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This dissertation describes two historical paths which led to the emergence of self-sustaining democracies following initial democratization. The first of those paths occurred in Europe and began with the emergence of constitutional monarchies with executive power responsible to the monarch and freely elected legislatures. Such polities, almost without exception, became self-sustaining democracies unless the transition was achieved through regime discontinuity (as in Germany in 1918). An intermediate stage in this historical process consisted of the development, in some countries, of competitive oligarchy as a transitional stage between the constitutional monarchy and democracy (as in Britain, Belgium or the Netherlands).

The second path to self-sustaining democracy occurred in the post-colonial world. There, self-sustaining democracy was achieved in those countries whose democratization and independence was preceded by a sufficiently-long period of colonial autonomy (as in India), entailing a freely elected colonial legislature and/or executive. The dissertation applies a mixed methods approach, which links qualitative methods with focused case study comparisons. The quantitative findings are based on an original dataset of regime-types which employs novel measures of regime type, corresponding to the new concepts I frame in theoretical component of the project. These
measurements aim to correct for both conceptual and measurement limitations of existing coding efforts, in particular Polity IV and Przeworski et al. (2000).
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Project Summary

The research project pursued in this dissertation started already in 2003, when I was completing my second year of the undergraduate program in international relations at the University of Warsaw in Poland. It was an old-fashioned continental-style program of study, with a lot of emphasis on historical and legal subjects, and much memorization of historical facts and definitions. No one applied any of the “scientific” methods of research at my department, and hardly anybody from the faculty used statistics. Still, it seems that I would never have been able to formulate the hypotheses advanced in this project if I had been an undergraduate student at an American university. The old-fashioned emphasis on political history, which has been almost entirely abandoned at American universities, infused us with extensive knowledge of European politics in the nineteenth and early twentieth century. And although, given that we studied international relations, it was mostly a diplomatic history, broad background was also provided on internal political history of the particular countries (without which, obviously, diplomatic history would have been hardly comprehensible). Suddenly, political history at the country level appeared to me much more interesting than the diplomatic history, and several puzzles came to my mind. First of all, why did some countries established self-sustaining democratic regimes in Europe before WWII, while others were entirely unsuccessful? Being almost completely unaware of “scientific” American Political Science and its findings, I pursued answers entirely on my own reading random history books available at the university library. These were mostly in Polish, but then Polish historiography was still “old-fashioned” and useful, in the sense that a lot of emphasis was put on political and constitutional issues (again, often neglected in the contemporary Anglo-Saxon historiography).
I then discovered that nearly all of the European countries which were sustainable democracies during the interwar period shared a common feature: they evolved from competitive oligarchies, meaning regimes characterized by free electoral competition under restricted suffrage. Hence, it seemed that gradual emergence of electoral contestation within the narrow elite facilitated consolidation of democratic politics among the wider social strata once the latter demanded the extension of suffrage (as already noted by Dahl). As I realized many years later, the story was much more complicated than this, but these were the beginnings. Then I started to ponder the political history of the former colonies. Why did so few retain democratic institutions after decolonization, even though the overwhelming majority started independent political existence as democracies? Regarding the political history of the post-colonial world, there were much fewer history books available at the university library, but their number was still sufficient to realize that the causal process was to a certain extent similar as in Europe. The main post-colonial democratic success story, India, had enjoyed a relatively long period of autonomy before independence, and this was true also about other, less known and relatively successful cases, such as Jamaica, Trinidad or Sri Lanka. On the other hand, nearly all former colonies in which democracy quickly collapsed did not experience before independence any kind of autonomy characterized by democratically-elected institutions, or such period of autonomy were very short. Being armed with these two hypotheses, I applied to numerous doctoral programs around the U.S. in order to rewrite them into a dissertation which would be known among the wider scholarly community (without, initially, much success, as I was admitted only to a paid master’s program at the University of Chicago).

