and the 1993 elections) are driven by the same authoritarian actors (Buyoya and his government), we code this U-turn as authoritarian manipulation.

Source: Nohlen, D., M. Krennerick, and B. Thibaut, eds. (1999): *Elections in Africa: A Data Handbook*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Central African Republic 2003-2006

- **Autocratization: 2003-2004**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization: 2005-2006**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

In 2003, General François Bozizé staged a military coup against President Ange-Félix Patassé, who was in an international meeting outside the country at that time. Bozizé forced the former President Patassé into exile in Togo and banned him from running for office. Bozizé initially planned to hold elections in December 2004, but pushed them back to March 2005. The elections were likely rigged by Bozizé's manipulation of the Electoral Commission. Bozizé and his party won, and Bozizé was inaugurated as President. Still, the return of parliament and elected officials meant a relative improvement in the levels of democracy.

Reasoning: A military coup followed by elections to legitimize the power grab. Elections as coup legitimization are coded as authoritarian manipulation.

Source: Inter-Parliamentary Union, [Central African Republic – Election Archive](#).

Comoros 1999-2005

- **Autocratization: 1999-2000**
- **Bottom: 2001**
- **Democratization: 2002-2005**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

Army Chief of Staff Colonel Azali Assoumani staged an armed coup in April 1999. At the same time, the three islands were troubled by secession plans by at least one of them, Anjouan. These conflicts could only be resolved with a new constitution in 2001 that guaranteed a rotating presidency between the three Comoro islands. Elections in 2002 then confirmed Assoumani as head of state.

Reasoning: Azali Assoumani led both autocratization and subsequent democratization. The new constitution and the following elections legitimized his rule.

Source: Hassan, H.A. (2009): [The Comoros and the crisis of building a national state](#). *Contemporary Arab Affairs* 2(2): 229-239.

Cuba 1928-1941

- **Autocratization: 1928-1934**
- **Bottom: 1935**
- **Democratization: 1936-1941**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

In 1924, Gerardo Machado became President using fraudulent means and established a dictatorship. In 1927-1928, he engineered illegal constitutional changes designed to facilitate his retention of power. He was the only candidate in the 1928 election. Machado was ousted and forced into exile in 1933 due to his increasing unpopularity, general strikes, uprisings among workers, and an army revolt. His replacement, Carlos Manuel de Céspedes y Quesada brokered by the US ambassador, was also quickly removed from power through a coup (in September 1933), installing a provisional government. They were also ousted after a few days with Ramón Grau San Martín heading a provisional government next until 1934.

The army organizing the coups at that time was already under the leadership of Fulgencio Batista, who was de facto maintaining control over the country. Batista nominally surrendered power to the new government, yet in reality was making behind-doors deals with the US and different political groups. Eventually Batista forced Grau to resign in 1934, and Colonel Carlos Mendieta, long a Cuban political leader, was installed as interim President of Cuba by a coup led by Batista. In May 1934, the US renounced the Platt Amendment and left the control of Cuba to its people, and a more favorable reciprocity treaty followed.

In June 1935, the Mendieta-Batista regime announced the restoration of the 1901 constitution in modified form. In December 1935, Mendieta resigned, and the next general election was scheduled. The provisional government formulated a new electoral code. However, the civilian politicians taking part in what remained of the political process were unwilling or unable to attack Batista who largely controlled the electoral process. Elections were finally held in 1936 and formally brought back the civilian rule, after several cabinets attempting to re-instate previous constitutions. Miguel Mariano Gómez became President until his Vice-President Federico Laredo Brú replaced him still in 1936 (Batista engineered the impeachment of Gómez in December 1936). Formally, 1936 marked the return to a constitutional regime in Cuba. Brú served as President until 1940 leading the way for Batista, who in 1940 attained openly the power that he had had all the time behind the scenes.

Reasoning: Executive-led autocratization, a series of coups through which Fulgencio Batista gradually rose to power. Batista was de facto maintaining control over the country since 1933 and ruled indirectly by controlling presidents until 1940, when he was eventually formally elected President of Cuba.

Source: Argote-Freyre, F. (2006): [*Fulgencio Batista: The Making of a Dictator*](#). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Fitzgibbon, R.H., and H.M. Healey (1936): [*Foreign Government and Politics: The Cuban Elections of 1936*](#). *The American Political Science Review* 30(4): 724-735.

Ecuador 2007-2018

- **Autocratization: 2007-2013**
- **Bottom: 2014-2016**

- **Democratization: 2017-2018**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

In Ecuador, institutions were undermined under President Rafael Correa (2007-2017) resulting in extensive executive powers and weak independent checks on his powers from the judiciary and the legislature. The term limit that Correa abolished with the approval of the legislature and the Constitutional Court as part of his weakening of independent checks on the executive led to his downfall. Since it should have been phased out from 2021, Correa planned to transfer power to his ally and Vice-President Lenín Moreno for the 2017 presidential elections. Yet, Moreno defected from the autocratization path and reversed many of Correa's decisions and policies, leading to a process of democratization.

Reasoning: Correa stepped aside letting his former vice-president Moreno be a timid caretaker in order to skirt term limits and then sweep back into office in 2021. Yet, Moreno went off script. Elite defection led to democratization.

Source: Freeman, W. (2023): [Ecuador's Democratic Breakdown](#). *Journal of Democracy*, online exclusive.

Egypt 1952-1964

- **Autocratization: 1952-1953**
- **Bottom: 1954-1955**
- **Democratization 1956-1964**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

Autocratization started with a military coup in July 1952. After the abdication of King Farouk, Egypt was in practice ruled by the Revolutionary Command Council led by Colonel Gamal Abd al-Nasser. The monarchy was abolished, all political parties were banned, the constitution was suspended, and on June 18, 1953, the Arab Republic of Egypt was declared. Persecution and repression were widespread during this time, and many oppositional actors went into exile.

A relatively minor liberalization started in 1956, with the referendum on a new constitution and Nasser as President. After this, referendums were held periodically in the coming years, but only gave voters choices within Nasser's single mass party. There was no Parliament between 1961 and 1964. Government control was rigid, and candidates were screened for political loyalty. Some choice was permitted between the candidates from political mass organizations, who mostly were local notables. Also, during this time suffrage was expanded to the whole population. Liberalization ended in 1964, and the country was only marginally less autocratic than after the 1952 coup.

Reasoning: Nasser and the elite around him control the whole process. Liberalization is used as a strategy of co-optation and legitimation of their rule. The reversal part consists of only some relative improvements compared to the situation right after the coup.

Source: Nohlen, D., B. Thibaut, and M. Krennerich, eds. (1999): *Elections in Africa: A Data Handbook*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Estonia 1932-1939

- **Autocratization: 1932-1935**
- **Bottom: 1936-1937**
- **Democratization: 1938-1939**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

A fascist movement called the Vaps Movement grew in Estonian politics in the early 1930s. In order to prevent their (further) rise to power, Prime Minister Konstantin Päts carried out a self-coup, declared a state of emergency and disbanded the group. He then ruled by decree from 1934 until 1938, when he proposed and with parliament introduced a new constitution that enabled the country to halt and reverse autocratization. The process of reversal was interrupted by the Soviet occupation in 1940.

Reasoning: The same incumbent (Päts) leads autocratization through a self-coup, and then the reversal – the 1938 elections and the 1938 constitution.

Source: Berg-Schlosser, D., and J. Mitchell, eds. (2016): [*The Conditions of Democracy in Europe 1919-39: Systematic Case Studies*](#). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Fiji 1987-1997

- **Autocratization: 1987-1988**
- **Bottom: 1989-1991**
- **Democratization: 1992-1997**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

Two military coups took place in 1987 led by Sitiveni Rabuka. Two years of stalemate and interim governments followed. In 1990, the elites, including Rabuka, drafted a new constitution. The first elections based on this constitution took place in 1992, with Rabuka winning and becoming Prime Minister.

Reasoning: A military coup followed by constitution and elections to legitimize the power grab.

Sources: Scobell, A. (1994): [*Politics, Professionalism, and Peacekeeping: an Analysis of the 1987 Military Coup in Fiji*](#). *Comparative Politics* 26(2): 187-201.

Knapman, B. (1990): [*Economy and State in Fiji Before and After the Coups*](#). *The Contemporary Pacific* 2(1): 59-86.

The Gambia 1993-1998

- **Autocratization: 1993-1995**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization: 1996-1998**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

The Gambia National Army (GNA) staged a coup against President Dawda Jawara in July 1994 and established the Armed Forces Provisional Ruling Council (AFPRC). When the military announced that they would maintain military rule until 1998, Western international donors (European Union, Great Britain, USA) condemned the military regime and suspended financial aid for the country. The announcement engendered adverse reactions within The Gambia, with a counter-coup attempt in November 1994. The military regime set up a two-year transition schedule to restore constitutional rule.

Following a referendum that backed a new constitution in August 1996, the presidential election was held in September 1996, in which the opposition was banned, and serious irregularities were reported. Nevertheless, the former military leader Jammeh, who had formally retired from the army to contest the election, won the election. Jammeh later invited the opposition to join his government.

Reasoning: A military coup followed by referendum and rigged elections to legitimize the power grab.

Source: Nohlen, D., B. Thibaut, and M. Krennerich, eds. (1999): *Elections in Africa: A Data Handbook*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Edie, C. J. (2000): [Democracy in The Gambia: Past, Present and Prospects for the Future](#). *Africa Development* 25(3): 161-198.

Ghana 1958-1971

- **Autocratization: 1958-1966**
- **Bottom: 1967-1968**
- **Democratization 1969-1971**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

Ghana became independent in 1957, and autocratization soon took off, slowly at first. Kwame Nkrumah was elected President in 1960, leading to start of the First Republic (1960–1966). President Nkrumah and his Convention People's Party (CPP) soon abandoned parliamentary democracy and established a one-party state, later institutionalized through a national referendum in 1964. Autocratization deepened on February 24, 1966 when a military coup ousted the government, suspending the constitution, dissolving parliament, and banning political parties. The National Liberation Council (NLC), consisting of army and police officers, formed a government and ruled unchecked.

In 1969, the ban on political parties was lifted, and elections were held. The Progress Party (PP) led by Kofi A. Busia won the elections, marking the reversal of autocratization. The new constitution, that saw the advent of the Second Republic (1969–1972), introduced civilian rule and a unicameral parliamentary system. Democratization ended sharply when the government of Busia was ousted by a military coup that ended the Second Republic on January 13, 1972.

Reasoning: The process consists of two distinct autocratization stages: the substantial deteriorations of democracy under the First Republic (1960-1966), and further declines under the military regime (1966-1969). The military did not rush to reintroduce elections but eventually did so without substantial pressure/intervention from within or outside. Both autocratization and democratization were driven by the same autocratic actors.

Sources: Nohlen, D., B. Thibaut, and M. Krennerich, eds. (1999): *Elections in Africa: A Data Handbook*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Greece 1922-1924

- **Autocratization: 1922-1923**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization: 1924**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

The Greeks lost the Greco-Turkish War in 1922. As a consequence, some military officers associated with former Prime Minister Venizelos (Liberal Party) staged a coup and forced King Constantine I to abdicate, and soon thereafter also his son who was the initial successor. Instead, power was transferred solely to the parliament, and in 1924, a referendum on becoming a republic was held and resulted in a 70% “yes” vote. The process of installing parliamentarism meant a democratization following the coup.

Reasoning: Venizelos’ military officers led both autocratization and subsequent democratization. Although it might seem from the case description that the coup was the result of the Greco-Turkish War, international dimension is of a marginal importance in this case, because Venizelos had rebelled against the king already before the war, particularly after losing the 1920 elections.

Source: Hatzis, A.N.: [A Political History of Modern Greece, 1821-2018](#). In: Marciano, A., G. B. Ramello, eds. (2019): *Encyclopedia of Law and Economics*. New York, NY: Springer.

Greece 1925-1927

- **Autocratization: 1925-1926**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization: 1927**

- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

Shortly after the establishment of the republic, General Theodoros Pangalos staged a coup and was sworn in as Prime Minister following a vote of confidence. He declared a state of emergency and ruled unchecked. However, officers who had originally helped Pangalos to power turned on him and removed him in a subsequent coup. This was led by General Georgios Kondylis who then also quickly re-introduced elections again in November 1926.

Reasoning: Kondylis and his allies staged a counter-coup and relatively quickly wanted to legitimize their rule by re-introducing elections.

Source: Gürsoy, Y. (2017). *Between Military Rule and Democracy: Regime Consolidation in Greece, Turkey, and Beyond*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Guinea-Bissau 2012-2019

- **Autocratization: 2012-2013**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization: 2014-2019**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

Autocratization started with the 2012 military coup that was staged right before the second round of a presidential election. Both second-round presidential candidates and the incumbent president were arrested by the junta and state institutions were dissolved. Following international condemnation and sanctions against leaders of the junta, an agreement was signed that led to the third-place candidate in the election, Nhamadjo, being selected as interim president. The presidential election was aborted and postponed for at least two years into the future. An interim government was administering the country until 2014. In 2014, the UN Security Council urged Guinea-Bissau's transitional government to abide by announced election places, warning of sanctions against those opposing a return to constitutional order. Elections were held later the same year, and the country returned to the civilian rule.

Reasoning: The military officers led both the military coup and the subsequent return to the civilian rule.

Source: Inter-Parliamentary Union: [Guinea-Bissau – Election Archive](#).

India 1971-1978

- **Autocratization: 1971-1975**
- **Bottom: 1976**
- **Democratization 1977**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

Slow autocratization started in India in 1971 amid the national elections, for example reflected in Indira Gandhi using the state to aid in her election campaign. Social unrest grew in the coming years, as did more violent ways of repressing them by the state. On June 25, 1975, Prime Minister Indira Gandhi imposed a national emergency in India, suspending civil and political rights, and ruling relatively unchecked. The state of emergency was imposed in response to unrest and calls for her resignation. On the day of the emergency declaration, cabinet approved censorship rules, revoked constitutionally protected rights, and awarded the state the right to detain citizens indefinitely. The period was marked by widespread repression and arrests of the opposition, widespread censorship, and various repressive acts such as forced sterilizations. The period lasted for 21 months and was then followed by a declaration of general elections. The elections and the end of the emergency marked the return of democratic rule to India.

Reasoning: Indira Gandhi first imposed national emergency and then declared general elections. The reason for Indira Gandhi withdrawing the emergency and holding elections remains debated, but there was little outside pressure or a “democratic reaction”. Rather, it was about internal conflicts, the negative impact on India’s reputation and alliances, and the like.

Source: Himanshu, J. (2023): [India’s Authoritarian Turn: Understanding the Emergency \(1975-1977\) and Its Afterlife](#). *Pacific Affairs* 96(1): 119-133.

Kuwait 1976-1982

- **Autocratization: 1976**
- **Bottom: 1977-1980**
- **Democratization: 1981-1982**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

In 1976, the Royal Family decided to close the legislature and discontinue elections. Presumably, this was because the opposition and the legislature became too powerful and exerted too much pressure on the Royal Family. In the aftermath of that decision, they restricted political and civil rights including the freedom of press. Only in 1981, elections were held again, and the new legislature was entrusted with the responsibility of drafting a new constitution in the hope that it was going to limit its own powers. It seems that this return was primarily a strategic response to the growing public pressure on the Royal Family decided it was best to follow the public’s demands in order to preserve its legitimacy.

Reasoning: The Royal Family was in control throughout the episode and made strategic calculations as to when it closed and re-opened the legislature and suspended and re-established elections. Although public pressure was involved, it never reached a level of seriously threatening the Royal Family’s hold on power.

Sources: Baaklini, A. I. (1982): Legislatures in the Gulf Area: The Experience of Kuwait, 1961–1976. *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 14(3): 359-379.

Tetreault, M. A. (1995): Patterns of Culture and Democratization in Kuwait. *Studies in Comparative International Development* 30: 26-44.

Herb, M. (2016): [The Origins of Kuwait's National Assembly](#). LSE Kuwait Programme Paper Series 39. London: London School of Economics.

Lesotho 2015-2023 (cens.)

- **Autocratization: 2015-2017**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization: 2018-2023**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

The 2014-2015 political conflict can be traced back to the 2012 National Assembly elections when then Prime Minister Mosisili's Democratic Congress (DC) party failed to attain the required majority and the first coalition government in Lesotho's history made up of three political parties was formed – Thabane's All Basotho Convention (ABC), Deputy Prime Minister Metsing's Lesotho Congress for Democracy (LCD), and Maseribane's Basotho National Party (BNP). The new government, however, faced challenges in managing the coalition. A collapse of the coalition government resulted in three elections between 2012 and 2017 under contested circumstances, a weakening rule of law, polarization between ruling elites, and an attempted coup d'état against the then Prime Minister Thabane and his exile to South Africa, and his return after an intervention by the Southern African Development Community.

Years 2015-2017 were marked by politically motivated assassinations, and attempted assassination. In 2018, Former Deputy Prime Minister Metsing of the LCD, who fled Lesotho for South Africa along with other opposition politicians in 2017, returned to the country following the agreement to participate in a governance reform process facilitated by the Southern African Development Community. In 2019, a no-confidence motion was filed against Prime Minister Thabane. He eventually forced to resign by his own party. This opened a period of reforms beginning in 2019 and significant liberalization.

