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Transition
What is a political transition?

• The act and process of changing and evolving from one form of regime (government) to another one
• This process ends when a new regime is created and when it enters officially into force
• Possible scenarios
  1. From authoritarianism to totalitarianism
  2. From authoritarianism to democracy
  3. From totalitarianism to authoritarianism
  4. From democracy to authoritarianism
Democratization
Evolution

- **1950-1970. Structural approach**
  - Empirical referents: first and second wave cases

  - Empirical referents: first and second wave (Rustow), third wave cases (O’Donnell and Schmitter)

- **1990-2000. Renewed focus on structures**
  - Empirical referents: post-communist and post-soviet countries (area studies, sovietologists)

- **Since 2002. Strategic approach**
  - Empirical referents: post-soviet countries, Color Revolutions, Arab Springs
  - Failed attempts
Structure
Social prerequisites (Lipset, 1959)

Conditions
- open class system
- economic wealth
- equalitarian value system
- capitalist economy
- literacy
- high participation in voluntary organizations

Initial Possible Consequence: democracy

Additional Consequences
- open class system
- equalitarian value system
- political apathy
- bureaucracy
- mass society
- literacy
Many causes (Huntington, 1991)

- A high overall level of economic growth
- Relatively equal distribution of income and/or wealth
- A market economy
- Economic development and social modernization
- A feudal aristocracy at some point in the history of society
- The absence of feudalism in the society
- A strong bourgeoisie (“No bourgeois, no democracy”)
- High levels of literacy and education
- Protestantism
- Social pluralism and strong intermediate groups
- The development of political contestation before the expansion of political participation
Democratic authority structures within social groups, particularly those connected to politics

- Low levels of civil violence
- Low levels of political polarization and extremism
- Political leaders committed to democracy
- Experience as a British colony
- Tradition of tolerance and compromise
- Occupation or influence by a pro-democratic foreign power
- Elite desire to emulate democratic nations
- Traditions of respect of rule of law and individual rights
- Communal (ethnic, religious, racial) homogeneity / heterogeneity
- Consensus / absence of consensus on political and social values
Waves of democratization

A wave of democratization is a group of transitions from nondemocratic to democratic regimes that occur within a specified period of time and that significantly outnumber transitions in the opposite direction during that period of time. A wave also usually involves liberalization or partial democratization in political systems that do not become fully democratic.
### First wave (1828-1926)
- 33 countries (e.g. United States, Great Britain, France, Switzerland, Italy, Ireland)

### First reverse wave (1922-1942)
- 22 countries (e.g. Italy, Germany, Austria, Baltic States, Brazil, Argentina)

### Second wave (1943-1962)
- 41 countries (e.g. West Germany, Italy, Japan, Turkey, Brazil, Uruguay, Nigeria)

### Second reverse wave (1958-1972)
- 22 countries (e.g. Brazil, Bolivia, Argentina, Chile, Peru, Pakistan, Philippines, Greece, Turkey, Nigeria, Barbados)

### Third wave (1974-?)
- 36 countries (e.g. Portugal, Greece, Spain, Argentina, Brazil, India, Pakistan, Turkey, South Korea, Philippines, South Africa, Poland, East Germany, Yugoslavia, Soviet Union)
The causes of the third wave

1. Declining legitimacy (performance legitimacy rather than procedural legitimacy)
2. Economic growth and economic crisis
3. New role of the Catholic Church
4. Changes in policies of the external actors
5. Snowballing or demonstration effect

✓ From causes to causers
The impact of the economic development

Figure 2.1. Economic Development as a Factor in Democratization
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No preconditions (Huntington, 1991)

- No single factor is sufficient to explain the development of democracy in all countries or in a single country.
- No single factor is necessary to the development of democracy in all countries.
- Democratization in each country is the result of a combination of causes.
- The combination of causes producing democracy varies from country to country.
- The combination of causes generally responsible for one wave of democratization differs from that responsible for other waves.
- The causes responsible for the initial regime changes in a democratization wave are likely to differ from those responsible for later regime changes in that wave.
Agency
A positivistic approach

- 1970-1995
- Third wave era
- Starting from Dunkwart Rustow (1970)
- Transitology + Consolidology = Positivistic approach
- Teleological approach
  - The explanation of phenomena in terms of the purpose they serve rather than of the cause by which they arise.
Robert Dahl’s theory on democratization (1971)

**Figure 1.2** Liberalization, Inclusiveness, and Democratization
O’Donnell and Schmitter (1986)
Rustow’s decalogue

1. The factors that keep a democracy stable may not be the ones that brought it into existence: explanations of democracy must distinguish between function and genesis.