Fortunately for me, in the scientific world of American social science it turned out that my hypotheses are quite novel, at least in the form I was trying to advance. As I realized, my
dissertation addressed a largely neglected topic in the study of regime transitions, namely, how the historical experiences that preceded democratization affect the probability of democratic breakdown. Coming, finally, to the short summary of the project, one could briefly say that I have identified two historical paths which have led to development of self-sustaining democracies: as mentioned, one took place in Europe and the other in the post-colonial world. The first path started with emergence of constitutional monarchies with free legislative elections and an executive responsible to the monarch. I call such polities PA monarchies as they were characterized by political pluralism and the possibility electoral alternation in legislative control. The first of PA monarchies was established in Britain after the Glorious Revolution of 1688, and otherwise most of them thrived in the early nineteenth-century. If a PA monarchy made a transition to democracy through a period of competitive oligarchy (as in the United Kingdom or Belgium) or directly to democracy (as in Denmark), the resulting democracy was self-sustainable. However, if a PA monarchy made a transition to democracy through a discontinuity, the positive effect of free electoral competition under the monarchical regime disappeared and the resulting democracy was unsustainable (e.g. in Germany or Austria after WWI). In this story, a self-sustaining competitive oligarchy was only an intermediate stage between PA monarchy and democracy. Otherwise, competitive oligarchies, if they were not preceded by PA monarchy, turned out, to my surprise, as unsustainable a regime form as democracies. They failed (for example, in Piedmont or Hungary) – as democracies did. Those findings shed new light on the development of democracy in Europe.

The second path to a self-sustaining democracy pertains to post-colonial democracies. Such democracies were generally very susceptible to breakdown unless they were preceded by a sufficiently-long period of colonial autonomy, which entailed freely elected autonomous
institutions functioning under colonial supervision. The longer a period of colonial autonomy preceding democratization, the higher were chances for survival of a post-colonial democracy. In a great majority of colonies which enjoyed autonomy for ten years or longer post-colonial democracies survived. With few exceptions, the only colonizer which granted long periods of autonomy to some of its colonies were the British, but post-colonial democracies established in British colonies not preceded by a long colonial autonomy were nearly as unsustainable as other post-colonial democracies. Hence, the British colonial experience did positively affect democratic survival, but mostly indirectly. Otherwise, those democracies and competitive oligarchies which did not follow the aforementioned “paths” were largely unsustainable.

Apart from advancing a theory about two paths to self-sustaining democracy, another goal of this dissertation is to present and apply a new classification of regime type whose development was necessary to assess the effect of regime legacies on democratic survival. This measure codes for regime legacies which could have affected subsequent democratic stability. In contrast to the existing measures of regime type, it covers both independent states and colonies; hence it enables assessment of how the type of colonial regime before independence affected subsequent democratic survival. Moreover, it codes for certain additional political variables, like type of executive recruitment or transitions in executive authority, which are not of direct interest in this dissertation but might be useful in future research projects.

As the reader could have noticed, this dissertation is in principle comparative-historical, but (as it will be described later) it applies two main research methods: both statistical and case comparison developed via historical narrative. The statistical part is used to confirm the validity of the hypotheses developed through qualitative research methods, as it permits the analysis of very large number of cases. It allows me not only to verify the existence of the previously-
described paths to self-sustaining democracy, but also to identify in more general terms the features of pre-democratization regimes and regime transitions which facilitated democratic survival. But this research project is characterized not only by methodological, but also by theoretical pluralism, in that it takes advantage of various theoretical approaches present in Political Science. Or, to be more precise, it does not unambiguously subscribe to any of its paradigmatic traditions, whether rational choice theory,\(^1\) historical structuralism,\(^2\) or interpretivism.\(^3\) Instead, it argues for what might be called the primacy of political history. The theory advanced in this project subscribes to the recent methodological change described as the “historical turn” in democratization studies, according to which one needs first to determine how different democratic institutions were created throughout longer historical periods in order to properly understand the character and functioning of subsequently-established democratic polities.\(^4\) To put it differently, the historical approach claims that in order to explain political outcomes, one should also consider antecedent historical and political conditions in addition to the impact of economic development and social structure. Accordingly, this dissertation will try to show that the effect of heretofore unaccounted for historical variables also exhibits a powerful effect on the prospects for democratic breakdown. These historical legacies conditioned political actors’ expectations, value commitments, and preferences, and thus made a powerful impact on these actors’ choices regarding the form of a political regime.