Reasoning: Actors remain unchanged throughout the processes of autocratization and subsequent reversal. Thabane was forced to resign by his own party.

Source: Institute for Peace and Security Studies (2019): [Kingdom of Lesotho – Conflict Insight. Peace and Security Report](#) Vol. 1, January 2019. Addis Ababa: Institute for Peace and Security Studies, Addis Ababa University.

Liberia 1980-1986

- **Autocratization: 1980-1981**
- **Bottom: 1982-1984**
- **Democratization: 1985-1986**

- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

In 1980, Samuel Doe staged a coup against William Tolbert. Backed by his ethnic group, Doe established a military regime, suspended the constitution (drafted in 1847), and established a Constitutional Commission to draft a new constitution. The constitution was approved via referendum on July 3, 1983. In 1985, Doe lifted a ban on opposition parties and called for new elections to be held in October 1985. Although elections were contested, results were widely rigged and fraudulent.

Reasoning: A military coup followed by a new constitution and general elections (in questionable conditions) to legitimize the power grab.

Source: Nohlen, D., B. Thibaut, and M. Krennerich, eds. (1999): *Elections in Africa: A Data Handbook*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Madagascar 2009-2018

- **Autocratization: 2009-10**
- **Bottom: 2011-2012**
- **Democratization: 2013-2018**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

In December 2007, Andry Rajoelina was elected mayor of Antananarivo. Over the course of 2008, there were tensions between President Marc Ravalomanana and the young mayor, as Rajoelina heavily criticized policies enacted by the President. In 2009, Rajoelina organized a series of rallies against Ravalomanana and publicly criticized his authoritarian politics and called for protests. Some protests were violent, and on January 31, 2009, Rajoelina claimed that he was taking control of the country due to the failure of Ravalomanana and his government to fulfill their responsibilities. The African Union immediately warned Rajoelina that it would not accept an unconstitutional power grab in Madagascar. There was an attempt to remove Ravalomanana through constitutional means, which failed. After that the military intervened and staged a military coup on March 16, 2009. They transferred power directly to Rajoelina. Once in power, Rajoelina suspended both chambers of Parliament and claimed that the coup was “the direct expression of democracy.”

The provisional government (headed by Rajoelina) was in place until early 2014. It repeatedly rescheduled the general election, which was eventually held in October-December 2013. The results of the elections were announced in January 2014. This election ended the rule of the provisional governments and restored a regular constitutional government in Madagascar.

Reasoning: Autocratic actors are in control throughout the whole episode – an unconstitutional power grab followed by a military coup, and then the provisional government (with military backing) voluntarily restores a regular constitutional government.

Source: Freedom House (2013): [Freedom in the World 2013 – Madagascar](#).

Malaysia 1969-1975

- **Autocratization: 1969-1970**
- **Bottom: 1971**
- **Democratization: 1972-1975**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

Following the 1969 federal elections, riots and violent clashes broke out between ethnic Chinese and ethnic Malays and as a result, several hundreds of ethnic Chinese lost their lives (13 May Incident). The government, in response to these riots, declared a state of emergency, suspended the parliament, disallowed political parties, while political activity basically came to a halt. Prime Minister Tunku Abdul Rahman was forced to retire in 1970. Instead, government was headed by the National Operations Council with former Deputy Prime Minister Tun Abdul Razak Hussein at the top. In 1971, parliament was re-instituted and Tun Abdul Razak Hussein remained in power as part of a new governing coalition that also won the next federal elections in 1974.

Reasoning: Same group of autocratic actors drove autocratization and subsequent democratization.

Source: Von Vorys, K. (2015): *Democracy Without Consensus: Communalism and Political Stability in Malaysia*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Nohlen, D., F. Grotz, and C. Hartmann, eds. (2002): *Elections in Asia and the Pacific: A Data Handbook*, Vol. 2. New York: Oxford University Press.

Malta 1958-1964

- **Autocratization: 1958-1959**
- **Bottom: 1960-1961**
- **Democratization: 1962-1964**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

This case is set in the colony of Malta in a time with intense debates about Malta's future – either as part of the UK or as independent state. Prime Minister Dominic Mintoff was increasingly agitated about the UK's actions and resigned in 1958. Due to 'disturbances' in the country, a state of emergency was declared by the (British) Governor which lasted until January 1959. A governors' council ruled until the next elections in 1962 and drafted a new constitution. This constitution was modified together with (or better, following demands by) the winner of the election Borg Olivier (Nationalist Party). In 1964, Malta then became independent.

Reasoning: The same autocratic actor (colonial administration) first declared the state of emergency and then allowed elections to take place again.

Source: Cox, R. (1963): [The Plight of Malta](#). *The World Today* 19(6): 259-265.

Niger 1999-2005

- **Autocratization: 1999**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization: 2000-2005**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

President Maïnassara, a career soldier, had seized power in a coup d'état in January 1996. In February 1999, local elections were held, and in early April the Supreme Court released results which showed the opposition winning more seats than Maïnassara's supporters. The Court also cancelled the results in many areas and ordered elections there to be held again. The opposition called for protests against the cancellation of results on April 8. The military intervened and organized a coup on April 9, 1999, which resulted in the death of President Maïnassara and the installation of Wanké as President on April 11. Wanké led a transitional government towards democratic elections, which were held in October and November 1999. The elections saw Tandja become President of Niger in December 1999.

Reasoning: Military assassinates the incumbent President, takes over control, and re-instates elections – all in the year of 1999. From then on, the country stabilizes at least for a couple of years.

Source: Bertelsmann Stiftung (2003): [BTI 2003 Country Report – Niger](#). Gütersloh: Bertelsmann Stiftung.

Peru 1948-1957

- **Autocratization: 1948-1949**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization 1950-1957**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

Autocratization took off in Peru when Military Officer Manuel A. Odría led a military coup, ousting the government and disbanding parliament. Political parties were banned, and political rights severely restricted in the process. To legitimize his rule, Odría held elections in 1950 where he ran unopposed. While far from democratic, this initiated an at first very limited democratization in 1950 in Peru as the return of an electoral regime meant some improvements. After this, progression stalled, but somewhat of an opening in terms of political rights and an eventual declaration was that parties were allowed to exist and compete. In 1956, multiparty elections were introduced, and opposition candidate Manuel Prados won the presidency. Shortly after this, democratization ended.

Reasoning: Autocratization and democratization are driven by the same (authoritarian) actors.

Source: Nohlen, D., ed. (2005): *Elections in the Americas: A Data Handbook*, Vol. 2. New York: Oxford University Press.

Republic of Vietnam 1963-1968

- **Autocratization: 1963-1964**
- **Bottom: 1965**
- **Democratization 1966-1968**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

In the face of the increasing guerilla attacks by NFL (National Front for the Liberation of South Vietnam) forces, President Diem was overthrown and killed in a military coup on November 1, 1963. Political turmoil amid an escalating war followed, and various military governments replaced each other through coups in the coming two years. In June 1965, General Nguyen Van Thieu assumed power and, under his government, a new civilian regime with elected national offices was re-established in 1967. The new Constitution provided for a semi-presidential system with a bicameral Parliament, and Van Thieu won the presidential election. Thieu made some efforts to create a viable political movement to support him in Parliament, and a new party law was enacted, whereby many parties were legalized. In 1973, however, all existing parties were dissolved by decree.

Reasoning: This is an unusual case given that the country is going through a war at the time, but there is no direct US (or other foreign) involvement in autocratization or democratization. Both processes are driven by (authoritarian) incumbents.

Source: Nohlen, D., F. Grotz, and C. Hartmann, eds. (2002): *Elections in Asia and the Pacific: A Data Handbook*, Vol. 2. New York: Oxford University Press.

Rwanda 1973-1982

- **Autocratization: 1973-1974**
- **Bottom: 1975-1978**
- **Democratization: 1979-1982**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

In July 1973, General Juvénal Habyarimana took power through a military coup and ruled Rwanda through a military commission until July 1975. Then, the ruling party, the Mouvement Révolutionnaire National pour le Développement (MRND), was created. In 1978, a new constitution was adopted by a national referendum. The constitution established a centralized presidential system and enshrined single-party rule. Subsequently, presidential (with only one candidate) and legislative (with competition within the ruling party) elections were re-instated.

Reasoning: Same actors (Juvénal Habyarimana and the military) led both autocratization and subsequent liberalization under the autocratic rule.

Source: Rafti, M. (2007): [A Perilous Path to Democracy: Political Transition and Authoritarian Consolidation in Rwanda](#). IOB Discussion Paper 2008 (3). Antwerp: Institute of Development Policy and Management (IOB), University of Antwerp.

Nohlen, D., B. Thibaut, and M. Krennerich, eds. (1999): *Elections in Africa: A Data Handbook*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Seychelles 1972-1980

- **Autocratization: 1972-1978**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization: 1979-1980**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

There is little information on why autocratization started in 1972, before the country became independent in 1976. Shortly after independence, however, in 1977, a bloodless coup was staged by supporters of the socialist Seychelles People's United Party (SPUP) which installed France-Albert René as President. He was also involved in the planning and organization of the coup. Once in power, he re-introduced elections although he was the only candidate that people could vote for, and his party was the only legal party under the new Constitution of June 1979.

Reasoning: Same actors, coup (autocratization) and subsequent democratization advanced by René and his supporters.

Source: Ostheimer, J.M. (1975): [The Seychelles: Politics in the Islands of Love](#). *The Journal of Commonwealth & Comparative Politics* 13(2): 174-192.

Lyon, P. (1977): [Unstable Archipelago](#). *The Commonwealth Journal of International Affairs* 67(268): 372-377.

Nohlen, D., B. Thibaut, and M. Krennerich, eds. (1999): *Elections in Africa: A Data Handbook*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

South Korea 1961-1964

- **Autocratization: 1961-1962**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization 1963-1964**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

After it became known that the 1960 elections were fraudulent, large-scale demonstrations took place in South Korea, leading President Rhee to go into exile. A new parliament was elected later in 1960, and Chang Myon became Prime Minister under a new constitution. However, on May 16, 1961, a coalition of military actors called the Supreme Council for National

Reconstruction (SCNR), led by major-general Park Chung-hee, ousted the government leading to substantial autocratization. Park declared that the military government would only be temporary. A new Constitution was approved by a referendum on December 17, 1962, and the presidential system was restored. After fairly democratic elections Park became the new President in October 1963.

Reasoning: A military coup followed by a new constitution and general elections to legitimize the power grab.

Source: Nohlen, D., F. Grotz, and C. Hartmann, eds. (2002): *Elections in Asia and the Pacific: A Data Handbook*, Vol. 2. New York: Oxford University Press.

Suriname 1980-1989

- **Autocratization: 1980-1981**
- **Bottom: 1982-1984**
- **Democratization: 1985-1989**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

In February 1980, a military coup overthrew the elected government in Surinam. A state of emergency followed, also suspending the constitution, leading to a short but substantial autocratization in 1980-81. For two years, Suriname was ruled unchecked by a coalition of civilians and the military. From late 1984 onwards, opposition parties – Progressive Reform Party (VHP) and Party for National Unity and Solidarity (KTPI) – started to gain ground politically as opposition to the government grew. Democratization started to take off in 1985 when opposition parties were increasingly consulted and members of them joined the government supreme council. This resulted in a nominated national assembly that drafted a new constitution, later approved by referendum in 1987. The same year, national elections were held under the new constitution, returning Suriname to parliamentary democracy and led to further easing of repression. This negotiated reversal back to democratization was still characterized by an unusually strong position of the military. The opposition won the 1987 election, and the party of the military regime formed the opposition, but continued to have a substantial influence on politics.

Reasoning: The military regime consults the opposition due to economic problems, which it is unable to overcome. The U-turn, i.e. both autocratization and democratization, is thus driven by (authoritarian) incumbents.

Sources: Nohlen, D., ed. (2005): *Elections in the Americas: A Data Handbook*, Vol. 1. New York: Oxford University Press.

Suriname 1991-1992

- **Autocratization: 1991**

- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization 1992**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

Surinamese military staged a coup in December 1990, throwing out the democratically elected government, and announcing that new elections would be held within 100 days. The international community, not least the US and the OAS (Organization of American States), reacted against the coup. Under international pressure, elections were held within 150 days after the coup, in May 1991, and were observed by several international actors. A transition of power occurred, and the military stepped down. This was followed by amendments to the 1987 constitution by civil forces that decreased the political significance of the military in order to prevent further interference.

Reasoning: Both autocratization and democratization were driven by the military. While international pressure was high and contributed to elections being held swiftly, there was no direct intervention.

Source: Nohlen, D., ed. (2005): *Elections in the Americas: A Data Handbook*, Vol. 1. New York: Oxford University Press.

Syria 1949-1955

- **Autocratization: 1949-1952**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization: 1953-1955**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

During this period, Syria experienced several coup d'états. In March 1949, there was the first coup led by Husni al-Zaim. It was followed by another coup in August 1949 led by al-Hinnawi, who was subsequently overthrown in December 1949 by al-Shishakli. Although the military repeatedly handed power back to the civilian politicians, the effective political power remained in their hands. In 1950, there was the inauguration of the Second Syrian Republic with a new constitution. Al-Shishakli established a military rule until 1954, and the military undermined the traditional political system. In February 1954, al-Shishakli was pressured by the opposition and was eventually overthrown in a military coup. This coordination by Syrian radical political parties (Ba'ath Party, the Communist Party, Syrian Socialist National Party, Druze alliance, among others) made the shift of power possible. As a result, former President Atassi took power together with a Druze alliance. The coup ended the reign of the military dictatorship and the political party of the army and restored constitutional order to Syria at least for some time. Although the old parties returned to power, the way was open for future civil-military relations patterned after Shishakli's model. The Arab Socialist Ba'ath party was the greatest beneficiary of the 1954 election.

Reasoning: Autocratization that started with a military coup was interrupted by yet another military coup that was organized by radical opposition parties.

Source: Perlmutter, A. (1969): [From Obscurity to Rule: The Syrian Army and the Ba'ath Party](#). *The Western Political Quarterly* 22(4): 827-845.

Nohlen, D., F. Grotz, and C. Hartmann, eds. (2002): *Elections in Asia and the Pacific: A Data Handbook*, Vol. 1. New York: Oxford University Press.

Syria 1958-1962

- **Autocratization: 1958-1959**
- **Bottom: 1960**
- **Democratization: 1961-1962**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

The Ba'ath and the Ba'ath-oriented officers were instrumental in forging the Egyptian-Syrian alliance which culminated in the formation of the United Arab Republic (UAR) in 1958. This led to a ban of all parties and established a military dictatorship headed by Egypt. The coup staged on September 28, 1961 led by Lt-Colonel al-Nahlawi was aimed at taking the control of Syria away from Nasser. The following day, Maamun al-Kuzbari, allied with and relative to some coup plotters, formed a government with previously banned conservative parties – the Syrian Arab Republic was reestablished in September 1961.

The democratization part of the U-turn (1961-1962) is the period of constitutional government of the UAR, which did not last long. No party received a decisive majority in the elections to create a lasting coalition government and to end the fighting. The Egyptian-Syrian denunciations only opened the way for a new army intervention. At the end of March 1962, six months after the formation of a civilian government, the army revolted again.

Reasoning: From the evidence available (Perlmutter 1969), it was the Syrian Ba'ath party rather than Nasser who wanted the union in the form it took (so the U-turn is not the result of international intervention). The Ba'ath party expected to be strengthened through the union. The union was not a success though. The reversal part of the U-turn is the military reaction to the establishment of the UAR.

Source: Perlmutter, A. (1969): [From Obscurity to Rule: The Syrian Army and the Ba'ath Party](#). *The Western Political Quarterly* 22(4): 827-845.

Thailand 1976-1989

- **Autocratization: 1976-1977**
- **Bottom: 1978**
- **Democratization 1979-1989**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

After a period of relative pluralism between 1973-1976, Thailand had a violent and repressive military coup in 1976. The military invoked martial law and ruled unchecked, but eventually put in place a new constitution in 1978, and held general elections in 1979. The officials elected in the 1979 elections were largely military-backed individuals, and the military controlled politics. In 1980, PM General Kriangsak Chomanan lost the support of the military and resigned, and army Commander-in-Chief Prem Tinsulanonda took over. His government won the elections in 1983 and 1986. After the 1988 elections, which were more competitive, Prem lost to Chatichai Choonhavan, the leader of the Chart Thai Party, and stepped down. The return of parliament, the holding of relatively competitive elections, and the gradual ceding of power by the military – most clearly marked by Prem stepping down in 1988 – are some of the key features of the relatively long and slow democratization taking place in Thailand.

Reasoning: Both autocratization and democratization are driven and controlled by (authoritarian) incumbents (the military).

Source: Nohlen, D., F. Grotz, and C. Hartmann, eds. (2002): *Elections in Asia and the Pacific: A Data Handbook*, Vol. 2. New York: Oxford University Press.

