5. Non-democratic regimes

By Claudio Foliti
CHAPTER 8. NON-DEMOCRATIC REGIMES
Authoritarianism: Juan Linz' definition

• 1. “Political systems with limited, not responsible, political pluralism,
• 2. without elaborate and guiding ideology, but with distinctive mentalities,
• 3. without extensive nor intensive political mobilization, except at some points in their development,
• 4. and in which a leader or occasionally a small group exercises power within formally ill-defined limits but actually quite predictable ones.”
1. Limited, not responsible, pluralism

- Authoritarian regimes typically rely on a small set of key groups and prevent the expression of certain group interests (e.g., labor, leftists, religious groups)
- Authoritarian regimes organize interest representation in a corporatist (not pluralist) manner. These interests are usually arranged by function.
- In contrast to totalitarian regimes, the boundary between state and society is not diminished. In authoritarian regimes, the state maintains some distance and allows for some private organization to operate (e.g. Catholic church during the fascist era in Italy)
2. Distinctive mentalities

- Authoritarian regimes have mentalities rather than totalitarian ideologies.
- Ideologies are systems of belief that are intellectually organized and elaborated. Mentalities are ways of thinking (e.g. God, family, and country).
- Mentality is “intellectual attitude,” ideology is “intellectual content.”
- Mentality allows for flexibility in switching sides (e.g., from left authoritarianism to right authoritarianism), but limits the ability of authoritarian regimes
  - 1) to mobilize people for extended periods of time or
  - 2) create a strong emotional and psychological identification with the regime.
3. Low levels of mobilization

- Authoritarian regimes have low levels of social mobilization for several reasons:
  - When you demobilize you depoliticize
  - Depoliticization is often a regime goal which facilitates stability
  - Depoliticization suits the reality of limited political pluralism (you don’t want much political participation)
  - Mobilization initially attracts support, but becomes difficult to sustain without either a move toward democracy (real participation) or totalitarianism (which requires an ideology).

- Authoritarian regimes reduce politics to the
  - 1) administration of public interest and
  - 2) the expression of certain key interests
Types of authoritarian regimes

- Fundamentum divisionis (The principle according to which a genus is divided into species): type of legitimacy (Max Weber):
  - Traditional (monarchies, theocracies)
  - Charismatic (personal dictatorships)
  - Legal-rational (one-party, multi-party, post-totalitarian, bureaucratic-military regimes)
Types of authoritarian regime/2

- Fundamentum divisionis: degree of militarization
  - a. Military dictatorships
  - b. Civilian-military dictatorships
  - c. Civilian dictatorships
a. Military dictatorships

- Oligarchical praetorianism: struggle among personal and family cliques; very short duration; low degree of violence (e.g. Carlos Mancheno’s regime in Ecuador, 1947; Aguiyi Ironsi’s regime in Nigeria, Jan-Jul 1966)

- Radical praetorianism: struggle among institutional and occupational groups supplements that among cliques; medium degree of violence short duration (1 year) (e.g. Sanchez Cerro’s regime in Peru, 1930-1931)

- Mass praetorianism: social classes and social movements dominates the scene; higher degree of violence; long duration (e.g. Pinochet’s regime in Chile, 1973-1990)
b. Civilian-military dictatorships

- Bureaucratic-military regime: limited pluralism, technocracy, repression (e.g. Brazil 1964-1985; Argentina 1975-1983)
- Corporatist regime: limited participation within organic sociopolitical organizations (corporate groups); no capitalist competition nor Marxist conflict; can include or exclude the working class (e.g. Salazar’s regime in Portugal, 1933-1974; Vargas’ regime in Brazil, 1937-1945)
- Army-party regime: usually (not only) Marxist-Leninist parties (Castro’s regime in Cuba, since 1959; al-Assad’s regime in Syria, since 1971; Hussein’s regime in Iraq from 1979 to 2003)
c. Civilian dictatorships

- Nationalist regimes (Angola and Mozambique, 1974)
- Communist regimes (Eastern Europe from 1945 to 1989)
- Fascist regimes (Italy, from 1922 to 1943)
- Theocratic regimes (Iran, since 1979)
Types of authoritarian regimes/3

• Fundamentum divisionis: modes of political power maintenance (Hadenius and Teorell)