\(^1\) See e.g. Geddes 2003; Boix 2003.

\(^2\) See e.g. Moore 1966; Skocpol 1979; Rueschemeyer, Huber, and Stevens 1992.

\(^3\) See e.g. Anderson 1991; Putnam, Leonardi, and Nanetti 1994.

\(^4\) See Capoccia and Ziblatt 2010.
Stability of Democratic Regimes: Theoretical Approaches

This dissertation advances a series of hypothesis regarding factors which condition survival of democratic regimes, and hence it forms a part of a large body of literature on the topic. This literature, although extensive, pays very scarce attention to the effect of pre-democratization historical legacies. However, other factors which affect democratic survival have been thoroughly analyzed. First of all, aside from a few scholars who argue that the relationship is in fact spurious,⁵ there is a near-consensus in the discipline that economic development strongly favors democratic survival. In other words, democracy established in a wealthy country is much more likely to survive in comparison to democracy established in a poor country.⁶ There is also a consistent finding that economic recessions increase the risk of democratic breakdown.⁷ Regarding other economic factors, there is a scarcity of consistent findings in the literature. Although numerous theoretical works⁸ argue that high levels of income inequality hamper both democratization and democratic survival, the empirical contributions on the topic offer meager support.⁹ In addition, Reenock et al.¹⁰ claimed that the relationship between inequality and democratization has a more nuanced character. The authors argued that democratic breakdowns are not caused by absolute levels of income inequality, but rather by continuing basic needs deprivation in conditions of persisting levels of high consumption by the wealthy. There is also a support for the thesis that a specific type of income inequality,

---

⁵ Acemoglu et al. 2008. These null findings about the effect of development on democratic survival appear only if regression model with fixed effects is used.

⁶ E.g. Boix and Stokes 2003; Epstein et al. 2006; Przeworski et al. 2000.


⁸ E.g. Acemoglu and Robinson 2006; Boix 2003.

⁹ See Houle 2009 for a review of this literature.

landholding inequality, favors democratic breakdown.\textsuperscript{11} Oil production, on the other hand, has been shown to increase the rates of survival of both democratic and non-democratic regimes.\textsuperscript{12} In addition to economic factors, it has been hypothesized that certain cultural or religious traditions, or ethnic diversity, might inhibit democratic survival. Yet, there are few consistent findings in this regard. Democracy, once established, survives with more or less equal likelihood in societies characterized by various levels of ethnic heterogeneity (ceteris paribus). It is also not directly affected by various cultural traditions (such as Islam, Catholicism, Protestantism, Confucianism, etc.).\textsuperscript{13} Finally, also international environment was shown to positively affect not necessarily the rates of democratic survival, but average levels of democracy (these variables are strongly correlated, nevertheless). Democracies tend to survive longer during periods characterized by international domination of democratic powers (for example, after 1989), and collapse more frequently when the international politics is strongly affected by non-democratic powers (for example, during the Cold War). This happens because both democratic and undemocratic powers promote their ideologies through various means: economic aid and trade conditionality, military assistance, financial support to civil society groups working for regime change, etc.\textsuperscript{14}

Still, in spite of a large number of valuable contributions, the existing scholarship on democratic survival suffers from a serious predicament, which is insufficient analysis of political and historical legacies which might affect democratic survival. I hypothesize that the effect of such variables on democracy might be equally strong to the effect of economic variables, such as economic development or economic growth. First of all, the existing literature on the effect of

\textsuperscript{11} Mahoney 2001; Moore 1966; Rueschemeyer, Huber, and Stephens 1992.