Thailand 2005-2012

- **Autocratization: 2005-2007**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization: 2008-2012**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

The 2005-2006 Thai political crisis began in October 2005 amidst public dissatisfaction with Prime Minister Thaksin Shinawatra due to his family's holdings in Shin Corporation and a violent crackdown on drug dealers. The 2006 military coup took place right before nationwide House elections were scheduled to be held. The military ousted Prime Minister Thaksin, cancelled the scheduled elections, dissolved the parliament, banned protests, censored the media, and declared martial law nationwide. In 2007, the military held a national referendum on the 2007 constitution, which was approved in August 2007 and came into force immediately. In December 2007, a general election was held. Despite being targeted by the junta, the People's Power Party (PPP), led by Thaksin's brother-in-law Wongsawat, won 233 out of 480 parliamentary seats in the House of Representatives. The 2008 political crisis followed. By the end of 2008, the Thai Constitutional Court put a temporary end to the political turmoil by dissolving three major Thaksin-aligned political parties, including the PPP. The disbandment of the PPP set the stage for the Democrat Party to form a majority coalition for the first time since Thaksin seized power in 2001.

Reasoning: The military first seize power and then control the process of holding elections.

Source: Bertelsmann Stiftung (2024): [BTI 2024 Country Report – Thailand](#). Gütersloh: Bertelsmann Stiftung.

Smith, D.B. (2018): The Thai Coup Cycle: [Why the National Council for Peace and Order’s Authoritarian Reforms are Unlikely to Bring Political Stability to Thailand](#). *International Immersion Program Papers* 84.

Thailand 2013-2023 (cens.)

- **Autocratization: 2013-2014**
- **Bottom: 2015-2017**
- **Democratization: 2018-2023**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

The 2014 military coup followed a series of political events, which included demonstrations both against the government (the “yellow shirts”) and in favor of the government (the “red shirts”). The military stepped in to prevent violence. The coup led to five years of military rule during which the military had repeatedly delayed elections. In 2018, Thailand’s a general election was eventually announced by the military. The 2019 flawed elections followed and resulted in some liberalization under the military-backed government. The 2023 elections were cleaner and resulted in a surprise win of the Move Forward party and the resignation of Prime Minister and former 2014 coup-leader Chan-ocha. Yet, the Pheu Thai party went into a coalition with military-backed parties to elect Thavisin as the new Prime Minister, leaving the Move Forward Party out of the government.

Reasoning: The military first stage a coup, and then organize and oversee the elections. The Constitutional Court overseeing the elections was appointed by the junta.

Source: Bertelsmann Stiftung (2024): [BTI 2024 Country Report – Thailand](#). Gütersloh: Bertelsmann Stiftung.

Tunisia 2013-2023 (cens.)

- **Autocratization: 2013-2022**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization: 2023-2023**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

Tunisia – the success story of the Arab spring – saw some first signs of autocratization already in 2013. Yet, Tunisia held a series of multiparty elections after the Arab spring, and a constitution was promulgated in 2014. However, corruption, economic problems, and security concerns persisted. In recent years, President Saïed has worked to expand his own political power. In 2021, he unilaterally replaced the prime minister, dissolved the parliament, postponed elections indefinitely, and in effect started ruling by decree. Attacks on civil liberties followed as people opposed the draconian measures.

In 2023, parliamentary elections were held. Yet, voter turnout was only 11 percent, and the electoral process was marred by restrictions and a boycott led by major opposition parties. Crackdowns against opponents followed – numerous opposition leaders, journalists, and civil activists were arrested.

Reasoning: An uptick in 2023 that technically qualifies as a U-Turn appears because parliamentary elections were held in 2023. The elections were organized by President Saïed.

Source: Freedom House (2024): [Freedom in the World 2024 – Tunisia](#).

Türkiye 1954-1967

- **Autocratization: 1954-1961**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization: 1962-1967**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

The Democrat Party (DP) of Adnan Menderes came to power in 1950. It also won the 1954 and 1957 elections, and after the 1954 election started to introduce legal and electoral reforms intended to cement its dominant position. This new single-party rule won the increasing hostility of a more politicized and educated ruling urban elite, as well as of the army, which had lost influence and status. The DP government reacted to these critics with increased repression, especially against the press. For example, Menderes ordered the “Istanbul pogrom” in September 1955, after winning the 1954 general elections in a landslide.

The growing opposition against the DP led by Menderes led to the first military coup in 1960. Soon after the coup, Menderes was put on trial along with other members of the government (Yassıada trials), which found him guilty of high treason, violation of constitution, embezzling public money, and the Istanbul pogrom. As a result, he was hanged on September 27, 1961. On July 9, 1961, a constitutional referendum passed a new constitution, and shortly after (on October 15, 1961) new elections brought to power the Republican People’s Party (CHP) for the first time since the beginning of the multiparty system. This was also the first civilian government since the coup. The military were nevertheless involved in politics until the next round of election in 1965 when the Justice Party won over 50% of the votes.

Reasoning: The military first stage a coup, and then organize and oversee the election. Both autocratization and democratization are led by autocratic incumbents.

Source: Nohlen, D., F. Grotz, and C. Hartmann, eds. (2002): *Elections in Asia and the Pacific: A Data Handbook*, Vol. 1. New York: Oxford University Press.

Türkiye 1980-1992

- **Autocratization: 1980-1981**
- **Bottom: 1982**
- **Democratization: 1983-1992**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

Amid political instability that was affecting Türkiye over the 1970s, General Kenan Evren headed a coup in 1980. Martial law was enforced, parliament disbanded, constitution suspended, political parties and trade unions banned. Hundreds of thousands of people were jailed and hundreds killed. An appointed and tightly controlled Constitution Assembly elaborated new party and electoral laws. In 1982, a new constitution was approved via referendum, and Evren was confirmed President of the Republic. Parliamentary elections were held in November 1983, but were not free and fair. In the new political system, the military was entitled to oversee the political process, inter alia to select the parties and the candidates allowed to contest elections.

Reasoning: A military coup followed by elections to legitimize the power grab. Elections as coup legitimization are coded as authoritarian manipulation.

Source: Nohlen, D., F. Grotz, and C. Hartmann, eds. (2002): *Elections in Asia and the Pacific: A Data Handbook*, Vol. 1. New York: Oxford University Press.

Uganda 1985-1995

- **Autocratization: 1985-1986**
- **Bottom: 1987-1988**
- **Democratization 1989-1995**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

General Lutwa Okelle overthrew Milton Obote's government in a military coup in 1985. In 1986, Museveni's National Resistance Movement (NRM) came to power through yet another military coup. The two coups led the country to autocratize from an already low starting point. Museveni's NRM government rejected the idea of multiparty politics but tried to enhance participation and legitimacy through a system of Resistance Councils (RC) that had some political influence but could not constrain the executive. Elections were held to the RC in 1989 and 1992. During this period, repression also declined to some degree. Together, these constitute the initial parts of Uganda's reversal, which was also accompanied by the drafting of a new constitution. A constitutional assembly was eventually elected in 1994, and a new constitution adopted in 1995, among other things restoring powers to a real parliament. Yet, this democratization was only partial, and the President remained very powerful, while restrictions remained on multiparty competition.

Reasoning: Museveni and the elites close to him control all the events happening after the coup in 1986. The U-turn is not “democratic” in the sense that by 1995 when the episode is finished, Uganda remains far from being a democracy.

Source: Nohlen, D., B. Thibaut, and M. Krennerich, eds. (1999): *Elections in Africa: A Data Handbook*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Uruguay 1933-1947

- **Autocratization: 1933**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization: 1934-1947**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

Gabriel Terra assumed the Uruguayan Presidency in 1931. In 1933, he staged a self-coup, which was motivated by Terra’s opposition to the second Constitution of Uruguay that had been approved in 1918. He disbanded the 1918 constitution and replaced it with a new one in 1934 – much less liberal than the previous one. The 1934 constitution transferred much of the power to the president who had to make decision together with the ministers, and established the Council of Ministers as the body in which these decisions were to be made.

In March 1938, elections were held, which Terra’s party (the Colorados) won with 61.4% votes. Alfredo Baldomir – a former soldier and the leader of the faction of the Colorados – became the new President. He was able to move away from Gabriel Terra’s close ties with the Axis and turned the country towards an alliance with the Allies during WWII. In 1942, Baldomir, now a general in the army, staged a bloodless coup, dissolved the parliament and called for state of emergency thereby extending his term, which was soon to expire, for a year. In 1943, Baldomir voluntarily held elections and gave up power, but the continued dominance of the Colorados was ensured.

Reasoning: The elites from the Colorados party control both autocratization (self-coup by Terra) and subsequent liberalization (new constitution, elections, and re-acting against Terra’s dictatorship).

Source: Taylor, P. B. (1955): The Electoral System in Uruguay. *The Journal of Politics* 17(1): 19-42.

Democratic Reaction

Armenia 1993-2019

- **Autocratization: 1993-2008**
- **Bottom: 2009**
- **Democratization: 2010-2019**
- **Coding: Democratic Reaction**

Autocratization started right after the Collapse of the Soviet Union: first under Levon Ter-Petrosyan (who remain in power from 1991-1998), then under Robert Kocharyan (Ter-Petrosyan's Prime Minister). The very first protests against Kocharyan started after the 2004 elections amid allegations of electoral fraud. In 2008 election, Kocharyan was not eligible for a third term. His Prime Minister Serge Sargsyan received his backing for his candidacy as the next president. Ter-Petrosyan (also a candidate for this election) accused Kocharyan's government of massive corruption. Sargsyan won the presidential election, however, presidential election protests erupted right after the election, and lasted for 10 days, with tens of thousands of demonstrators on the streets.

Nikol Pashinyan was the one of those who campaigned for Ter-Petrosyan in that election. He was later convicted on a charge of inciting "mass disorder" in the presidential election protests and was put in prison in 2009. In 2011, he was released in a general amnesty. Pashinyan remained a critic of Sargsyan, often denouncing the growing corruption and power of the oligarchs. In 2018, he launched a protest movement against Sargsyan, which became known as the 2018 Velvet Revolution. While Pashinyan's leadership seems to be critical for the revolution, the protests in Armenia grew over time and were the result of a long history of opposition and civil society movements (starting in 2004), most importantly – of post-election protests in 2008, which the government dispersed with violence.

Reasoning: Autocratization was halted and reversed by a growing opposition movement led by Nikol Pashinyan. The protests of 2018 drew on a long history of opposition and civil society movements.

Sources: Iskanian, A. (2018): [Armenia's Unfinished Revolution](#). *Current History* 117(801), Russia and Eurasia: 271-276.

Lanskoy, M., and E. Suthers (2019): [Armenia's Velvet Revolution](#). *Journal of Democracy* 30(2): 85-99.

Bangladesh 1982-1992

- **Autocratization: 1982-1983**
- **Bottom: 1984-1985**
- **Democratization 1986-1992**
- **Coding: Democratic Reaction**

President Ziaur Rahman was killed in a failed coup in May 1981. Vice-President Abdus Sattar replaced him, and was later elected President in November 1981. Under General Ershad the military staged a new coup, and on March 24 1982 Ershad declared martial law, suspending the constitution and parliament. Ershad ruled unchecked after this, but in 1985 he held a referendum seeking to legitimize government. Democratization took off shortly after, as in 1986 Ershad held parliamentary and presidential elections. However, the major opposition parties boycotted the elections, leading to a significant lack of legitimacy despite Ershad winning both elections. Facing strong protests by opposition parties, Ershad dissolved the Parliament in December 1987. New parliamentary elections were held in March 1988, but the opposition continued to boycott and pressured the government to step down. Ershad eventually succumbed to this pressure and handed power to Chief Justice Shahabuddin Ahmed as leader of a caretaker government in December 1990 ahead of new elections. This next round of parliamentary elections were held on February 27, 1991. The Bangladesh Nationalist Party (BNP) leader Khaleda Zia won and was appointed Prime Minister, and elections restored the parliamentary system in August 1991.

Reasoning: Autocratization is interrupted and reversed through pressures from domestic democratic actors. It is primarily the opposition parties and their followers that force concessions and further democratization through several iterations while Ershad is trying to legitimize his rule without ceding power.

Source: Nohlen, D., F. Grotz, and C. Hartmann, eds. (2002): *Elections in Asia and the Pacific: A Data Handbook*, Vol. 1. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bolivia 2006-2023 (cens.)

- **Autocratization: 2006-2020**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization: 2021-2023**
- **Coding: Democratic Reaction**

Bolivia's autocratization started with Evo Morales ascending to power in 2006. He gradually undermined many of the checks and balances. The opposition movement against Morales and public dissatisfaction with his rule grew over time, and intensified after he changed the constitution seeking a third consecutive term in office. In 2017, Morales attempted to get re-elected for a fourth consecutive term. Bolivians rejected a constitutional draft that would have allowed Morales to seek another term. After Bolivia's constitutional court annulled the results of a referendum, nationwide protests erupted. Protesters in the streets, united under the slogans of "No means no", questioned the legitimacy of the court by casting null votes in 2017 judicial elections. 2019 marked a turning point when widespread electoral fraud, mass protests supported by the army and the police, splits within the elites, and pressure from the international community led to Morales' resignation. The 2020 presidential election were largely free and fair.

Reasoning: Bolivia's return to democracy was largely the result of opposition movement and mass protests. Many organizations and groups were united in ousting Morales out of power, including major labor unions, civic groups, and student organizations.

Source: Wiebrecht et al. (2023): State of the World 2022: Defiance in the Face of Autocratization. *Democratization* 30(5): 769-793.

Brazil 2016-2023 (cens.)

- **Autocratization: 2016-2021**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization: 2022-2023**
- **Coding: Democratic Reaction**

Autocratization started in 2016 when former President Rousseff was removed from office in a process that polarized Brazilian voters. Bolsonaro was elected president two years later. During his presidency, he attacked the media, restricted academic freedom, undermined the electoral system, and had conflicts with the legislative and judiciary powers. Anti-Bolsonaro protests grew over time and left-wing movements advocating for women's rights and environmental protection were among the most active opposition actors. Bolsonaro's response to the COVID-19 pandemic also led to anti-government protests. In 2022, "Lula" da Silva defeated Bolsonaro in the polls and took office on January 1, 2023, leading to a year of refutation of Bolsonaro's policies and ceasing of his transgressions.

Reasoning: "Lula" da Silva defeated Bolsonaro in the polls. Bolsonaro made several allegations of electoral fraud and requested that the Superior Electoral Court invalidate the votes recorded by electronic voting machines that lacked identification numbers. Yet, the court rejected the request. Lula was sworn in on January 1, 2023.

Source: Nord et al. (2024): *Democracy Report 2024: Democracy Winning and Losing at the Ballot*. Gothenburg: University of Gothenburg, V-Dem Institute.

Burkina Faso 2014-2016

- **Autocratization: 2014-2015**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization: 2016-2016**
- **Coding: Democratic Reaction**

Burkina Faso's gradual democratization since 2000 was interrupted by the 2014 Burkinabé uprising followed by the 2015 military coup. The 2014 Burkinabé uprising began in response to attempts at changing the constitution to allow President Blaise Compaoré to run again and extend his 27 years in office. Pressures for political change came from civil society and in

particular from the country's youth. After uprising, Compaoré dissolved the government and declared a state of emergency before eventually fleeing to Côte d'Ivoire. After several days of mass protests, Compaoré resigned. Lieutenant Colonel Zida from the former president's security forces (RSP) staked a claim to be interim head of state until an election within 12 months and received unanimous military backing. Yet, a coalition of unnamed opposition parties – which formed in the wake of the Burkinabé uprising – rejected the military takeover. Military takeover was also condemned by most civil society organizations, trade unions, and political parties. Across the country, people mobilized in popular resistance and civil disobedience. Resistance mounted and after a few days it became clear that the coup would fail. The African Union intervened and gave the country a fortnight to end military rule. A framework was agreed upon for a transitional executive and legislative administration. In 2015, a month before the scheduled election, a controversial autonomous military unit organized a military coup. Leaders of the transitional government were detained, and the junta denounced the transitional government's electoral law. However, the junta failed to consolidate its authority across the country, and faced protests from regional leaders, and eventually from the regular army. The transitional government was restored, and general elections were held in October 2015, as planned. The country restored quickly its initial democracy level after the 2015 general elections.

Reasoning: This is a case of popular resistance first against Compaoré's attempt to modify the Constitution (and make the presidency a life-long post), and then against the junta that attempted to take over control of the country. The role of international community is also important but only in terms of supporting the resistance. There was no direct intervention.

Source: Hagberg, S. (2015): ["Thousands of New Sankaras": Resistance and Struggle in Burkina Faso](#). *Africa Spectrum* 50(3): 109-121.

Chile 1924-1937

- **Autocratization: 1924-1928**
- **Bottom: 1929-1931**
- **Democratization: 1932-1937**
- **Coding: Democratic Reaction**

The period between 1924 and 1932 is extremely unstable for Chile's history with 11 (successful or attempted) coup d'états. In 1924, there was a conflict between President Arturo Alessandri and the Congress that refused to enact the laws the President submitted. The military intervened in September 1924, and Alessandri resigned. Instead of accepting his resignation, the Congress granted him a constitutional leave of absence. The ruling junta was ousted by another coup in January 1925. A brief presidency by Figueroa (1925-1927) followed, which terminated with him stepping down due to political pressures put by his Minister of War, Carlos Ibáñez del Campo. Ibáñez won the 1927 election and ruled until 1931. During the authoritarian government of Ibáñez, the state was reorganized, and the road, port, and education infrastructures were developed.