2. Correlation is not the same as causation: a genetic theory must concentrate on the latter.

3. Not all causal links run from social and economic to political factors.

4. Not all causal links run from beliefs and attitudes to actions.

5. The genesis of democracy need not be geographically uniform: there may be many roads to democracy.
6. The genesis of democracy need not be temporally uniform: different factors may become crucial during successive phases.

7. The genesis of democracy need not be socially uniform: even in the same place and time the attitudes that promote it may not be the same for politicians and for common citizens.

8. Empirical data in support of a genetic theory must cover, for any given country, a time period from just before until just after the advent of democracy.

9. To examine the logic of transformation within political systems, we may leave aside countries where a major impetus came from abroad.

10. A model or ideal type of the transition may be derived from a close examination of two or three empirical cases and tested by application to the rest.
3 phases

1. Preparatory phase (R)
2. Opening of the crisis (O'D&S)
3. End of the authoritarian regime (H)

2. Decisional phase
   - Instauration
3. Habituation phase
   - Consolidation

Actors and modes

- **Transfer of power or transformation**
- **Surrender of power or transplacement**
- **Overthrow of power or replacement**

**Hard liners (Standpatters)**
- Try to resist the reformist action

**Soft liners (Reformers)**
- Try to reform the system from within

**Radical extremists**
- Try to overthrow the authoritarian regime

**Democratic moderates**
- Push for the liberalization
No preconditions: the primacy of the actors

- O’Donnell and Schmitter: virtù and fortuna
- Legitimacy declining and performance dilemma
- Dispensability
- Failure and success of the authoritarian regime
Transformations

1. Emergence of reformers
2. Acquiring power
3. Failure of liberalization
4. Backward legitimacy: subduing the standpatters (continuity with the past)
5. Coopting the opposition
Replacements

• The struggle to produce the fall
• The fall
• The struggle after the fall

• No pacts (no decision phase, complicated consolidation)
• High levels of violence
Transplacements

- Phase 1: un uncertain struggle
- Medium levels of violence
- Role of the bourgeoisie
- Role of the masses
  - The cycle of mobilization
  - The resurrection of the civil society
  - The concept of “people”
  - The popular upsurge
Transformations and transplacements: the importance of the pacts/1

- What concludes the preparatory phase is a deliberate decision on the part of political leaders to accept the existence of diversity in unity and, to that end, to institutionalize some crucial aspect of democratic procedure.
- Moderation-participation trade-off
- Great Compromise (Sweden 1907)
- Instalment plan (Great Britain 1688 [principle of the limited government] -1832 [suffrage reform])
Transformations and transplacements: the importance of the pacts/2

• Specious reasons: The forces of conservatism may yield from fear that continued resistance may lose them even more ground in the end.

• Reasons of strategy: The radicals may accept the compromise as a first installment, confident that time is on their side and that future installments are bound to follow.

• Reasons of coherence: The conservatives may belatedly wish to live up to principles long proclaimed.

• Contingent reasons: Both conservatives and radicals may feel exhausted from a long struggle or fearful of a civil war.
The second-best choice

1. The democratic content of the decision may be incidental to other substantive issues.

2. Second, in so far as it is a genuine compromise it will seem second-best choice to all major parties involved, it certainly will not represent any agreement on fundamentals.

3. Third, even on procedures there are likely to be continuing differences of preference (e.g. parliamentary vs. presidential system). What matters at the decision stage is not what values the leaders hold dear in the abstract, but what concrete steps they are willing to take.

4. Fourth, the agreement worked out by the leaders is far from universal. It must be transmitted to the professional politicians and to the citizenry at large. These are two aspects of the final, or habituation, phase of the model.
First political moment

• Such a pact involves a package deal among the leaders of a spectrum of electorally competitive parties to:

1. Limit the agenda of policy choice
2. Share proportionately in the distribution of benefits
3. Restrict the participation of outsiders in decision-making.