\textsuperscript{12} Dunning 2008; Smith 2007.

\textsuperscript{13} See Przeworski, Cheibub, and Limongi 1998 for overview.

\textsuperscript{14} Boix 2011.
previous regime type on democratic stability is relatively undeveloped. Dahl first noticed the positive effect of competitive oligarchy on democratic sustainability. His observation was also discussed by Diamond and Lipset and Lakin.\textsuperscript{15} Huntington used the Dahl’s theory to predict that South Africa, if it democratized, would probably be a sustainable democracy, as it was a type of competitive oligarchy in which competition preceded full participation.\textsuperscript{16} Still, this supposedly positive effect of an antecedent regime history of competitive oligarchy on subsequent democratic survival has not been analyzed systematically. No one has ever made a definite list of such regimes and included the experience of competitive oligarchy as a variable in the quantitative analysis of democratic survival. Regarding the effect of different types of colonial experience on democratic stability, the most renowned hypothesis pointed to the positive effect of British colonialism on democratic survival.\textsuperscript{17} This experience had a positive influence mostly because the British had contributed to the development of vibrant civil society, political parties, and autonomous institutions. The British also built favorable foundations for democracy in some of their colonies by enabling political mobilization of the working and middle classes, which otherwise would have been prevented by anti-democratically inclined upper classes.\textsuperscript{18} Yet, numerous large-n studies of democratization detected relatively small positive effect of British colonial legacy (or its length) on democratic survival, or they did not detect any effect at all.\textsuperscript{19} This might stem from the simple fact that in great majority of former British colonies democracy collapsed.


\textsuperscript{16} Huntington 1991, 111-12.

\textsuperscript{17} Weiner 1987, 19-22; Huntington 1984, 206; Diamond 1989, 11-12; Lipset and Lakin 2004, 174-76.

\textsuperscript{18} Rueschemeyer, Huber, and Stevens 1992, 259-60.

\textsuperscript{19} Bernhard, Reenock, and Nordstrom 2004; Lipset, Seong, and Torres 1993; Przeworski et al. 1996; Przeworski and Limongi 1997; Rost and Booth 2008.
Given the weak statistical association between the identity of the colonizer and democracy, a recent strand of the literature tried to address the topic of colonial legacies in a more nuanced way. Acemoglu et al. argued for the causal role of institutions in this regard.\textsuperscript{20} In territories where they suffered from high mortality rates, Europeans were unwilling to settle and established extractive and authoritarian institutions. Institutions characterized by rule of law, which favored development, were established only in the territories where Europeans could settle in large numbers. An alternative hypothesis, on the other hand, emphasized that human capital, and not institutional legacy, was responsible for faster development and higher levels of democracy.\textsuperscript{21} The higher level of human capital in non-Western world, according to some authors, was associated with Protestant missionary activity.\textsuperscript{22} The fact that the British allowed Protestant missions to a larger extent than other colonizers explains slightly better democratic performance of British colonies after independence. An alternative argument was developed by Lange, who contended that the difference in level of democracy among former British colonies could be explained by the type of British colonial rule.\textsuperscript{23} Direct British rule, established in plantation and commercial colonies, favored democracy and development to a larger extent than indirect rule, dominant where plantation economy or white settlement were infeasible.

Still, the aforementioned arguments suffer from a notable shortcoming as they did not distinguish between those British colonies which experienced long periods of autonomy before independence and other British colonies (autonomy could be established both in indirect and direct rule colonies). In other words, the political regime type which existed under the colonial

\textsuperscript{20} Acemoglu, Johnson and Robinson 2001.

\textsuperscript{21} Glaeser et al. 2004.

\textsuperscript{22} Lankina and Getachew 2012; Woodberry 2004; 2012.