The Great Depression hit Chile in 1929, and exacerbated by mid-1932. President Montero had to resign shortly after a mutiny led by Grove, who headed Chile until being overthrown by former ally Dávila who would also be overthrown, this time by Blanche. After his downfall, Oyanedel became head of state. Alessandri (at that point in exile) came back in 1932, and easily won the competitive election held same year. He brought back stability to the country, which by that time had been unstable for almost a decade. In his second administration, Alessandri repressed with violence protests and started swinging to a more right-wing-leaning alliance. In an attempt to avoid coups, he relied on the republican forces, who repressed any intent to protest or get involved in politics.

Reasoning: Although Alessandri is a very controversial figure, he seemed to have resisted coups and militaries, and came to power in 1932 in a democratic way. He also stabilized the country, and established an “estado de compromiso”, which guaranteed the stability of the political system despite severe political disputes.

Source: Nohlen, D., ed. (2005): *Elections in the Americas: A Data Handbook*, Vol. 1. New York: Oxford University Press.

Costa Rica 1917-1924

- **Autocratization: 1917-1918**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization: 1919-1924**
- **Coding: Democratic Reaction**

By January 1917, an economic crisis brought about through the disruption of trade during the WWI led to the imposition of new taxes and other economic austerity measures which, in turn, triggered a military coup. The coup established the “Tinoco brothers” dictatorship. They cracked down democratic freedoms and rights (e.g., the elimination of the direct vote, ban of alternative opposition parties, the restoration of the death penalty), and the first anti-Tinoquist protests started to emerge in 1918. In 1919, there was the uprising (Sapoá Revolution), which failed, but kept the opposition momentum alive. In 1919, there was also the civic student movement (i.e., protests led mostly by intellectuals). In the same year, the opposition became more violent and managed to kill José Joaquín Tinoco (one of the two brother dictators). Federico Tinoco (the other brother) was forced to resign and flee into exile in August 1919. This led to general elections where Julio Acosta García, leader of the opposition, won.

Reasoning: Tinoco was overthrown by opposition forces shortly after the murder of his brother. This was a democratic reaction by domestic democratic actors (oppositional elites and citizens).

Source: Nelson, H.D., ed. (1983): *Costa Rica – a Country Study*. Washington D.C.: American University, Foreign Area Studies.

Costa Rica 1948-1954

- **Autocratization: 1948**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization: 1949-1954**
- **Coding: Democratic Reaction**

In 1948, the National Republican Party (NRP) lost the presidential election to the opposition leader Otilio Ulate. However, President Calderón refused to accept the results of the election, and the NRP that held the majority in the Legislative Assembly from previous elections invalidated the electoral. This led to an armed uprising led by José Figueres Ferrer, an opponent of the NRP against the government of President Teodoro Picado. At the end, Calderón and his supporters negotiated a surrender and were allowed to leave the country. The victory of Ferrer led him to become a provisional President. In 1948, elections followed, and in 1949, Otilio Ulate, the winner of the 1948 elections, became President of Costa Rica. In the aftermath, Ulate and Ferrer had ideological differences, and Ferrer won against Ulate in the following presidential elections in 1953.

Reasoning: The opposition won the 1948 election but reverted to an armed uprising when Calderón refused to accept the results.

Source: Nohlen, D., ed. (2005): *Elections in the Americas: A Data Handbook*, Vol. 1. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ecuador 1906-1912

- **Autocratization: 1906**
- **Bottom: 1907-1910**
- **Democratization: 1911-1912**
- **Coding: Democratic Reaction**

José Eloy Alfaro took power via coup against his successor, Lizardo García, in 1906. García had been elected president through elections in 1905. In 1906, Alfaro called for elections (60 votes in total), and became “supreme dictator” and ruled the country until 1911 when he was removed from power by former supporters. His successor, Emilio Estrada, was also his former ally during the late 19th century’s rebellions that had overthrown the previous regime. The elections in 1911 were much more participated, and Estrada won with 93% votes. However, Alfaro did not recognize the vote as legitimate and attempted to prevent Estrada from taking power and killed some of Estrada’s allies (especially military such as General Emilio María Terán). On August 11, 1911, the population took to the streets with slogans like “Down with the dictatorship! Viva Emilio Estrada! Viva the Constitution!” and went towards the presidential palace to take Alfaro. The president of the Senate at the time, Carlos Freile Zaldumbide, requested Alfaro’s resignation leveraging on the protests happening down the

streets. Estrada was able to mediate Alfaro's exit from the country in late August (towards Panama), and on September 1, 1911 took the presidency. After Estrada's death later in 1911, Alfaro attempted to seize control of the government once again, but was captured by government troops in January 1912 and imprisoned by the government. He was killed by a mob on January 28, 1912. The 1912 presidential elections saw an opposition party running against the Liberal Party of Ecuador for the first time in the 20th century.

Reasoning: Alfaro was forced to resign after intense popular pressure.

Source: Grupo El Comercio (2012): [Los Últimos Días de Alfaro: Documentos Para el Debate](#). Cuaderno 3.

Narváez, L. (1911): [La Evolución Política del 11 de Agosto de 1911: Relato de Sus Autores](#). Quito: Imprenta y Encuadernación Nacionales.

Ecuador 1932-1939

- **Autocratization: 1932-1936**
- **Bottom: 1937**
- **Democratization: 1938-1939**
- **Coding: Democratic Reaction**

The presidential elections in 1931 saw the victory of the opposition party PCE (the Conservatives) headed by Neptalí Bonifaz Ascázubi. However, the Congress disqualified Bonifaz from being elected President by attributing Peruvian nationality. This decision led to a period of chaos and unrest throughout the country, and led to a civil war (September-December 1932) between military units defending Bonifaz and those that were in favor of disqualification of Bonifaz. The latter won. Senate President Alberto Guerrero Martínez called for new elections, in which the Liberal candidate Juan de Dios Martínez Mera won. Yet, the election was claimed to be fraudulent, and Martínez Mera was forced to resign by the Congress. Abelardo Montalvo became acting President. In 1933, José María Velasco Ibarra (the Conservatives) assumed the Presidency after having won with a landslide (80%, the highest ever recorded in Ecuador's history). Velasco undermined horizontal accountability (e.g., MPs from the Liberal party in the opposition). Carlos Arroyo del Río was one of the toughest MPs that opposed Velasco's policies, fighting through legal means in the Congress and Senate. Velasco dissolved the congress on 20 August 1935 and called for a Constituent Assembly the same year. The military opposed this unconstitutional decision and ousted him. Shortly thereafter, the military placed Federico Páez (supporter of the faction against Neptalí Bonifaz) in the presidential palace, who used violence and harassment of opposition during his presidency. After having attempted to stabilize the country through a Constitutional Assembly in 1937 (failed), he militarized the country.

In September 1937, Páez was overthrown by his Minister of National Defense, General Alberto Enríquez Gallo. Enríquez Gallo created a Constitutional Assembly bringing together liberals, conservatives, and socialists, which closed the authoritarian period started in 1935. Enríquez

ruled for less than a year and resigned in 1938, appointing Manuel María Borrero as interim President. Borrero was dismissed several months later, and in December 1938, elections were held, and Aurelio Mosquera Narváez (the Liberal party) won. During his short time as President, with the support of the army, he dissolved the National Assembly and reestablished the Constitution of 1906, known for its secularity. Narváez died suddenly in November 1939, and in 1940, Carlos Arroyo del Río became President.

Reasoning: The opposition elites respond to an incumbent that autocratizes the country. Arroyo del Río is a prominent opposition leader within an increasingly authoritarian parliament. Alberto Gallo, Minister of Defence, acts within the authoritarian rules by naming himself as “supreme chief” only to swiftly establish the Constitutional Assembly. Had it been something different than democratic reaction, Gallo would have most likely held onto power rather than given it away. In 1937, the opposition forces managed to close the authoritarian period by establishing a very wide coalition, which is not common without open signs of democratic reaction. Furthermore, between 1937 and 1939, there seems to be a systematic effort by opposition leaders to resist autocratization. This seems to be a key element that brought Carlos Arroyo del Río to become president in 1940.

Source: Hanratty, D.M., ed. (1989): [Ecuador: A Country Study](#). Federal Research Division, Library of Congress.

Study Center of the Army History (2014): [Brief History of the Ecuadorian Army](#). Quito: Study Center of the Army History.

Ecuador 1960-1969

- **Autocratization: 1960-1964**
- **Bottom: 1965-1966**
- **Democratization: 1967-1969**
- **Coding: Democratic Reaction**

José María Velasco Ibarra won elections and became President for the fourth time in 1960. From an early stage in the regime, there were disagreements between the President and the Vice President. In October 1961, the Congress charged the government with violating the Constitution. A virtual riot took place in the Legislative Palace with an organized pro-government mob attacking the congressmen. The legislators were fired on from the crowd, but nobody was killed. The Vice President threatened to bring a charge of attempted murder against Velasco and his Cabinet. After these accusations, Velasco imprisoned the Vice President and members of the ruling and opposition parties in the Parliament. Protests erupted in the country. The military ousted Velasco and freed the Vice President from jail. Carlos Julio Arosemena Monroy (the Vice President) was then proclaimed President by the Congress, attempting to prevent protests to become stronger. In 1963, the military ousted Arosemena because of his support for politics of Cuba’s Fidel Castro. They established a four-man military junta until 1966. Through these three years, the opposition was able to gather some strength: student groups and labor union organized protests. On March 29, 1966, following a bloody attack on

the Central University in Quito, the remaining three members of the military junta stepped down. This set the road for a new civilian government after the Constitutional Assembly elections on October 16, 1966. Next general elections were held in 1968.

Reasoning: The opposition had to work behind the scenes to take power back from the military junta after they intervened to stop Velasco's autocratization.

Source: Hanratty, D.M., ed. (1989): [Ecuador: A Country Study](#). Federal Research Division, Library of Congress.

Pyne, P. (1975): [The Politics of Instability in Ecuador: The Overthrow of the President, 1961](#). *Journal of Latin American Studies* 7(1): 109-133.

Ecuador 1970-1980

- **Autocratization: 1970-1973**
- **Bottom: 1974-1977**
- **Democratization: 1978-1980**
- **Coding: Democratic Reaction**

Velasco won his fifth presidency in 1968. Soon after (1969), he started pressuring the Congress to centralize his executive powers, and responded to student demonstrations with violence. He installed a personalist authoritarian regime on June 22, 1970, discarding the Constitution. Opposition and media were strongly repressed. He also opened to Castro's Cuba and welcomed Salvador Allende, both against the US interests and regional policy. Agee (1975) – former CIA – details the US involvement in deposing Velasco. The military coup carried out on February 15, 1972 was led by Guillermo Rodríguez Lara, who then became President until 1976. Military rule enforced severe repressive measures. In 1976, the Supreme Council of Government (another military junta) ousted Guillermo Rodríguez, took over until 1979 and set out to ensure a democratic transition. In 1976, the military government formed three commissions to assist with the transition back to civil rule. In January 1978, a constitutional referendum was held. The triumvirate then called for elections (allegedly due to international pressure as well), which were held in 1978 and 1979. However, these elections were quite limited as many former presidents and parties were not allowed to run at all and results were probably tempered and fraudulent. Jaime Roldós Aguilera won and was supported by Assad Bucaram (former Mayor of Guayaquil who was banned by the military), the opposition leader that Velasco had imprisoned during his fourth presidency (1961) and then imprisoned again during the military rule in the 1970s. Aguilera died in 1981 (probably assassinated), same year in which Bucaram died while President of the Congress.

Reasoning: The opposition in this instance worked through the hard dictatorship years, waiting the right moment to emerge and win the popular support.

Source: Hanratty, D.M., ed. (1989): [Ecuador: A Country Study](#). Federal Research Division, Library of Congress.

Agee, P. (1975): *Inside the Company: CIA Diary*. Penguin. pp. 106-316.

Fiji 2000-2003

- **Autocratization: 2000-2001**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization: 2002-2003**
- **Coding: Democratic Reaction**

This episode is centered around a civilian coup in Fiji. Extreme nationalists removed the elected Prime Minister Mahendra Chaudhry from office. Violent skirmishes and chaos broke out and as a result, Chief Justice and other judges advised Military Commander Frank Bainimarama to take over power. He took over power and led negotiations with the rebels until 'the time is right' to hand power back to civilian control. Bainimarama nominated a civilian Prime Minister later in 2000. In March 2001, the Court of Appeal of Fiji ruled that the interim regime was illegal. In August-September 2001, general elections were held confirming the nominated Prime Minister.

Reasoning: This case describes an elite reaction to the coup. Although this reaction included primarily unlawful means, we code it as a democratic reaction since elites were concerned with re-establishing political stability and had the intention of returning to democratic politics in a timely manner.

Source: Lal, B.V., and M. Pretes, eds. (2008): *Coup: Reflections on the Political Crisis in Fiji*. Canberra: Australian National University Press.

Hungary, 1919-1923

- **Autocratization: 1919**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization: 1920-1923**
- **Coding: Democratic Reaction**

Following WWI and the independence of Hungary, in 1919, a communist regime was established by Béla Kun. In an effort to recreate Hungary's former borders, he also led the country into a war with Romania but lost it very quickly. As a result, Romanian forces occupied Budapest and Kun's regime was ousted. In the aftermath, there was widespread violence between leftists, conservatives, and rightists. This offered a welcome window for the reactionary government that had initially formed against Kun's regime to step in and take charge. At its top was Admiral Miklós Horthy who was named the Regent of the Kingdom of Hungary by the parliament in March 1920.

Reasoning: This episode is coded as democratic reaction because the reactionary government was certainly formed in response to Kun's communist regime. Although the international

dimension offered a window of opportunity for political intervention, we do not see this as the primary reason for the democratization episode: Resistance against Kun's regime was more encompassing than only focusing on the international dimension.

Source: Sugar, P. F., P. Hanák, and T. Frank (1990): *A History of Hungary*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Ivory Coast 2000-2001

- **Autocratization: 2000**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization: 2001**
- **Coding: Democratic Reaction**

The 1999 Ivorian coup d'état took place on December 24, 1999, and the military led by former army commander Robert Guéi took over the power. The junta dissolved the parliament, the former government, the constitutional council, and the supreme court. A new constitution, approved by referendum on July 23, 2000, controversially barred all presidential candidates other than those whose parents were Ivorian, including Ouattara, the former Prime Minister and the political rival of the ousted former President Bédié. A presidential election was held on October 22, 2000. All of the major opposition candidates except for Gbagbo of the Ivorian Popular Front (FPI) were barred from standing. Guéi was defeated by Gbagbo but refused to recognize the result. Ouattara, excluded from this election, called for a new election. Street protests broke out, bringing Gbagbo to power. Gbagbo took office as president on October 26, 2000. On November 13, Guéi recognised the legitimacy of the presidency of Gbagbo. On December 10, 2000, parliamentary elections were held and won by Gbagbo's FPI.

Reasoning: A military coup followed by elections to legitimize the power grab. Yet, against the expectations of the military, they lost the elections. A people's revolt ousted Guéi who attempted to proclaim himself the winner of the presidential election. Although Gbagbo is a very controversial figure, he was the opposition in the 2000 presidential election and came to power in a democratic way (elections and mass protests to recognize their result).

Source: Inter-Parliamentary Union: [Côte d'Ivoire – Election Archive](https://edition.cnn.com/2000/WORLD/africa/10/25/ivory.coast.05/).
<https://edition.cnn.com/2000/WORLD/africa/10/25/ivory.coast.05/>
<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2000/oct/25/2>

Malawi 1999-2013

- **Autocratization: 1999-2005**
- **Bottom: 2006-2008**
- **Democratization: 2009-2013**
- **Coding: Democratic Reaction**

The 1995 multiparty elections officially ended one-party rule. Yet, by 2000, corruption and poor governance became prevalent. In 2002, President Muluzi attempted to abolish term limits in the constitution so that he could run for president again in 2004. The court blocked the attempt. Bingu was Mutharika was elected President. In 2009, President Muluzi again attempted to run for president violating the constitution. The courts yet again ruled against him. President Mutharika was re-elected, and his second term marked the turnaround. During his second term, Mutharika emphasized better governance practices – and his second term marks a transition back to democracy.

Reasoning: A combination of institutions (courts) and elections (through getting a new, more democratic leader) leads to the ending of autocratization and improvements under the new government generating democratization.

Source: Samarin, M. (2024): [Desk Study on Aid and Democracy: Malawi](#). Helsinki: UNU WIDER.

Maldives 2010-2023 (cens.)