• They agree to forgo appeals to military intervention and efforts at mass mobilization
• Grand coalition or rotational scheme
Contingent consent

• These actors agree to compete in such a way that:
  1. Who win greater electoral support will exercise their temporary political superiority in such a way as not to impede those who may win greater support in the future from taking office;
  2. Those who lose in the present agree to respect the contingent authority of the winners to make binding decisions, in exchange for being allowed to take office and make decisions in the future.
  3. Citizens will presumably accept a democracy based on such a competition, provided its outcome remains contingent upon their collective preferences as expressed through fair and regular elections of uncertain outcome.
Rules that embody the contingent consent

1. The actors must decide: which parties can play the game; the thresholds for the representation of minor parties and certain social groups (minorities)

2. Voting or electoral system (majority, plurality, proportional, mixed): workable majorities or accurate representation?

3. System of government: parliamentarism, presidentialism or semipresidentialism?
Elections

• The heart of the democracy

• Founding elections (O&S)
  - An heroic moment
  - Authoritarian regime provokes the parties: to steer and divide the people; parties are not only or not so much agents of mobilization as instruments of social and political control
  - A magnanimous gesture that could be appreciated

• Stunning elections (H)
  - The leaders convoke elections to buttress their legitimacy
Other political moments, toward the polyarchy: a sequence of piecemeal reforms

- Changes in electoral code and party finance statutes
- More effective voter registration
- More equal legislative apportionment
- More transparent public information acts
- Greater administrative decentralization
- Lower barriers to party formation and parliamentary representation
- Dissolution of corporatist monopoles and obligatory associations
- Easing of citizenship requirements
- Also some social and economic reforms
Competition and conciliation

• The process of democracy institutes a double process of Darwinian selectivity in favor of convinced democrats:
  - one among parties in general elections
  - and the other among politicians vying for leadership within these parties.

• Politics is a process for resolving conflicts within human groups.

• With its basic practice of multilateral debate, democracy in particular involves a process of trial and error, a joint learning experience.

• The first grand compromise that establishes democracy, if it proves at all viable, is in itself a proof of the efficacy of the principle of conciliation and accommodation.

• The first success, therefore, may encourage contending political forces and their leaders to submit other major questions to resolution by democratic procedures.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODE OF TRANSITION</th>
<th>One-party systems</th>
<th>Personal dictatorships</th>
<th>Military regimes</th>
<th>Racist oligarchies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformation</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soviet Union</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td></td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transplacements</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td></td>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Salvador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacements</td>
<td>East Germany</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign military intervention</td>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td></td>
<td>Panama</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consolidation/1: An attitudinal test
Developing the democratic political culture

• Elites work together to cope problems
• Citizens distinguish between the rulers and the system.
• The legitimacy of the rulers depends on the extent to which they meet the expectations of the key groups of voters, that is, on their performance.
• The legitimacy of the system depends on procedures, on the ability of the voters to choose their rulers through elections. If the rulers fail to perform, they lose legitimacy, they are defected in elections, and a different set of rulers takes over.
• The loss of performance legitimacy by the rulers leads to the reaffirmation of the procedural legitimacy of the system.
• Ruler or performance legitimacy vs. regime or procedural legitimacy
• Authoritarian regimes: this distinction is impossible
Consolidation/2: A behavioural test
Institutionalizing Democratic Political Behaviour

- Two-turnover test: A democracy is consolidated if the party group that takes the power in the initial election at the time of the transition loses a subsequent election and turns over power to those election winners, and if those election winners then peacefully turn over power to the winners of a later election.

- Selecting rulers through elections is the heart of democracy, and democracy is real only if rulers are willing to give up power as a result of elections.

- First electoral turnover: symbolic significance

- The second turnover show two things
  - Two major groups of political leaders in the society are sufficiently committed to democracy to surrender office and power after losing an election.
  - Both elites and public are operating within the democratic system. If something go wrong, you change the rulers, not the regime.
Consolidation: How is it possible?