\textsuperscript{23} Lange 2004; 2009.
rule has not been coded and included as a variable in large-n studies. As I will try to show both through qualitative and statistical analysis, the effect of colonial autonomy on post-colonial democratic survival was much stronger and statistically significant in contrast to the effect of institutions (proxied through settler mortality), Protestant missionary activity or type of British rule (whether direct or indirect). Regarding the effect of the previous regime transitions on democratic survival, there are few large-n statistical studies on the topic. Yet, some theoretical contributions addressed the issue. Generally, it has been implicitly assumed in the literature that gradual transitions to democracy, which do not involve a violent overthrow of the incumbent, pose better for democratic survival. For example, O'Donnell and Schmitter argued that democracy is likely to be more sustainable if it was achieved without “mobilized violence and dramatic discontinuity”.24 Another body of research pointed that the necessity of elite consensus on the desirability of democratic government was frequently a precondition of self-sustaining democracy. This type of consensus was hard to achieve if democratization was achieved not via an elite pact, but through a discontinuity leading to inter-elite divisions.25 Still, also in case of this research, the “type of transition” variable has not been coded and included in large-n studies. The exception in this case has been the previous experience of military coups. It has been shown that previous coups increase the risk of democratic breakdown,26 although this effect probably diminished after the end of the Cold War.27

24 O'Donnell and Schmitter 1986, 11-12.
26 Cheibub 2007.
As mentioned above, the aim of the dissertation was to investigate the relationship between pre-democratic historical legacies and democratic stability in a comprehensive way, thus moving the state of knowledge on this topic forward. In particular, I was trying to identify the characteristics of pre-democratic regimes, both in independent states and in colonies, which might have contributed to democratic stability after democratization. The first step in this process was the assessment of the effect of pre-democratic regime type on the probability of democratic breakdown. I also tried to determine whether the character of democratic transition affected subsequent democratic stability. This way I also hoped to arrive at more definitive findings on the effect of legacies of competitive oligarchy and British colonialism on democratic stability. To achieve those tasks, it was necessary to build a measure of regime type which, in contrast to the existing measures, both conceptualized and measured democracy as an essentialist concept. In other words, this measure classified a country democratic if it met several necessary conditions of democracy with each of these conditions, or dimensions of democracy, considered separately. As dimensions of modern democracy, I identified stateness, independence de jure, independence de facto, political pluralism, elected institutions (whether the legislature, the executive, or both are elected), alternation in power, scope of participation, restrictions on participation of political organizations and limitations on the scope of powers of elected authorities.

Obviously, many contemporary or historical regimes have not met these conditions entirely or partially - in other words, they departed from the ideal type of a democratic regime on various dimensions. For instance, Bosnia after 1998 or Jamaica in 1944-62 met all the conditions of the ideal type democracy besides de facto independence. Russia after 2000 held pluralist
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28 Such as Polity IV or Przeworski et al. 2000.

29 I discuss my understanding of these dimensions more thoroughly in chapter 2.
(opposition-permitting), but not open-outcome elections. Kuwait elected only the legislature, while in Turkey in the 1990s the military severely restricted the power of elected leaders. On the other hand, in Argentina in 1958-62 the most popular political party was excluded from electoral participation, and South Africa before 1994 had very restricted suffrage. All these regimes did not meet all the necessary conditions of modern democracy, but met some of those conditions within different dimensions of democracy.

Generally, I would argue that among the dimensions of democracy, the most essential is the practice of open-outcome elections which may lead to alternation in power and/or control of the legislature. If open-outcome elections are established in a regime characterized by unelected executive and/or restricted suffrage and/or colonial dependency, then such a regime should be more likely to survive after it makes a transition to democracy through fulfillment of its remaining necessary conditions. Consequently, I will show that the longer a regime characterized by open-outcome elections existed before democratization, the higher were the chances of survival of subsequently-established democracy. In other words, the experience of open-outcome elections served as a factor which helped build self-sustaining democracy in a longer term, after all the necessary conditions of democracy were met. As a corollary, I will argue that the pre-democratic experience of regimes not characterized by alternation did not have a positive effect on democratic stability. To put it differently, even if dictatorships which existed before democratization permitted for pluralist elections, but these elections were fraudulent, such an experience did not decrease the risk of democratic breakdown in comparison to the experience of regimes which did not allow for political pluralism at all.
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30 I prefer the terms “open-outcome” or “alternation-permitting” to the more commonly used “free and fair” as I find it ontologically more precise. It suggests that the outcome of an election is in principle not determined in advance.