• Hereditary succession, or lineage (monarchies, e.g. Saudi Arabia);

• The actual or threatened use of military force (military dictatorships, e.g. Pinochet’s regime in Chile)
  • Subtype: rebel regimes (Congo since 1997);

• Popular election
  • No-party regimes (e.g. Maldives)
  • One-party regimes (de jure, North Corea; de facto, China; independents in Hussein’s regime)
  • Limited multi-party regimes (two criteria: stability + party dominance; competitive authoritarianism in Russia)
Totalitarianism

- No (social or political) pluralism > Single party > Monism
- Ideology
- Frequent and wide mass mobilization
- Power managed by a charismatic leader and/or a party
- Reign of terror and concentrationary universe
- Communications monopoly
- Weapons monopoly
- Centrally directed economy
- Project: Creation of a new society/a new world order/a new man
Hybrid regimes: diminished subtypes

Figure 4. Diminished Subtypes vis-à-vis Procedural Minimum and Expanded Procedural Minimum Definitions

(Location of subtypes in the columns reflects their meaning in relation to the spectrum of definitions in Figure 1. The meaning of each subtype must be understood in relation to usage by the specific author. Bibliographic references are in Appendix.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nondemocratic Regime</th>
<th>Electoralism</th>
<th>Procedural Minimum</th>
<th>Expanded Procedural Minimum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phantom democracy (Goldman 1993)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pseudodemocracy (Higley/Gunther 1992)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sham democracy (Berntzen 1993)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Missing Attribute: Full Suffrage</td>
<td>Exclusionary democracy (Remmer 1986)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oligarchical democracy (Hartlyn and Valenzuela 1994)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protodemocracy (Kohli 1993)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stable limited democracy (Higley/Gunther 1992)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Controlled democracy (Bagley 1984)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De facto one-party democracy (Leftwich 1993)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restrictive democracy (Waisman 1989)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Missing Attribute: Generic</td>
<td>Imperfect democracy (Sakwa 1994)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partial democracy (Wessin 1987)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quasidemocracy (Haggard/Kaufman 1992)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semidemocracy (Vanhanen 1990)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Missing Attribute: Civil Liberties</td>
<td>Electoral democracy (Hadenius 1994)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal democracy (Diamond 1994)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Illiberal democracy (Emmerson 1994)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited democracy (O’Donnell/Schmitter 1986)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Missing Attribute: Elected Government Has Effective Power to Govern</td>
<td>Guarded democracy (Torres Rivas 1994)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Military democracy (Rubin 1990)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protected democracy (Loveman 1994)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totalitarian democracy (Przeworski 1988)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definitions of democracy that are the point of departure for subtypes

Subtypes
Hybrid regimes: Carothers’ gray zone

• Feckless pluralism regimes
  • have significant amounts of political freedom, regular elections, and alternation of power between genuinely different political groupings
  • Low levels of participation > disaffection
  • Inconclusive and fast alternation of power
  • Corruption and dishonesty, struggle between elites and counter-elites
  • State is weak
  • Negative economic policy and performance

• Where?
  • Latin America: Nicaragua, Ecuador, Guatemala, Panama, Honduras, Bolivia
  • Post-communist world: Moldova, Bosnia, Albania, Ukraine
  • Asia: Nepal, Bangladesh, Mongolia, Thailand
  • Sub-Saharan Africa: Madagascar, Guinea-Bissau, Sierra Leone
Hybrid regimes: Carothers’ gray zone/2

- **Dominant-power politics regimes**
  - Have limited but still real political space, some political contestation by opposition groups, and at least most of the basic institutional forms of democracy
  - No alternation of power
  - The state’s main assets are put in the service of the ruler(s)
  - Judiciary is cowed and controlled by the government
  - Elections are just for show
  - Bureaucratic decaying because of the stagnancy of the system
  - Corruption and crony capitalism

- **Where**
  - **Sub-Saharan Africa:** Cameroon, Burkina Faso, Equatorial Guinea, Tanzania
  - **Post-soviet countries:** Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Kazakhstan
  - **Islamic world:** Morocco, Jordan, Algeria, Egypt, Iran, and Yemen
  - **Important countries:** South Africa, Russia, Venezuela