- **Autocratization: 2010-2017**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization: 2018-2023**
- **Coding: Democratic Reaction**

Since The Maldives became a multiparty democracy in 2008, its has been ruled by either the pro-India Maldivian Democratic Party (MDP) or the pro-China Progressive Party of Maldives (PPM). The Maldives saw a significant shift towards China following the 2011-2013 Maldives political crisis, which was a series of peaceful protests against the government's mismanagement of the economy. After several years of turmoil, and resignation of one president, and the defeat of the other, the pro-China PPM candidate Abdulla Yameen won the 2013 election. Yameen attracted multiple development and infrastructure projects through China's Belt and Road Initiative. He also borrowed heavily from China, and the total debt amounted to 20 per cent of GDP. Opposition activists criticized this move. There were also growing concerns that closer relations with China would undermine the historically close relations with India. President Yameen was also responsible for violation of civil liberties and executive overreach. Facing mounting public dissatisfaction, Yameen lost the 2018 presidency to pro-India MDP candidate Ibrahim Solih. The reduced repression along with the free and fair parliamentary elections in 2019 won by President Solih's MDP party, led to the regaining of status as democracy. His administration has taken efforts to revise antidemocratic laws and establish transitional justice mechanisms.

Reasoning: Ibrahim Solih, the candidate of an opposition alliance, soundly defeated Abdulla Yameen in elections, which observers considered to be mostly free and fair.

Source: Dey, S., P. Das, S. Dutta, N. Gopalan Lakshmi (2023): [Insight: South Asia: Political Infighting Tests Maldivian Democracy as China and India Look On](#). CAST: South Asia Team.

Moldova 2001-2011

- **Autocratization: 2001-2006**
- **Bottom: 2007-2008**
- **Democratization: 2009-2011**
- **Coding: Democratic Reaction**

In 2001, the Communist Party was voted back into power with a constitutional majority. In 2005, the communists scored a victory again, but this time their coalition strategically included non-communist ministers in the government. Until 2009, the Communist Party managed to control politics and large segments of economic power. Yet, the opposition against its rule was growing over time. Large-scale protests erupted against the 2008 parliamentary elections. The demonstrators claimed that the elections, which saw the governing Communist Party win a majority of seats, were fraudulent, and demanded a recount, a new election, or resignation of the government. After the civil unrest, the climate in Moldova became very polarized. The parliament failed to elect a new president. For this reason, it was dissolved, and snap elections were held. The polls were won by the Communist Party, but opposition parties agreed to create the Alliance for European Integration that pushed the Communist party into opposition.

Reasoning: Autocratization is halted and reversed in a democratic way (elections) through pressures from domestic democratic actors (oppositional elites and masses).

Source: Bertelsmann Stiftung, ed. (2012): Transformation Index BTI 2012: Regional Findings Post-Soviet Eurasia. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann Stiftung.

Moldova 2012-2021

- **Autocratization: 2012-2017**
- **Bottom: 2018**
- **Democratization: 2019-2021**
- **Coding: Democratic Reaction**

While Moldova has had several democratic elections since independence, corruption was endemic and many oligarchs controlled political parties since the 1990s. After the 2014 parliamentary elections, Moldova faced a serious economic and political crisis, which revealed deep structural problems and corruption affecting the judiciary and law enforcement institutions. By 2019, oligarchs were the dominant force in several political parties. After a series of short-lived governments, the opposition coalition led by the Party of Action and Solidarity (PAS) won control over the presidency. In 2020, Maia Sandu became President. She was from one of the country's main pro-European parties and replaced pro-Russian President Igor Dodon. Sandu promised in her campaign to fight corruption and to "end the rule of

thieves”. In 2021, the constitutional court ruled that snap elections should be held. Parliament attempted to obstruct this by initiating a COVID-19 state of emergency and replaced one of the judges in the constitutional court. In parliamentary elections the following year, Sandu’s party won a majority of seats in the national legislature.

Reasoning: Autocratization is halted and reversed in a democratic way (elections) through pressures from domestic democratic actors (oppositional elites and masses).

Source: Carothers, T., and B. Feldman (2023): [Understanding and Supporting Democratic Bright Spots](#). Working Paper. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Myanmar 1942-1953

- **Autocratization: 1942-1943**
- **Bottom: 1944**
- **Democratization 1945-1953**
- **Coding: Democratic Reaction**

Autocratization started in Myanmar in 1942 when the Japanese occupied the country during WWII. In 1943, Myanmar was granted nominal independence due to successful pressure from Burmese nationalist groups, leading to an end of autocratization. It stayed at this bottom until 1945 when the Burmese national movement formed the Anti-Fascist People's Freedom League (AFPFL) and contributed actively to the Japanese defeat, also initiating democratization. The AFPFL and their leader Bogyoke Aung San negotiated with the British, and won full national independence soon thereafter. Elections for a Constitutional Assembly were held in April 1947, and the resulting constitution provided for a parliamentary democracy. Aung San was assassinated on July 19, 1947, and U Nu took over leadership to become Prime Minister on January 4, 1948. Disorder and armed rebellions led to multiple postponements of the first parliamentary elections, but they were finally conducted in 1951 with the AFPFL and its allies winning a parliamentary majority. Relatively shortly after that, democratization ended.

Reasoning: Autocratization is interrupted and reversed through pressures from domestic democratic actors. International actors were prevalent, both at the start of the autocratization (Japanese occupation) and at the beginning of democratization as the British granted Myanmar independence, enabling the following process of a new constitution, elections, and so on. Yet the role of the domestic AFPFL is critical, both in halting autocratization and in starting to democratize, and they are the ones taking the steps within the boundaries set by the international actors.

Source: Nohlen, D., F. Grotz, and C. Hartmann, eds. (2002): *Elections in Asia and the Pacific: A Data Handbook*, Vol. 1. New York: Oxford University Press.

Nepal 2000-2009

- **Autocratization: 2000-2003**
- **Bottom: 2004-2006**
- **Democratization: 2007-2009**
- **Coding: Democratic Reaction**

Nepalese Civil War started in 1996, the Maoists wanted to disband the monarchy (that since 1990 changed from absolute to constitutional). Yet, the conflict intensified in June 2001, when the Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist) managed to kill King Birendra and his entire family at the Narayanhiti Palace. The massacre was carried out by the heir Prince Dipendra. The conflict intensified in 2002, and the government cracked down on freedom of expression. In 2005, King Gyanendra tightened his rule by imposing martial law and state of emergency.

In 2006, seven political parties formed the Seven Party Alliance (SPA). The international community (United Kingdom and India) suspended material support to Nepal's regime and India attempted to bring Maoist and SPA together to establish a democratic path for Nepal. Peaceful pro-democratic demonstrations began in 2006. House of representatives was opened again, and SPA and Maoist worked together, while the Maoist accepted the intervention of the UN to handle weapons for them and the government. In November 2006, SPA, Maoist, and the government signed a Comprehensive Peace Accord, which ended the civil war. The cooperation between mainstream political parties and the Maoist insurgency was achieved through a 12-point agreement which outlined the democratic framework to be instituted after the abolition of monarchy. This framework set out the formation of an internationally monitored interim government, holding free and fair elections in a system of governance which guarantees civil, political and human rights, as well as the rule of law. Furthermore, the Constitution was redrafted. As a result, King Gyanendra gave up power, the parliament was reinstated, and the Interim Constitution of Nepal was promulgated. In 2008, the first constituent assembly elections since 1999 were held.

Reasoning: Autocratization was halted and reversed due to pressures from domestic democratic actors. It is difficult to assess whether without the intervention of India the conflict would have ceased or not, yet decisive was the fact that the Maoist and SPA came together and found a way to collaborate, cease armed activities (with international intervention) and outline the democratic framework to be instituted after the abolition of monarchy.

Source: International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (2015): [Nepal's Constitution Building Process: 2006-2015. Progress, Challenges, and Contributions of International Community](#). Stockholm: International IDEA.

Nepal 2012-2016

- **Autocratization: 2012-2013**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization: 2014-2016**
- **Coding: Democratic Reaction**

In 2012, the elected Constituent Assembly that had been formed in April 2008 after the monarchy was abolished, reached the end of its term, and dissolved without agreeing on a draft constitution. The Supreme Court had refused to once again extend its deadline. The electoral basis of the government was no longer clear. The previous Prime Minister at first continued in power, which was quickly denounced by the opposition as a power grab. Then, by agreement of the main parties, a “caretaker” technical government was appointed to administer the election. The election for another constituent assembly was held in November 2013 under an interim government.

Reasoning: The constitutional deadline passed, the incumbent remains in power in the constitutional vacuum that occurs, protests erupt, the threat of a state of emergency is real with the Nepali Army surrounding the parliament. The ability of opposition parties to not open a second civil war, legally pressuring the government to call elections, and ensuring an alternation of power without major problems – all hint upon the ability of solving a very serious challenge democratically.

Source: Treisman, D. (2020): Democracy by Mistake: How the Errors of Autocrats Trigger Transitions to Freer Government. *American Political Science Review* 114(3): 792-810.

Niger 2009-2012

- **Autocratization: 2009-2010**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization: 2011-2012**
- **Coding: Democratic Reaction**

Autocratization in Niger started with President Tandja’s efforts to extend his mandate beyond December 2009, when his second term was originally scheduled to end. Arguing that the people wanted him to remain in office, Tanja dissolved the National Assembly in May 2009 and subsequently appointed a new Constitutional Court, enabling him to push forward with a constitutional referendum in August 2009 that extended his mandate for additional three years. The opposition reacted furiously to Tandja’s efforts to remain in office and denounced him as a dictator. International and regional criticism followed. Niger was suspended from the Economic Community of West African States, and some aid from western countries was halted. The 2010 coup forced Tandja out of power and announced the formation of the Supreme Council for the Restoration of Democracy. The 2011 general elections followed and were largely considered free and fair. They resulted in a victory for President Issoufou.

Reasoning: Autocratization was halted and reversed mostly due to pressures from domestic democratic actors. The military intervened because the political crisis in Niger appeared deadlocked since the disputed referendum and democratic institutional channels were already closed by the incumbent dictator.

Source: Freedom House (2016): [Freedom in the World 2016 – Niger](#).

Pakistan 1999-2010

- **Autocratization: 1999-2000**
- **Bottom: 2001**
- **Democratization 2002-2010**
- **Coding: Democratic Reaction**

In October 1999, the military under General Pervez Musharraf staged a coup. To legitimize his rule, Musharraf started to gradually liberalize and open up society, allowing for some limited political pluralism and relaxing repression and censorship. In April 2002, he was appointed President through a manipulated referendum, and won parliamentary majority through an equally questionable general election that year. However, the liberalization soon started to go further than intended. Not least, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Muhammad Iftikhar Chaudhry, began to challenge government and holding the executive to account. In 2007, when Musharraf's presidential term was nearing its end, he attempted to fire Justice Chaudhry, sparking countrywide mobilization. Expecting the Supreme Court to bar him from running for another election, Musharraf suspended the constitution and declared a state of emergency in November 2007. In the process, he cracked down on opposition and protesters. However, the military withdrew their support for Musharraf who were under growing pressure, leading to Musharraf's resignation and ended the emergency rule. Elections were called for in February 2008, which along with subsiding repression saw the return to democracy for Pakistan.

Reasoning: It's important to note that democratization goes through two stages here, a first starting in 2002 when Musharraf liberalizes the regime somewhat and holds new elections but stays in power (had the democratization ended here, it would be a case of authoritarian manipulation). However, opposition to his rule continued after this, and eventually led to a second phase of democratization starting in 2007-2008, where Musharraf's attempt to again grab power is interrupted and reversed through pressures from domestic democratic actors. This latter process is key to the democratization episode, and thus makes this a case of democratic reversal.

Source: Shah, A. (2014): Constraining Consolidation: Military Politics and Democracy in Pakistan (2007–2013). *Democratization* 21(6): 1007-1033.

Peru 1990-2002

- **Autocratization: 1990-1992**
- **Bottom: 1993-1995**
- **Democratization 1996-2002**
- **Coding: Democratic Reaction**

Peru started to autocratize in 1990 amid substantial political turmoil and the election of Alberto Fujimori as President. Democracy broke down with the 1992 autogolpe led by Fujimori where he suspended the constitution and congress. After ruling by decree for seven months, the Fujimori government held elections for a Constituent Assembly in November 1992, and a new constitution was enacted and approved through referendum in 1993.

In 1995, Fujimori was reelected in general elections, marking the return of elections and a relative improvement that initiated a limited democratization process. Fujimori's rule however continued to be marred by widespread violations of civil liberties, restrictions on freedom of expression, and manipulation of elections and electoral institutions. The government also effectively removed all constraints on the executive, giving extensive authority to the national intelligence service and its leader Montesinos.

Fujimori won a third presidential term in 2000 after having reinterpreted the rules so to make him eligible to stand for a third term. The government faced protests for the widespread manipulation of the elections, yet these failed to remove Fujimori. Shortly after these protests though, in September 2000, a video of the head of the intelligence service Montesinos bribing a member of the Congress set off scandal that quickly ended Fujimori's rule. Having also tracked various violations by other politicians, not least Fujimori, the rest of the government soon followed Montesino's downfall, with Fujimori resigning later that same year. Interim president Valentín Paniagua took over and oversaw the 2001 elections – that meant a substantial improvement in conduct of elections. In addition, much of the executive constraints and the judicial independence were restored, as well as the media independence.

Reasoning: This is best coded as democratic reaction, because autocratization is reversed through pressures from domestic democratic actors. It is important to note though that the start of the democratization episode (1996) is due to the re-introduction of elections by Fujimori, while democratic opposition to Fujimori's regime is growing over time and comes to the fore only after the bribing scandal. Fujimori's regime implodes through media reporting on their illicit activities and the popular reaction to it.

Source: Levitsky, S., and M.A. Cameron (2003): [Democracy Without Parties? Political Parties and Regime Change in Fujimori's Peru](#). *Latin American Politics and Society* 45(3): 1-33.

South Korea 2008-2017

- **Autocratization: 2008-2013**
- **Bottom: 2014-2015**
- **Democratization: 2016-2017**
- **Coding: Democratic Reaction**

Erosion of democracy in South Korea began in 2008 under President Lee Myung-bak's rule, but became more blatant under his successor, President Park Geun-hye. This development manifested itself primarily in restrictions in media freedom, illegal government surveillance of

opposition members and journalists, and the use of repressive measures to silence political dissent.

Reversal of autocratization in South Korea was triggered by a major corruption scandal surfaced in 2016. This led to large-scale protests led by civil society organizations that brought millions of citizens onto the streets to demand Park's impeachment. The Constitutional Court upheld the impeachment by a unanimous ruling on March 10, 2017, thereby removing Park from office, making her the first Korean president to be so removed. In April 2018, South Korean courts sentenced her to 24 years in prison for corruption and abuse of power.

Reasoning: Autocratization is interrupted and reversed because of pressures from domestic democratic actors (oppositional elites, the judiciary, popular protest).

Source: Croissant, A., and J. Kim (2020): [Keeping Autocrats at Bay: Lessons from South Korea and Taiwan](#). *Global Asia* 15(1): 28-34.

Sri Lanka 2004-2018

- **Autocratization: 2004-2006**
- **Bottom: 2007-2009**
- **Democratization: 2010-2018**
- **Coding: Democratic Reaction**

Autocratization happens during the Sri Lankan Civil War (1983-2009). 2004 marks President Chadrika Kumaratunga's efforts at constitutional change to devolve power to the Tamil majority in the North and East. These efforts were sabotaged by the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE, a Tamil military rebellion organization), who assassinated two Tamil politicians, and attempted to assassinate the President. The civil war restarted, and intensified under the new President Mahinda Rajapaksa, who came to power in 2005. Under his presidency, Sri Lanka's brutal and bloody ethnic conflict officially ended, after 26 years, in May 2009: the LTTE admitted defeat. After the war, media freedom and other restrictions of civil liberties remained. The country remained militarized, especially in regions affected by the war.

In 2010, a diverse coalition came together to oppose the Rajapaksa regime in the 2015 presidential election. The coalition was diverse and included the Colombo-centered UNP (the United National Party), some divisions of Rajapaksa's own SLFP (the Sri Lanka Freedom Party), several minority parties, and the Sri Lankan intelligentsia. 2015 to 2019 saw some democratic improvements, but the government was weakened by economic failures and growing security concerns. The democratization period ended with the Easter Sunday terrorist attacks in April 2019.

Reasoning: The reversal starts gradually with the end of the civil war and continues due to pressures from domestic democratic actors. A diverse coalition of domestic democratic actors came together to achieve regime change.

Source: Kadirgamar, A. (2020): [Polarization, Civil War, and Persistent Majoritarianism in Sri Lanka](#). In: Carothers, T., and A. O'Donohue, eds. (2020): *Political Polarization in South and Southeast Asia: Old Division, New Dangers*. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Sudan 1958-1968

- **Autocratization: 1958-1959**
- **Bottom: 1960-1963**
- **Democratization 1964-1968**
- **Coding: Democratic Reaction**

Sudan became independent in 1956 with a transitional constitution that included an elected parliament. In 1958, General Ibrahim Abboud staged a military coup. Extensive repression followed under the military rule, which faced growing opposition, not least due to the regime's handling of southern Sudan. Starting with student movements in urban areas, Sudan soon saw substantial protests against the regime, with strikes and demonstrations following. Facing mounting pressure, Abboud resigned from power in 1964, and elections under a transitional government led to a new government later that year. New elections in 1965 saw Sadiq El-Mahdi become Prime Minister. Mahdi's rule meant further democratization, including the 1968 elections for a constitutional assembly. The democratization came to an abrupt halt with a new military coup in 1969.