- Forced acceptance
- Experience
- Rationalization
- Belief
Schedler: Empirical viewpoints and normative horizons/1

Avoiding democratic breakdown

Authoritarian Regime  Electoral democracy  Liberal democracy  Advanced democracy

Outer negative horizon  Empirical referents of all debate on democratic consolidation  Outer positive horizon

Avoiding democratic erosion

Authoritarian regime  Electoral democracy  Liberal democracy  Advanced democracy

Outer negative horizon  Empirical referents of all debate on democratic consolidation  Outer positive horizon
Schedler: Empirical viewpoints and normative horizons/2

Completing democracy

- Authoritarian regime
- Outer negative horizon
- Empirical referents of all debate on democratic consolidation
- Liberal democracy
- Advanced democracy
- Outer positive horizon

Deepening democracy

- Authoritarian regime
- Outer negative horizon
- Empirical referents of all debate on democratic consolidation
- Liberal democracy
- Advanced democracy
- Outer positive horizon
Organizing democracy

- Authoritarian regime
- Outer negative horizon

- Electoral democracy
- Empirical referents of all debate on democratic consolidation

- Liberal democracy

- Advanced democracy
- Outer positive horizon
Renewed focus on structures: post-communist and post-soviet cases
Post-soviet countries
Actor-centered approach vs. structural approach

• Przeworski (1991). The East becomes the South
  - The internal impetus
  - Application of Latin America models to Eastern Europe

• David Stark (1992). Against “futurist transitology”
  - We become circumspect about the notion of “transition” itself - alert to the possibility that behind such a seemingly descriptive term are teleological concepts driven by hypothesized end states.

• We should regard the region as undergoing a plurality of transitions, in a dual sense:
  1. across the countries we are seeing a multiplicity of distinctive paths that differ in kind and not simply in degree;
  2. within any given country, we find not one transition, but many, occurring in different domains - political, economic, and social - and these processes are often asynchronous and their articulation seldom harmonious
Area studies and structural variables (Terry, 1993)

1. The dual track nature of the post-communist transitions
2. Socio-economic and industrial development was more advanced and more dysfunctional
3. Greater ethnic complexity
4. The weakness of the civil society
5. A more uncertain and a more unfavorable international environment (from the bipolar to the uni-multipolar world order)
What is at stake in eastern Europe is nothing less than the creation of the very building blocks of the social order. What is open for negotiation...

- is not just the character of the regime but also the very nature of the state itself,
- not just citizenship but also identity,
- not just economic liberalization but also the foundations of a capitalist economy.
- What is also at stake is not just amendment of the existing class structure but the creation of a new class system;
- not just a shift in the balance of interests, therefore, but something much more fundamental: the very creation of a range of new interests.
- Finally, what is involved in the eastern European transitions is not just modification of the state’s foreign policies, but also a profound redefinition of the role of the state in the international system.
Strategy
Rueschemeyer, Stephens e Stephens (1992)

Balance of power among classes and class coalitions

Transnational power relations

State
McFaul’s Fourth Wave Theory (2002)

- Non-cooperative model of transition
- Post-communist transitions to democracy and dictatorship

1. Simultaneity

2. No compromises
   - In negotiations over borders or economy type in this region, the distribution of benefits has been highly skewed in favor of one side or the other. Even battles over political institutions resulted in skewed distributional benefits to the winners and did not produce compromise, benefit-sharing arrangements.

3. Less significant splits: key role of the civil society

4. Democracy through revolutions
Three modes of transition

• Impositions from below: democratic revolutions (hegemonic democrats)
• Impositions from above: new autocratic solutions (hegemonic autocrats)
• Stalemated transitions: protracted confrontation and imposition (unstable hybrid regimes, war)
Please, consider all cases

• That **conflict** can result from **equal distributions of power** should not be surprising. Analysts of the third wave focused on the successful cases of democratization and deliberately ignored unsuccessful cases.

• If all **countries** undergoing stalemated transitions are brought into the analysis, however, the causal influence of this mode of transition becomes less clear.

• **Equal distributions** can compel both sides to negotiate, but they can also tempt both sides into believing that they can prevail over their opponents.