Reasoning: Autocratization is interrupted and reversed through pressures from domestic democratic actors (student demonstrations, strikes, demonstrations in the provinces).

Source: Nohlen, D., B. Thibaut, and M. Krennerich, eds. (1999): *Elections in Africa: A Data Handbook*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Thailand 1991-2001

- **Autocratization: 1991**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization 1992-2001**
- **Coding: Democratic Reaction**

In 1991, the military staged a coup in Thailand, and created the Samakhi Tham (SKT) party. The new party enabled coup leader General Suchinda Kraprayoon to run for Prime Minister in the 1992 elections. Demonstrations against Suchinda's government were met with repression and dozens dead. On the intervention of the King, Suchinda stepped down, and new elections were held in September 1992, marking the start of the reversal.

Although democratic opposition remained restricted, small democratic improvements followed over the next years. For example, the defeat of attempts to construct an independent electoral

commission was met with large-scale protests among both parts of the elite in the Parliament and the public at large. This eventually led the Parliament to establish a Constitution Drafting Assembly in September 1996. The new constitution came into effect one year later, with an important feature being the re-organization of both Parliament and electoral procedures and management. The first general elections under these rules were held in 2000 and 2001, and Thaksin Shinawatra's Thai Rak Thai (TRT) Party won, marking a return to a more democratic setting in Thailand.

Reasoning: Autocratization is interrupted and reversed through pressures from domestic democratic actors. The long and slow process of democratization that followed, culminating with elections, is characterized by strategic opposition among elites and the public pushing the regime into reforming procedures – not least of elections – and forcing more democratic settings that eventually led to a change of government through elections.

Source: Nohlen, D., F. Grotz, and C. Hartmann, eds. (2002): *Elections in Asia and the Pacific: A Data Handbook*, Vol. 2. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ukraine 1996-2007

- **Autocratization: 1996-2001**
- **Bottom: 2002-2004**
- **Democratization: 2005-2007**
- **Coding: Democratic Reaction**

Ukraine was a pluralistic but unstable democracy after the collapse of the Soviet Union. Despite a liberal democratic façade (e.g., the 1996 Constitution), distribution of power and resources was controlled by post-Soviet oligarchs. Elections held in 1998, 1999, and 2002 were largely fraudulent and manipulated (Myagokov and Ordeshook, 2013), and the whole period is marked as an autocratization episode under Leonid Kuchma. To be noted, according to the ERT the autocratization ends in 2001, yet evidence extends over to also cover 2002 and 2004 (Myagkov et al., 2005), which is a further evidence of how U-Turns are not only the “failure” of autocratization but something more. Kuchma tried to constrain the Rada’s independence by proposing a referendum in 2000 to split the legislative body into two chambers. Although the majority of Ukrainians voted for Kuchma’s “reform”, the Rada blocked implementation.

The Orange Revolution took place from November 2004 to January 2005 as a result of revoking the runoff elections held in November 2004. The Ukraine’s Supreme Court ordered a revote in December 2004, which was held in January 2005 and saw the victory of the opposition candidate Yushchenko. As part of the Orange Revolution, the Ukrainian constitution was changed to shift powers from the presidency to the parliament.

Reasoning: The interlinkage here is that the Orange Revolution took place as a direct reaction to the Supreme Court’s decision to revote, something that did not happen in the previous

election cycles. The Orange Revolution gained momentum primarily due to the initiative of the general population.

Source: Myagkov, M., P. C. Ordeshook, and D. Shakin, (2009): *The Forensics of Election Fraud: Russia and Ukraine*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Myagkov, M., and P. C. Ordeshook (2005): [The Trail of Votes in Ukraine's 1998, 1999, and 2002 Elections](#). *Post-Soviet Affairs* 21(1): 56-71.

Minakov, M., and M. Rojansky (2018): [Democracy in Ukraine: Are We There Yet?](#) *Kennan Cable* 30. Kennan Institute: Wilson Center.

Ukraine 2010-2020

- **Autocratization: 2010-2014**
- **Bottom: 2015-2018**
- **Democratization: 2019-2020**
- **Coding: Democratic Reaction**

The quality of democracy in Ukraine continuously declined between 2010 and 2014 under Yanukovich rule. In November 2013, Yanukovich made a sudden decision, amidst economic pressure from Russia, to withdraw from signing an association agreement with the EU and instead accept a Russia trade deal and loan bailout. This led to the Maidan Uprising against him and ultimately led to his ousting as President. This civil unrest peaked in February 2014. The new government issued a warrant for Yanukovich's arrest, accusing him of being responsible for the killing of protestors. In June 2015, he was officially deprived of the title of President by parliament. Poroshenko, who was elected President in May 2014, led the country through the first phase of the war in Donbas. In 2019, Poroshenko lost elections to Zelensky.

Reasoning: Yanukovich was removed through pressures from domestic democratic actors (the Maidan Uprising and the leaders of the parliamentary opposition). Zelensky came to power in a democratic way (Poroshenko lost in the 2019 presidential election).

Source: Hedenskog, J. (2022): [Internal Political Conflicts in Ukraine During the Threat of Russian Military Escalation](#). Commentary. Stockholm Centre for Eastern European Studies.

Zambia 2010-2023 (cens.)

- **Autocratization: 2010-2017**
- **Bottom: 2018-2020**
- **Democratization: 2021-2023**
- **Coding: Democratic Reaction**

Autocratization started in 2009 and deepened with the election of President Lungu from the Patriotic Front (PDF) in 2014. His tenure was characterized by severe restrictions on freedoms of expression and the media, and assembly. It was also period of poor economic management,

which resulted in an economic crisis. Poor economic performance led to a decline in support for the ruling party. Eventually, opposition leaders coalescing with civil society groups (including the Zambian Conference of Catholic Bishops and the Council of Churches of Zambia) mobilized citizens against the regime. They united around Lungu's attempts to make constitutional amendments. In 2021, Hakainde Hichilema, the opposition leader from the United Party for National Development (UPND), won the election. Lungu first rejected the results, but eventually peacefully handed over power due to public pressure and international pressure that came from Europe and the United States.

Reasoning: Autocratization was halted and reversed due to pressures from democratic actors. Widespread mobilization for democracy ahead of elections led by civil society groups ensured a substantial opposition turnout and support, tipping the electoral scales in favour of the democratic opposition.

Source: Resnick, D. (2022): How Zambia's Opposition Won. *Journal of Democracy* 33(1): 70-84.

Wiebrecht et al. (2023): State of the World 2022: Defiance in the Face of Autocratization. *Democratization* 30(5): 769-793.

International Intervention

Belgium 1914-1921

- **Autocratization: 1914-1915**
- **Bottom: 1916-1917**
- **Democratization 1918-1921**
- **Coding: International Intervention**

Belgium was occupied by Germany in 1914-1918 (World War I).

Reasoning: Autocratization here is the result of the German occupation that lasted until 1918. Following the retreat of the German troops, Belgium not only restored pre-occupation institutions but also expanded suffrage.

Source: Kesteloot, C. (2017): Post-War Societies (Belgium), In: [*1914-1918-Online. International Encyclopedia of the First World War*](#), ed. by Ute D., P. Gatrell, O. Janz, H. Jones, J. Keene, A. Kramer, and B. Nasson.

Belgium 1940-1950

- **Autocratization: 1940-1941**
- **Bottom: 1942-1943**
- **Democratization 1944-1950**
- **Coding: International Intervention**

Belgium was occupied by Germany in 1940-1944 (during World War II).

Reasoning: Autocratization here is the result of the German occupation that lasted until 1944. Following the retreat of the German troops, Belgium restored pre-occupation institutions.

Source: Veranneman, J.-M. (2014). *Belgium in the Second World War*. Barnsley: Pen and Sword Military.

Cuba 1904-1909

- **Autocratization: 1904-1907**
- **Bottom: 1908**
- **Democratization: 1909**
- **Coding: International Intervention**

Democracy levels started to deteriorate under President Tomás Estrada Palma who went after political opponents and was accused of electoral fraud in 1905. With rising tensions between government and opposition, Palma and his cabinet resigned in 1906, leaving no government in

place. The United States stepped in and took control of Cuba until February 1909 when a new presidential election took place.

Reasoning: The US intervention here was decisive in that they established the Provisional Government of Cuba and assumed the provisional governorship of Cuba. It was also the American provisional governor who then decided that Cuba was stable enough again to hold elections which were also organized by the United States.

Source: Minger, R. E. (1961): [William H. Taft and the United States Intervention in Cuba in 1906](#). *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 41(1): 75-89.

Czechia 1930-1947

- **Autocratization: 1930-1940**
- **Bottom: 1941-1944**
- **Democratization 1945-1947**
- **Coding: International Intervention**

In the 1930s, and especially with Edvard Beneš becoming President, Czechoslovakia started to undergo a growing personalization of power. In addition, tensions started to increase between different regions, nationalities, and minorities all throughout the 1930s. Then, the German occupation of the Sudetenland started in 1938. Following WWII, Czechoslovakia had two more free and fair elections in 1945 and 1946 before the Communists took over in 1948.

Reasoning: This is predominantly a case of international intervention. Although the autocratization period started already in 1930 characterized by the abovementioned issues, the empirical impact of this seems negligible. In fact, the Electoral Democracy Index only declined from 0.78 in 1930 to 0.76 in 1937. Therefore, the annexation by Nazi Germany comprises the bulk of the autocratization during this period. In addition, the following period of democratization is only possible due to Czechoslovakia regaining independence due to the defeat of Nazi Germany.

Source: Zeman, Z., and A. Klimek (1997): [The Life of Edvard Beneš 1884–1948: Czechoslovakia in Peace and War](#). New York: Oxford University Press.

Denmark 1940-1946

- **Autocratization: 1940-1944**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization 1945-1946**
- **Coding: International Intervention**

Denmark was occupied by Germany in 1940-1945 (during World War II).

Reasoning: Autocratization here is the result of the German occupation that lasted until 1945. Following the defeat of Nazi Germany, Denmark reinstated its democratic institutions and processes.

Source: Lidegaard, B. (2009). *A Short History of Denmark in the 20th Century*. Copenhagen: Gyldendal A/S.

Dominican Republic 1964-1967

- **Autocratization: 1964**
- **Bottom: 1965**
- **Democratization 1966-1967**
- **Coding: International Intervention**

After the fall of Trujillo's dictatorship, the country experienced a brief period of political liberation. Free and fair national elections were held in December 1962, which saw Juan Bosch Gaviño and the Dominican Revolutionary Party (PRD) elected. In 1963, a new constitution was drawn up to guarantee civil and public rights, declare the pre-eminence of the civil authority over the armed forces and arrange the separation of the State and Church. On September 25, 1963, Bosch was overthrown (some considered him too left-leaning) by a military coup led by Elías Wessin y Wessin. The new government was a "triumvirate" of right-leaning parties. The new President was Donald Reid Cabral. This first coup however did not have public support. There were protests and strikes against the junta. In 1965, there was a second coup, the "April Revolution" (April 24, 1965 – September 3, 1965). It started when a group of military and civilian constitutionalists (i.e., those supporting the overthrown Juan Bosch) seized radios, attempted to seize streets and government buildings, and ousted the military installed President Cabral from office on April 25, 1965. The pro-Bosch rebel regime demanded the return of Bosch. This, however, was opposed by units of the naval and air forces under the command of Wessin y Wessin who organized elements of the military loyal to the dictator Reid ("loyalists"), initiating an armed campaign against the "constitutionalist" rebels.

In view of the uncertainties resulting from this conflict, the US under Lyndon Johnson now intervened *openly* (first time in three decades in Latin America) through the Operation Power Pack siding with Wessin y Wessin to avoid a second Cuban Revolution. As a result, on July 1, 1966, there were elections and Joaquín Balaguer (a conservative politician who also served as the last President before the first democratic elections in the country) won against Juan Bosch. Balaguer was supported by the US, and his victory also overlapped with the US withdrawal from the country.

Reasoning: The election of Bosch triggered the reaction by the "conservatives" (and the US). The US intervened directly in the context of the Cold War after the Cuban revolution. The US forces gradually withdraw from the island shortly after the intervention.

Source: Nohlen, D., ed. (2005): *Elections in the Americas: A Data Handbook*, Vol. 1. New York: Oxford University Press.

Palmer, B. (1989): *Intervention in the Caribbean: The Dominican Crisis of 1965*. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky.

Finland 1939-1949

- **Autocratization: 1939-1940**
- **Bottom: 1941-1944**
- **Democratization 1945-1949**
- **Coding: International Intervention**

Finland was never occupied but it was fighting first against the Soviet Union and then alongside the Allies against Germany. Due to the war, some restrictions were imposed. Finland was led by its elected President and parliament during the whole 1939-1945 period. This why the decrease in the Electoral Democracy Index is not as substantial as in Denmark for example (the last direct parliamentary elections were held in July 1939, which were followed by indirect presidential elections in 1940; the next elections followed in 1945).

Reasoning: This case is coded as an international intervention in which the decrease and subsequent increase of democracy levels are inherently linked to restrictions imposed during the war.

Source: Vehviläinen, O. (2002): *Finland in the Second World War: Between Germany and Russia*. New York: Palgrave.

France 1939-1948

- **Autocratization: 1939-1941**
- **Bottom: 1942-1944**
- **Democratization 1945-1948**
- **Coding: International Intervention**

France was occupied by Germany in 1940-1944 (due to World War II).

Reasoning: Autocratization here is the result of the German and Italian occupation that lasted until 1944. Following the defeat of Nazi Germany, France reinstated its democratic institutions and processes.

Source: Jackson, J. (2003): *France: The Dark Years, 1940-1944*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Haiti 1992-1997

- **Autocratization: 1992**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization 1993-1997**
- **Coding: International Intervention**

Only seven months after having been elected president in relatively free and fair elections, Jean-Bertrand Aristide was removed by a military coup in 1991. A repressive military regime followed, but in 1994, US soldiers landed in Haiti and re-imposed Aristide so he could serve the remainder of his term. This removal of the unelected military regime and the installment of the originally elected government and parliament, along with subsequent presidential election in 1995 and parliamentary election in 1997, led to a re-democratization.

Reasoning: International actors, in this case the US, play a substantial role in the U-turn. The US intervention is critical for halting the autocratization and initiating democratization.

Source: Nohlen, D., ed. (2005): *Elections in the Americas: A Data Handbook*, Vol. 1. New York: Oxford University Press.

Haiti 2001-2012

- **Autocratization: 2001-2004**
- **Bottom: 2005**
- **Democratization: 2006-2012**
- **Coding: International Intervention**

From early 1996 until 2001, the country was run by President René Préval. He lost the 2000 election to President Jean-Bertrand Aristide and transferred power in February 2001. However, the 2000 elections were largely considered fraudulent by the opposition and the Western observers. In 2002-2004, Haitian students organized multiple protests against the Aristide government. The 2004 military coup led by the National Revolutionary Front for the Liberation and Reconstruction of Haiti removed President Aristide from office. Aristide was flown out of the country on a US plane accompanied by US security personnel. Many international politicians expressed concern that the US interfered with Haiti's democratic process. Supreme Court Chief Justice Alexandre succeeded Aristide as interim president with the full backing of the United States, Canada, and France. He petitioned the UN security Council for the intervention of an international peacekeeping force. The Security Council passed a resolution the same day. Originally scheduled for November 2005, the presidential election was postponed four times before finally held in February 2006. President Préval was re-elected in the 2006 election, which represents a major defeat for Haitian elite.

Reasoning: There is a series of similar events in Haiti during the 1990s – 2000s with a similar pattern: elections are followed by a military coup, which, in turn, is followed by the US intervention to re-install civilian rule through elections.

Source: Dupuy, A. (2006): [Haiti Election 2006: A Pyrrhic Victory for René Préval?](#) *Latin American Perspectives* 33(3): 132-141.

Kuwait 1986-1993

- **Autocratization: 1986**
- **Bottom: 1987-1990**
- **Democratization: 1991-1993**
- **Coding: International Intervention**

In 1985, the opposition won a majority of the seats in the parliament, for the first time in Kuwaiti history. After that, the opposition forced from office one member of a family closely related to the Emir of Kuwait al-Sabah. In response, the ruling family closed down the National Assembly with explanation that open debate during the Iran-Iraqi war was dangerous for national security. Although the Iran-Iraqi war ended in July 1988, the ruling family did not re-open the National Assembly. Instead, the Emir set a different institution with very limited powers, the National Council. In 1990, just before the Iraqi invasion, elections for the National Council were held.

Iraq invaded Kuwait August 2, 1990. This marked the beginning of the Gulf War. Military occupation of Kuwait lasted for the next several months. In response to the invasion, a United Nations Security Council imposed sanctions on Iraq. On January 16, 1991, a US-led coalition began the Operation Desert Storm. Iraqi forces were defeated, and retreated from Kuwait on February 28, 1991.