• As Geoffrey Blaney concluded in his analysis of international armed conflict: "War usually begins when two nations disagree on their relative strength and wars usually cease when the fighting nationals agree on their relative strength."
Overthrowing the third wave analysis

- Uncertainty ➔ Conflict
- Certain distributions of power ➔ Less confrontation.
- In the three modes of transition just described, noncooperative strategic situations usually produced institutions that favored one side or the other.
- The process is the opposite of democracy without democrats.
No negotiations, only impositions

• Unlike Huntington, who asserted that "negotiation and compromise among political elites were at the heart of the democratization processes," in fact they were not.

• If the powerful believed in democratic principles, then they imposed democratic institutions. But if they believed in autocratic principles, then they imposed autocratic institutions.

• A zero-sum game: winners obtains their preferred institutional outcome (no second-best or third-best choice)

• These institutions are not efficient and they do not enhance the welfare of all, but they can be stable

• Transition is not a bargain but a confrontation with winners and losers
## Typology of postcommunist regimes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Balance of Power for Ancien Régime</th>
<th>Dictatorships</th>
<th>Partial Democracies¹</th>
<th>Democracies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>Bosnia-Herzegovina</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Partial Democracies include countries with incomplete democratic institutions and political freedoms.
The weakness of the structure, the importance of the strategy

• Research in the long run (general theory of democratization): the importance of the structural variables (geography, economic development, history, culture, prior regime type, ideological orientation etc.)

• Research in the short run (Fourth Wave Theory): the importance of the balance of power (contingent/strategic variables)
Anomaly/1: Disputed borders

- The greatest number of cases defying the analytic framework outlined in this article are countries where the distribution of power was firmly in favor of the challengers yet the regime that emerged after transition was not fully democratic.

- This list includes Armenia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Georgia, and, until last year, Croatia.

- These countries share one common problem that the more successful democracies in the region lacked: border disputes.

- To varying degrees, territorial debates sparked wars in the 1990s in all four of these countries. These territorial conflicts in turn empowered nationalist leaders with poor democratic credentials.

- Actions of leaders, however, are not predetermined by geography. Ideas, leaders, and choice still play a role even in these cases.
Anomaly/2: The proximity to the West

• Romania and Bulgaria: two countries that started the transition from communism with very powerful leaders from the ancien régime.

• Democratic consolidation in both countries has benefited from proximity to the West. Indeed, throughout the postcommunist world, there is a positive correlation between distance from the West and regime type.

• Leaders in Romania and Bulgaria have real incentives to deepen democracy, because both countries have a reasonable chance of joining the Western institutions.

• Over time, however, the pull of the West has helped weaker democratic transitions in the West become more democratic. Conversely, initially successful transitions to democracy farther from Europe, such as Armenia or even Kyrgyzstan, have had less success in consolidating.

• Neighborhoods matter.

• Proximity matters - not Christianity, education, or economic development.
Fourth wave of regime change

• Toward democracy
• Toward dictatorship
• Democratic imposition from below in which confrontation is the mode of transition is not a new phenomenon, unique to the post-communist world.
• On the contrary, there is a tradition of democratic revolutions that includes some of the most important case studies in democratization.
Different models

- American and French revolutions: no pacts, rather protracted, confrontational armed struggles in which the victors then dictated the new rules of the game.

- Germany, Austria, Japan: Imposed regime changes > no pacts or negotiation.

- Decolonization, which played no role in the third wave, has featured prominently in both the fourth wave discussed here and the second wave.

- In the long stretch of history, the successful transitions from communism to democracy may look more like the norm, while the pacted transitions and transitions from above in Latin America and Southern Europe may look more like the aberration.
A new model

• The third and fourth waves must be fused to generate a comprehensive theory of transition.

• In addition, without abandoning agency altogether, this research agenda should attempt to push the causal arrow backward in order to account for the factors that produce different modes of transition in the first place.

• A comprehensive theory of transition should therefore include both structural and strategic variables.
The Color Revolutions
Bunce and Wolchik (2006)
Two waves of democratization in the post-communist world

First wave (1988-1992)
- Poland
- Hungary
- Czechoslovakia
- Slovenia
- Baltic States

Second wave (1996-2005)
- Bulgaria
- Romania
- Slovakia
- Serbia
- Georgia
- Ukraine
- Kyrgyzstan
Second wave, electoral revolutions

• This was a wave of electoral revolutions that shared certain characteristics across cases:

• 1) the conscious deployment of an electoral model of democratization;

• 2) an upsurge in mass participation, not just in elections, but also in the streets before and sometimes after the elections;

• 3) a major turnover in governments, sometimes to the point of regime change as in Serbia-Montenegro and Croatia;

• 4) significant improvement in democratic performance after the election.
Diffusion effects

• Like the first round of democratization in this region, moreover, the second round testified to the power of diffusion effects.

• It was not just that the earlier cases illustrated to others in the region that the electoral model could work; it was also that “graduates” of the earlier cases provided direct assistance to liberal activists elsewhere in their postcommunist neighborhood.
Goal and tools

- In all these cases, the goal has been the same: to transform rigged electoral rituals into fair elections, thereby facilitating a transition from an illiberal to a more liberal government.

- The tools used have been:
  1) formation of a unified opposition;
  2) efforts to increase voter registration and turnout and to improve the quality of voter lists;
  3) efforts to focus campaign debate on the costs of the incumbent regime and the benefits of participation to opposition members and citizens at large;
  4) utilization of international and domestic election monitoring as well as the media and public-opinion polls, where possible;
  5) preparations for public protests if incumbents or their anointed successors try to steal the election.
Way (2008): The importance of structure and strategy

- Authoritarian stability is most affected by: 1) the strength of a country’s ties to the West;
- and 2) the strength of the incumbent regime’s autocratic party or state.
- In a nutshell, postcommunist autocrats have been more likely to hold onto power when their countries have weaker ties to the West and when they have access to at least one of the following sources of authoritarian organizational power:
  - a single, highly institutionalized ruling party;
  - a strong coercive apparatus that has won a major violent conflict;
  - or state discretionary control over the economy, through either de jure state control or the capture of major mineral wealth, such as oil or gas
The Arab Springs
## Table—The Structure of Arab Regime Change, 2010–12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Major Oil Exporters</th>
<th>Minor or Non-Oil Exporters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hereditary Regimes</td>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>*Egypt, Tunisia, Yemen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Libya</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hereditary Regimes</td>
<td>Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, UAE</td>
<td>Jordan, Morocco, Syria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Causal pathways

**Figure—Causal Pathways of the Arab Spring**

- Non-hereditary regimes without oil
- Hereditary regimes or major oil exporters
- Elite defection and breakdown of despotic power
- Elite cohesion and crackdown
- Regime change
- Regime continuity
The “real sequence” vs. “right sequence”
Seymour Martin Lipset (1959)

Socio-economic development

Democracy
Dunkwart Rustow (1970)

National unity  Democratic transition
Mansfield and Snyder (1995); Zakaria (1997); Fukuyama (2004; 2005)

State-building (rule of law, constitutionalism, liberalization)

Democracy-building (participation)
Huntington (1991); Boix and Stokes (2003)

Economic development

Democratic transition and consolidation
Schmitter and Karl (1991)

Democracy

Political stability, social peace, and economic development
Przeworski et al. (1996)

Socio-economic development

Democratic consolidation
Przeworski (1992): The Neoliberal Fallacy
Empirical vs. Normative approach

- Empirical approach: simultaneity
  - Capitalism-building
  - Democracy-building

- Normative approach: sequencing
  - Democracy-building
  - Capitalism-building
Kuzio (2001): The quadruple transition
The double transition of the South

Capitalism-building  Democracy-building
Kuzio (2001): The quadruple transition/2

The triple transition of the Post-communist Europe

- **Empirical approach: simultaneity**
  - State-building
  - Capitalism-building
  - Democracy-building

- **Normative approach: sequencing**
  - State-building
  - Capitalism-building
  - Democracy-building
Kuzio (2001): The quadruple transition/3
Post-colonial transitions (Soviet Union and Yugoslavia)

Empirical approach: simultaneity

Normative approach: sequencing

Nation-building
State-building
Capitalism-building
Democracy-building

Nation-building and State-building
Capitalism-building
Democracy-building