After the war, the ruling family wanted to demonstrate to the rest of the world that it had support among the citizens of Kuwait. Opposition leaders made their claims clear to the ruling family: in return for their support, the sheikhs had to reopen the National Assembly under the 1962 constitution. The first Bush administration supported the demands of the opposition, as they needed to justify the First Gulf War to the public and such demands matched their needs. In 1991, the Emir restored the 1962 constitution, re-opened the National Assembly. In October 1992, the general elections followed.

Reasoning: Autocratization – the unilateral change in the constitution in 1990 (the setting up of the National Council instead of the National Assembly) – followed by democratization – the restoration of the 1962 constitution after liberation in 1991 – suggests that the leaders of Kuwait planned to establish a political system in Kuwait that would be similar to the rest of the Arab monarchies of the Gulf. The Iraqi invasion prevented this and the US-led intervention increased the bargaining power of the opposition and the international leaders. It is unlikely that the restoration of the 1962 constitution and the re-opening of the National Assembly would have happened without the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait and the subsequent international intervention. The case is thus coded as international intervention since democratization part of the U-turn episode was a great deal to the Iraqi threat.

Source: Human Rights Watch (1991): [Human Rights Watch World Report 1990 – Kuwait before the Iraqi Invasion and the Government-in-Exile](#).

Herb, M. (2016): [The Origins of Kuwait's National Assembly](#). LSE Kuwait Programme Paper Series 39. London: London School of Economics.

Liberia 2003-2007

- **Autocratization: 2003-2004**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization 2005-2007**
- **Coding: International Intervention**

Autocratization started with the Movement for Democracy in Liberia (MODEL) – a rebel group – invading southern Liberia, and President Charles Taylor leaving the country. Confronting the humanitarian crisis that emerged in June 2003, as the rebels advanced toward the capital, the international community launched a multi-track effort that successfully ended Liberia's civil war. First, on August 18, 2003, the Accra Comprehensive Peace Agreement was signed between the government and rebel leaders, which was organized by the regional Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS). Second, international action succeeded in halting the fighting: a Nigerian-led peacekeeping force, the US task force, and the African peacekeepers arrived to Liberia in August 2003. Third, the United Nations Mission in Liberia was established. This led to the general elections in 2005, the first elections since the civil war (second civil war) took place. Members of the transitional government did not run for elections, as agreed in the peace agreement, and elections were considered to be free and fair.

Reasoning: This case is coded as an international intervention because international actors play the decisive role in managing the civil war (i.e., halting and reversing autocratization).

Source: Kuperman, A. (2015): [Liberia: How Diplomacy Helped End a 13-Year Civil War](#). *Negotiating in Times of Conflict*, eds. Sher, G., and A. Kurz. Tel Aviv: Institute for National Security Studies.

Luxembourg 1940-1947

- **Autocratization: 1940-1941**
- **Bottom: 1942-1944**
- **Democratization 1945-1947**
- **Coding: International Intervention**

Luxembourg was invaded by Germany in September 1939 and remained occupied until August 1942 when Nazi Germany formally annexed it. It was liberated in 1944 and held elections again in October 1945. The domestic political institutions have remained relatively unchanged compared to pre-WWII, with the exception that the constitution dropped the country's state of neutrality.

Reasoning: This episode has been coded as an international intervention since there is no reason to believe that Luxembourg would have undergone the episodes of democratization and autocratization if it was not for the invasion by Germany.

Source: Arblaster, P. (2018): *A History of the Low Countries*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Mali 2007-2014

- **Autocratization: 2007-2013**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization: 2014**
- **Coding: International Intervention**

There are some minor declines on the EDI in 2007, but the EDI remains stable from 2008 until 2012, when it suddenly plummets. This corresponds to the initiation of the Malian Civil War in January 2012 (ongoing) and a subsequent military coup (March 2012) that ousted President Touré. The junta formed a new interim government – the National Committee for the Restoration of Democracy and State – and the new cabinet consisted of ministers close to the coup leader. They cancelled scheduled elections, suspended the constitution, and arrested government ministers. The coup was followed by economic sanctions and a blockade by the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS). Under international pressure, a deal was signed that civilian leader Traoré would assume the presidency in an interim capacity until elections. On July 1, 2013, the UN peacekeeping mission was established in the country's north with the aim to prevent a jihadist takeover and help maintain a fragile peace. The presidential elections were held on July 28, 2013.

Despite the ongoing civilian conflict in northern Mali between the government and the Islamist rebel groups, Mali's democracy levels stayed stable in 2014-2017, after the 2013 election. This was largely due to international assistance, UN peacekeeping mission, and military interventions that arrived in Mali starting in 2013: ECOWAS, the United Nations (UN) peacekeeping mission, African-led International Support Mission, French military intervention, etc.

Reasoning: This case is coded as an international intervention because international actors play the decisive role in managing the conflict (i.e., halting and reversing autocratization).

Source: Samarin, M. (2024): [Desk Study on Aid and Democracy: Mali](#). Helsinki: UNU WIDER.

Netherlands 1940-1949

- **Autocratization: 1940-1941**
- **Bottom: 1942-1944**

- **Democratization 1945-1949**
- **Coding: International Intervention**

Netherlands was occupied by Germany in 1940-1945 (due to World War II).

Reasoning: Autocratization here is the result of the German occupation that lasted in some areas until the German surrender in May 1945. Following the defeat of Nazi Germany, Netherlands reinstated its democratic institutions and processes.

Source: Castelein, K., and M. Wenting (2022): *The Dutch Resistance 1940-45: World War II Resistance and Collaboration in the Netherlands*. Oxford: Osprey Publishing.

North Macedonia 2000-2003

- **Autocratization: 2000**
- **Bottom: 2001**
- **Democratization 2002-2003**
- **Coding: International Intervention**

This was a period of intense ethnic conflicts primarily between the government and ethnic Albanians in the country as a continuation of the Yugoslav wars. In 1999, there were concerns about the fairness of the presidential elections. In 2000, there were already fairly wide-ranging attacks on the media. Finally, in 2001, an armed conflict broke out between insurgents from the Albanian minority clashing with the North Macedonian armed forces. This is likely to drive most of the experts' rating but is combined with electoral fraud in local elections in 2001 and an increase in political violence at the time. Due to the relatively quick response of the international community and especially NATO, the conflict's duration was limited to less than six months. The Ohrid Framework Agreement was the peace agreement signed in 2001 which ended the conflict and raised the status of the Albanian minority in North Macedonia. It is the key as to why democracy levels increased again in North Macedonia in this episode. The EU and US were involved in the mediation process.

Reasoning: We code this episode as one of international intervention as we see it primarily as a continuation of the Yugoslav wars with several international actors involved. Although the Ohrid Agreement, which was key in this episode, is domestic, it was mediated by the US and the EU, aligns well with other similar agreements (for instance, for Bosnia), and structures relations between actors operating across borders (e.g., the National Liberation Army was very close to the Kosovo Liberation Army).

Source: Freedom House (2002): [Freedom in the World 2002 – Macedonia](#).

Ilievski, Z., and D. Taleski (2009): [Was the EU's Role in Conflict Management in Macedonia a Success?](#) *Ethnopolitics* 8(3-4): 355-367.

Norway 1940-1946

- **Autocratization: 1940-1943**
- **Bottom: 1944**
- **Democratization 1945-1946**
- **Coding: International Intervention**

Norway was invaded by Nazi Germany in April 1940. The government went into exile and a pro-German puppet government ruled. With the end of the occupation in 1945, however, the country quickly returned to its pre-war democracy with new general elections held in autumn 1945.

Reasoning: We code this episode as a case of international intervention. There is no reason to believe that Norway would have undergone democratization and autocratization episodes if it was not for the invasion by Germany.

Source: Larsen, K. (2015): *History of Norway*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Philippines 1941-1947

- **Autocratization: 1941-1942**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization 1943-1947**
- **Coding: International Intervention**

The Japanese occupation, starting in the Philippines late 1941, led to autocratization. The Philippines remained under Japanese control until 1945, but saw early improvements in democracy already in 1943 when a new Constitution was put in place through a Constitutional Assembly. The 1943 constitution provided for an elected national assembly and president along with a new supreme court. More substantial change took place in 1945 when the Japanese occupation ended and the Congress was restored. New elections were held in 1946, and the return of a national legislature and elected officials meant further democratization.

Reasoning: International actors play a substantial role in the U-turn, as both the autocratization and democratization are the results of the Japanese occupation and its subsequent end.

Source: Nohlen, D., F. Grotz, and C. Hartmann, eds. (2002): *Elections in Asia and the Pacific: A Data Handbook*, Vol. 2. New York: Oxford University Press.

Solomon Islands 1998-2004

- **Autocratization: 1998-2001**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization 2002-2004**
- **Coding: International Intervention**

There had long been tensions between different ethnic groups, primarily between groups from the two main islands Guadalcanal and Malaita. Violence between the two groups increased especially in 1999 and this went up to a point where both groups established armed militia forces, the Guadalcanal Revolutionary Army (GRA) and the Malaita Eagle Force (MEF), attacking each other. The MEF toppled the sitting Prime Minister and forced him to resign in 2000. At the same time, they prevented other members of parliament from returning to the capital so that they could not elect the next Prime Minister. An international intervention led by Australia facilitated a peace agreement between the opposing groups signed in August 2000. The next Prime Minister was Manasseh Sogavare, who stayed in power just for one year until the next elections could take place again as scheduled in 2001. In 2003, a more extensive multinational intervention also headed by Australia helped to calm ethnic tensions and de-arm ethnic groups across the islands.

Reasoning: We code this episode as a case of international intervention since we regard the intervention led by Australia as key in easing tensions on the Solomon Islands and enabling the country to halt autocratization and revert to a path of democratization.

Source: McDougall, D. (2004): [Intervention in Solomon Islands](#). *The Round Table* 93(374): 213-223.

Other

Estonia 1991-1993

- **Autocratization: 1991-92**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization 1993**
- **Coding: Other**

This is a “technical” U-turn. Elected officials index goes to 0 due to independence, but no autocratization in practice.

Sudan 1969-1987

- **Autocratization: 1969**
- **Bottom: 1970-1971**
- **Democratization 1972-1987**
- **Coding: Other**

On May 26, 1969, General Ja'faar Muhammad Nimeiri staged a military coup. Nimeiri introduced a new constitution, and won the presidential elections in 1972. In 1973, Sudan was declared a one-party state via a new constitution, and Nimeiri ruled unchecked going forward. In 1983, as part of a deal made with the National Islamic Front, Nimeiri introduced Islamic law throughout Sudan. After a renewed civil war and widespread famine, Nimeiri was ousted by a military coup in 1985, and General Abd al-Rahman Sawr al-Dahab took over power. He formed a 14-member Transitional Military Council, announced that elections would be held within one year and suspended the 1973 Constitution. In April 1986, elections were held, and Sadiq El-Mahdi became Prime Minister of a Umma (the National Umma Party) — DUP (Democratic Unionist Party) coalition government.

Reasoning: This is a “false positive” identified by the ERT rules. There is no reason to view Sudan as democratizing in the period from 1972 up until about 1986, a period that includes one-party rule, sharia laws, a coup, and civil war. We believe it’s better to view the whole period as a longer authoritarian rule, and that more substantive democratization only emerges with the 1986 elections.

Source: Nohlen, D., B. Thibaut, B. & Krennerich, M., eds (1999): *Elections in Africa: A Data Handbook*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Suriname 1975-1976

- **Autocratization: 1975**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization 1976**

- **Coding: Other**

This is a “technical” U-turn. Elected officials index goes to 0 due to independence, but no autocratization in practice.

Zimbabwe 1978-1981

- **Autocratization: 1978**
- **Bottom: -**
- **Democratization 1979-81**
- **Coding: Other**

This is a “technical U-turn”. Elected officials index goes to 0 due to pre-independence events, but no autocratization in practice.

Extra Cases: Six years between the episodes

Albania 1937-1947

- **Autocratization: 1937-1940**
- **Bottom: 1941-1945**
- **Democratization: 1946-1947**
- **Coding: International Intervention**

Autocratization primarily took place as a result of Italy's invasion of Albania in 1939. After the Italian capitulation in September 1943, the country was occupied by the Germans until the end of the war. Resistance forces then liberated the country in 1944, and in 1945 the People's Republic of Albania was declared with uncompetitive elections held in the same year.

Reasoning: Autocratization is the result of the Italian occupation, democratization is the result of the German retreat and establishment of the People's Republic of Albania.

Source: Fischer, B.J. (1999): *Albania at War 1939-1945*. London: Hurst & Company.

Argentina 1966-1974

- **Autocratization: 1966-1967**
- **Bottom: 1968-1972**
- **Democratization: 1973-1974**
- **Coding: Democratic Reaction**

In 1963, while the Peronists were still banned, Arturo Illia from the UCRP (the Radical Civic Union) was elected president. In 1966, a coup deposed him, and the military established an authoritarian regime led by Juan Carlos Onganía (1966 to 1970), Roberto Levingston. (1970 to 1971), and Alejandro Lanusse (1971 to 1973). The military government became increasingly unpopular, and pressure started to increase around 1970, not least from civil society organizations like unions along with more direct challenging and organizing by opposition parties, especially the Peronists. This eventually led to a slowly negotiated return to democracy, primarily involving Juan Perón and his allies on the one side and the military government on the other, culminating in the decision to hold multiparty elections which, for the first time in a long time, allowed the Peronists to compete. In the 1973 elections the Peronists—now the Partido Justicialista (PJ; Justice Party)—defeated the UCRP. Perón was elected President with over 60% of the vote later that same year.

Reasoning: Negotiated democratization after mounting pressure, the opposition pushes for a return to elections that would not have happened otherwise. Thus, this is a democratic reaction.

Source: Nohlen, D., ed. (2005): *Elections in the Americas: A Data Handbook*, Vol. 2. New York: Oxford University Press.

Argentina 1975-1984

- **Autocratization: 1975-1977**
- **Bottom: 1978-1982**
- **Democratization: 1983-1984**
- **Coding: Democratic Reaction**

Perón's sudden death in 1974, after having been elected in 1973, led to a political crisis. In 1976, a military coup led to start of a repressive military dictatorship. Opposition to the military rule after the loss of the Malvinas War in 1983 became intense, and forced the government to give up power who called for elections. This was the outcome of a substantial popular pressure, which included widespread demonstrations, civil society organizations mobilizing, and opposition parties coordinating and participating in the pressure to swiftly return to democracy. Raúl Alfonsín from the UCR (the Radical Civic Union) won the elections, which saw the return of civilian government and democracy in Argentina.

Reasoning: This is a democratic reaction, even though the war played a crucial role in the democratization by leading to a full-scale government crisis, this crisis itself does not explain the return to democracy, nor did any international actors participate in or intervene in the call for democratization. Rather, the crisis led to a massive popular reaction that pressured the government to hand over power and stage elections, as well as seizing repression.

Source: Nohlen, D., ed. (2005): *Elections in the Americas: A Data Handbook*, Vol. 2. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ghana 1972-1980

- **Autocratization: 1972-1973**
- **Bottom: 1974-1978**
- **Democratization: 1979-1980**
- **Coding: Democratic Reaction**

President Kofi Abrefa Busia was ousted by a military coup on January 13 1972, ending Ghana's second republic. The National Redemption Council (NRC) by Lt-Col. Ignatius Kutu Acheampong took charge and ruled unchecked. The NRC was subsequently replaced by a Supreme Military Council (SMC) in 1975, and the military continued to rule Ghana by decree. Popular dissatisfaction, not least due to poor economic performance, soon led to changes in the regime. First, the SMC allowed for a "Union Government". Where elected civilians would share power with military officers, which was confirmed via referendum in March 1978. Yet, pressure for substantial change persisted, and Acheampong resigned on July 5 1978, and the new SMC was now only supposed to be transitional and to hand over power to a fully civilian government. Elections were scheduled for July 1 1979, but the SMC was removed before the elections took place by a military coup led by Flgt-Lt. Jerry John Rawlings. Despite the coup,

the multi-party elections took place that year and elected President Hilla Limann on September 24, 1979. These elections, and the introduction of a new constitution that provided for a civilian, elected government, constitute the bulk of the democratization process.

Reasoning: The democratization and return of civilian rule are due to pressures from the opposition and the public, although the process is briefly interrupted by the Rawlings coup. Still, this counts as a democratic reaction.

Source: Nohlen, D., M. Krennerick, and B. Thibaut, eds. (1999): *Elections in Africa: A Data Handbook*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Greece 1966-1984

- **Autocratization: 1966-1968**
- **Bottom: 1969-1973**
- **Democratization: 1974-1984**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

This is a tricky one. On the surface we have the same (or very similar at least since they changed their composition a bit) group of people that staged a coup in 1967 and remained in power until 1974 when they handed power back to an interim government. However, it's not quite as simple as that because the events that happened in between also play a role. First, dictator Georgios Papadopoulos had a plan of liberalization that he started in an attempt to legitimize his government but then he had to crush student protests. In 1973, he was replaced by a coup within the same ruling coalition which put Dimitrios Ioannides in power. He was not prepared to hand power back to a civilian government yet and instead, also staged a coup in Cyprus which led to the Turkish invasion of Cyprus in 1974. The entire junta then essentially gave up and handed power back over because they realized that they had failed.

Reasoning: The military junta staged a coup, but eventually voluntarily relinquished power because they could not deal effectively with the crisis.

Source: Arvanitopoulos, C. (1991): [The Rise and Fall of the Greek Military Regime: 1967-1974](#). *Journal of Modern Hellenism* 8: 97-116.

Extra Cases: Seven years between the episodes

Fiji 2006-2015

- **Autocratization: 2006-2007**
- **Bottom: 2008-2013**
- **Democratization: 2014-2015**
- **Coding: Authoritarian Manipulation**

Essentially, this is similar to most other coup cases with the difference that there much more happening between coup and re-introduction of elections. In 2006, military leader Frank Bainimarama staged a coup and together with Ratu Josefa Iloilo formed the leadership of Fiji for the next few years. They promulgate a new constitution according to which new elections were held in 2014.

Reasoning: A military coup followed by elections to legitimize the power grab. Elections as coup legitimization are coded as authoritarian manipulation.

Source: Baledrokadroka, J. (2016): [The Fiji Military and the 2014 Elections](#). In: Ratuva, S., and S. Lawson, eds. (2016): *The People Have Spoken: The 2014 Elections in Fiji*. Canberra: Australian National University Press: 177-190.

Dominican Republic 1916-1927

- **Autocratization: 1916-1917**
- **Bottom: 1918-1923**
- **Democratization: 1924-1927**
- **Coding: International Intervention**

Autocratization started when the US occupied the Dominican Republic in 1916. They established a military government in the DR that lasted until 1922 when the US agreed to turn nominal rule over to a provisional Dominican government and to withdraw by 1924. The withdrawal was primarily a decision made by the US on the basis of domestic considerations as they did not face overwhelming pressure to do so from actors in the DR. New elections were then held in 1924 after which the country saw a period of stability again.

Reasoning: This can reasonably be coded as an international intervention as the US controlled the development of all events.

Source: Calder, B.J. (1984): *The Impact of Intervention: The Dominican Republic during the US Occupation 1916-1924*. Austin: University of Texas.

Honduras 1973-1983

- **Autocratization: 1973**
- **Bottom: 1974-1979**
- **Democratization: 1980-83**
- **Coding: Not a U-turn**

After military rule, a civilian government briefly ruled Honduras in 1971-1972. This government was overthrown by the military in the face of economic crisis and the mobilization of guerrilla groups. The military ruled under a tumultuous period with different heads of state

up until democratization started in 1980 with the decision to elect a constitutional assembly, and the call for parliamentary and presidential elections in 1981. The promulgation of a new constitution in 1985 completed the transition to democracy.

Reasoning: If this is regarded as a U-turn, it fits best as authoritarian manipulation, as the military remains largely in control over the choice to hand over power (although presiding over a chaotic period). Yet, the autocratization and democratization seem relatively unrelated, and the generally crisis of Honduran society and politics in the 1970s makes it difficult to see a clear connection between the two processes.

Source: Nohlen, D., ed. (2005): *Elections in the Americas: A Data Handbook*, Vol. 1. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lesotho 1994-2003

- **Autocratization: 1994-1995**
- **Bottom: 1996-2001**
- **Democratization: 2002-2003**
- **Coding: Not a U-turn**

The autocratization episode was a military-backed coup. The Southern African Development Community (SADC) stepped in and forced negotiations between the royal family, the military, and the previously ruling Basotho Congress Party (BCP). They reinstated the government and found a consensus on who should be the King and Head of State. What follows in the next few years are primarily disputes between governing and opposition parties. Democratization is then linked to new elections in 2002 that saw a lot less restrictions for the opposition parties.

Reasoning: Autocratization and democratization seem to be very distinct processes.

Source: Nohlen, D., M. Krennerick, and B. Thibaut, eds. (1999): *Elections in Africa: A Data Handbook*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pakistan 1977-1989

- **Autocratization: 1977-1978**
- **Bottom: 1979-1984**
- **Democratization: 1985-1989**
- **Coding: Not a U-turn**

After the defeat in the war with Eastern Pakistan (Bangladesh), Pakistan returned to a parliamentary system and Zulfikar Ali Bhutto became prime minister. The 1977 elections were accused of being rigged, and Bhutto in response called for new ones to be held. Yet, before this could take place General Zia ul-Haq overthrew the government in a military coup on July 7, 1977 and suspended the constitution and parliament. On March 2, 1985 Zia decided that the

1973 constitution would be re-instated, after having held parliamentary elections on a non-party basis the year before as well as a referendum on his government programs. This reintroduction of the 1973 constitution set off democratization slowly, and more substantial improvements occurred in 1988 when Zia announced parliamentary elections, and then died in a plane crash under mysterious circumstances on August 17 1988. Ishaq Khan, the Chairman of the Senate, became acting President and continued with the scheduled elections. These elections were won by the Pakistan People's Party (PPP) under Benazir Bhutto, and meant an improvement that saw a move away from Zia's military rule.

Reasoning: A 50/50 case, Zia's rule is relatively long and consolidated. If it is viewed as a U-turn, it's a case of authoritarian manipulation. Yet the stability and longevity of Zia's rule before any noticeable democratization takes place suggests that this is probably better viewed as isolated instances of autocratization and democratization.

Source: Nohlen, D., M. Krennerick, and B. Thibaut, eds. (1999): *Elections in Africa: A Data Handbook*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Spain 1923-1932

- **Autocratization: 1923-1924**
- **Bottom: 1925-1930**
- **Democratization: 1931-1932**
- **Coding: Not a U-Turn**

The initial autocratization period was the time of the coup led by General Miguel Primo de Rivera in 1923, when parliamentary regime was replaced by a military dictatorship with the support of the King Alfonso XIII. Primo de Rivera stayed in power until 1930 when he was removed by the King amid increasing inflation and civic unrest. Then a period of instability followed seeing two different governments before ultimately, the Second Spanish Republic was proclaimed in 1931 and constituent elections were held in the same year.

Reasoning: One could make an argument that it was the population that put pressure on the King to remove Primo de Rivera and it was the same population that then wanted a republic. But it seems to be rather the case that first there was widespread dissatisfaction with Primo de Rivera and later this dissatisfaction was primarily focused against the King, making the two episodes distinct and rather unrelated processes.

Source: Nohlen, D., and P. Stöver, eds. (2010): *Elections in Europe: A Data Handbook*. Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft.

Extra Cases: Eight years between the episodes

Colombia 1947-1960

- **Autocratization: 1947-1950**
- **Bottom: 1951-1957**
- **Democratization: 1958-1960**
- **Coding: Not a U-Turn**

President Ospina Perez dissolved the Congress in 1949. In the subsequent elections of 1950, Laureano Gomez won but primarily due to widespread manipulation. He was overthrown in 1953 by a coup which brought General Gustavo Rojas Pinilla into power. He was successful in the sense that he stopped the ongoing civil war but was reluctant to give up power again. As a result, dissident sectors of the military backed by the two main political parties of Conservatives and Liberals also toppled him through a coup and subsequently, shared power.

Reasoning: Because there were separate coups involved – when scores were already at the bottom - we do not classify it as a reaction. It was certainly a reaction against Rojas Pinilla, but he wasn't the one driving the initial autocratization episode.

Source: Nohlen, D., ed. (2005): *Elections in the Americas: A Data Handbook*, Vol. 1. New York: Oxford University Press.

Greece 1935-1953

- **Autocratization: 1935-1937**
- **Bottom: 1938-1944**
- **Democratization: 1945-1953**
- **Coding: Not a U-Turn**

This is a case where no link exists between autocratization and democratization. Autocratization was due to Prime Minister Metaxas declaring a dictatorship in 1936. Democratization then was possible due to the end of WWII where Greece was also occupied.

Reasoning: Autocratization and democratization are unrelated processes here.

Source: Nohlen, D., and P. Stöver, eds. (2010): *Elections in Europe: A Data Handbook*. Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft.

Sudan 1989-2015

- **Autocratization: 1989-1990**
- **Bottom: 1991-1997**
- **Democratization: 1998-2015**
- **Coding: Not a U-Turn**

Lt-General Omar Hassan Ahmad al-Beshir became head of government in 1989 as result of a military coup. The government banned political parties and declared a state of emergency that led to widespread repression. In 1998, a new constitution came into effect, but it's legitimacy was weak as it was drafted during an on-going civil war. A very gradual democratization took place from there, but al-Beshir stayed in power throughout this period (up until 2019) wielding substantial power and reigned over an autocratic rule.

Reasoning: Much like Sudan 1969-1987, this does not look like two related processes, and much of the early democratization rather seems like stability. If it's counted as a U-turn, it's best coded as authoritarian manipulation, but this case should be excluded.

Source: Nohlen, D., B. Thibaut, B. & Krennerich, M., eds (1999): *Elections in Africa: A Data Handbook*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Uganda 1966-1981

- **Autocratization: 1966-1972**
- **Bottom: 1973-1979**
- **Democratization: 1980-1981**
- **Coding: International Intervention**

A conflict between King (Kabaka) Mutesa II and Prime Minister Milton Obote escalated into armed conflict in 1966. Obote won the struggle, and introduced a new constitution that gave him far-reaching political power as a newly appointed president. Obote soon banned all parties but his own UPC, and elections were postponed indefinitely. Obote was then deposed by Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces, Idi Amin in a military coup. Uganda autocratized even further as the democratic institutions were removed also on paper, and an extremely violent and repressive regime cost the lives of hundreds of thousands of people. Amin's rule soon came to an end, as Tanzanian forces intervened in 1979 and deposed Amin. A political crisis ensued, but elections were held in December 1980, leading to some democratization with the return of elections and civilian government. Obote's UPC won the elections, which were manipulated, and parts of the opposition chose to pick up arms. The initiation of guerrilla warfare soon led to renewed autocratization and the end of a short and limited democratization.

Reasoning: This should not be coded as a U-turn. Amin's rule is long and relatively consolidated, the subsequent democratization is not strongly linked to the autocratization. If coded as a U-turn, this is probably international intervention due to Tanzania's role.

Source: Nohlen, D., B. Thibaut, B. & Krennerich, M., eds (1999): *Elections in Africa: A Data Handbook*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Uruguay 1963-1995

- **Autocratization: 1963-1976**

- **Bottom: 1977-1983**
- **Democratization: 1984-1995**
- **Coding: Not a U-Turn**

In the 1960s the left-wing Tupamaros' guerilla forces took up arms against the Uruguayan regime, to which it responded with increasing repression. Gradual deterioration of the elected regime starting in 1971 led to the establishing of a military dictatorship in 1973. The Uruguayan military successfully repressed the guerilla. To legitimize their rule, the military held a referendum in 1980, but their new constitution was rejected. Parts of the military favored democratization, and a negotiated return to democracy with the main parties eventually took place in 1983. In 1984, the country held the first presidential and legislative elections since 1971. These ended in the victory of the Colorado party and its presidential candidate, Julio María Sanguinetti. In 1990, he was succeeded by the Blanco candidate Luis Alberto Lacalle. Sanguinetti was returned as president in 1995, heading a coalition government with the Blancos.

Reasoning: This case involves about a decade of military rule, and is too consolidated to be regarded a U-turn.

Source: Nohlen, D., ed. (2005): Elections in the Americas: A Data Handbook, Vol. 2. New York: Oxford University Press.

Extra Cases: Nine years between the episodes

Equatorial Guinea 1971-1988

- **Autocratization: 1971-1973**
- **Bottom: 1974-1981**
- **Democratization: 1982-1988**
- **Coding: Not a U-Turn**

President Macias amassed all legislative, executive, and judiciary competencies himself in 1970 and proclaimed himself President for life in 1973 in a single-party regime. The country remained at low levels of democracy, but Macias' rule was ended in 1979 through a coup staged by his nephew Teodoro Obiang. The reforms he introduced were very minor but ultimately, he at least introduced direct elections to an otherwise very weak legislature.

Reasoning: It may qualify as an elite reaction, but Obiang's rationale for the coup remain unclear. We suggest that the fact that Macias was able to pursue his extremely authoritarian rule over years seems to suggest that was in fact not a reaction but rather just a matter of wanting to be in power.

Source: Nohlen, D., M. Krennerick, and B. Thibaut, eds. (1999): *Elections in Africa: A Data Handbook*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Peru 1968-1981

- **Autocratization: 1968-1969**
- **Bottom: 1970-1977**
- **Democratization: 1978-1981**
- **Coding: Not a U-Turn**

Fernando Belaúnde Terry became president in 1963 after having won the elections. However, he was ousted in 1968 by a military coup led by General Juan Velasco Alvarado. Alvarado ruled as a dictator for seven years, but the rule came to an end in 1975 as a result of substantial protests. Alvarado was replaced by Francisco Morales Bermúdez as president, leading to another two years of military rule. In 1977, under further popular pressure and strikes, Bermúdez conceded and called for elections for a constituent assembly. Democratization started the year after, as the assembly drafted a democratic constitution that provided for civilian rule, legalizing all parties and paving the way for elections and return to democracy.

Reasoning: About a decade of military rule, too long and consolidated to be a U-turn.

Source: Nohlen, D., ed. (2005): *Elections in the Americas: A Data Handbook*, Vol. 2. New York: Oxford University Press.

Venezuela 1949-1961

- **Autocratization: 1949**
- **Bottom: 1950-1957**
- **Democratization: 1958-1961**
- **Coding: Not a U-Turn**

Venezuela's democratically elected government was overthrown by a military coup in November 1948, subsequently banning major parties in the country. The military ruled by decree, but announced elections for a constituent assembly in 1952. However, disappointed with the results of this election, they were revoked and the Junta leader Gobierno Pérez Jiménez was declared president, extending the military rule. This rule only ended when in 1958 various oppositional factions, along with civil society organizations, joined forces and successfully deposed Pérez Jiménez after mounting pressure. Soon after, democracy returned to Venezuela.

Reasoning: About a decade of military rule, too long and consolidated to be a U-turn.

Source: Nohlen, D., ed. (2005): *Elections in the Americas: A Data Handbook*, Vol. 2. New York: Oxford University Press.

Extra Cases: Ten years between the episodes

Burkina Faso 1981-2000

- **Autocratization: 1981-1981**
- **Bottom: 1982-1990**
- **Democratization: 1991-2000**
- **Coding: Not a U-Turn**

In the 1980s, there were a number of coups (1980, 1983, 1987) each replacing the different leaders. Among them Captain Thomas Sankara stayed in power for the longest time from 1983 to 1987. But he was then also replaced in a coup in 1987 which brought Blaise Compaore into office who then also oversaw the subsequent democratization period.

Reasoning: The democratization episode is unrelated to the previous series of coups that started in 1980.

Source: Nohlen, D., M. Krennerick, and B. Thibaut, eds. (1999): *Elections in Africa: A Data Handbook*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ghana 1981-2001

- **Autocratization: 1981-1982**
- **Bottom: 1983-1991**
- **Democratization: 1992-2001**
- **Coding: Not a U-Turn**

Lieutenant Jerry John Rawlings led a military coup in 1981, installing an autocratic regime with Rawlings at the head. What followed was a stable, but relatively inclusionary and participatory, autocratic regime. In 1988-89, an opening up of the regime was initiated with the holding of (non-party) district elections. Rawlings and his government eventually saw increasing pressure to democratize, both from domestic and foreign actors. As a result, a new constitution was confirmed via referendum on 28 April 1992, and presidential elections later that same year as the ban on parties was removed. Rawlings, still popular, won the presidential elections, and his National Democratic Congress (NDC) won a landslide in the parliamentary elections. This marked the end of military rule, and return of democracy in Ghana.

Reasoning: About a decade of military rule, too long and consolidated to be a U-turn.

Source: Nohlen, D., B. Thibaut, B. & Krennerich, M., eds (1999). *Elections in Africa: A Data Handbook*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Panama 1964-1992

- **Autocratization: 1964-1969**
- **Bottom: 1970-1978**
- **Democratization: 1979-1992**
- **Coding: Not a U-Turn**

After the free and competitive elections of 1968, the National Guard (Officers' Corps) staged a coup against the elected Arnulfo Arias. The new government, led by General Omar Torrijos banned political parties and closed parliament. He remained in power throughout the 1970s and only in 1977 the US (together with domestic opposition) starting exerting more pressure on him to liberalize the regime. In 1978, then, there were constitutional reforms reintroducing the separation of powers and opposition parties became legal again. Torrijos died in 1981.

Reasoning: Although it is the same actor that is in power at the autocratization and at the onset of democratization, given Torrijos' relatively long period in office, these processes do not seem closely connected. Plus, a substantial degree of democratization takes place after his death with new political developments emerge than cannot readily be connected with Torrijos' tenure including the US invasion of Panama in 1989.

Source: Nohlen, D., ed. (2005): *Elections in the Americas: A Data Handbook*, Vol. 1. New York: Oxford University Press.