31 For a related argument applied to Sub-Saharan Africa in post-Cold War period, see Lindberg 2009.
In the subsequent parts of this dissertation, I will call regimes which are characterized by open-outcome elections as “alternation-permitting regimes”. Empirically, such regimes include the already-mentioned competitive oligarchies, which were not democratic only on the dimensions of the scope of participation (e.g. Belgium in 1847-1894), PA monarchies and PA republics, which were not democratic only on the dimension of completeness and/or scope of participation (e.g. Denmark in 1848-1900) and colonial autonomies, which were not democratic on the dimensions of independence and/or completeness and/or scope of participation (e.g. the Philippines in 1907-1946). Figures 1-1 and 1-2 show the prevalence of principal types of regimes among de jure states during the time span covered by the dissertation (since 1789). Online (at http://goo.gl/NcCwAu) I provided a list of all alternation-permitting regimes and regime discontinuities identified in the dataset used in the dissertation. This list could not be reproduced directly in the text due to editorial requirements of the University of Florida, which does not permit for non-standard fonts.

A complex causal mechanism was responsible for the fact that democracies established after a long period of alternation-permitting regime functioned under a low risk of breakdown, but the crucial element in the process consisted of development of pro-democratic norms among the elites. First of all, during the period of open-outcome elections before democracy, the elites habituated the norm of free electoral competition for power. This principle was in the beginning enforced by an external actor; a monarch under PA monarchy and a colonizer under colonial autonomy. Without the exogenous enforcement its emergence would be significantly less likely because, given the expectation that one’s political opponents would rig elections or prohibit
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32 See Ziblatt 2009 for description on how free and fair elections were enforced in Imperial Germany.
opposition once in power, every prudent politician would do exactly the same while still in office (a situation well modelled by the prisoner’s dilemma).

However, external enforcement allowed for the emergence of sufficient inter-elite trust to hold open-outcome elections and honor victories of political opponents. This resulted from the gradually-emerging expectation that the current opposition would also honor the principle of open-outcome elections in the future; hence one would never be permanently excluded from power. Otherwise, the long practice of open-outcome elections led to habituation and emergence of commitment to democratic norms among other social actors: the military, the civil society and wider population. The actions and attitudes of these groups also played a role: they constrained elite options (in a sense of making anti-democratic actions more costly) and increased the probability of democratic survival. This process was similar regarding democratizations from colonial autonomy and PA monarchy.

Regarding the effect of other historical experiences on democratic breakdown, I argue, following O'Donnell and Schmitter,\textsuperscript{33} that the positive effect of alternation-permitting regimes on probability of democratic survival is significantly smaller if such regimes make a transition to democracy through a discontinuity, i.e. a military coup or a popular uprising. In other words, if an alternation-permitting regime democratizes through overthrow of the previous and introduction of a new order, the positive effect of the pre-democratic period of open-outcome elections on subsequent democratic stability largely disappears. This effect is present only in case of the regimes which preserved their institutional order during the democratic transition. In this regard, the negative effects of discontinuity could be manifold. If an alternation-permitting regime that existed before democratization had been perceived as legitimate by large sectors of

\textsuperscript{33} O'Donnell and Schmitter 1986, 11-12.
the population, its sudden abolition through forceful means could substantially decrease the perceived legitimacy of the newly-established democracy. This effect was visible during the Weimar Republic in Germany (1919-33). In another situation, discontinuity may result in creation of an entirely new political framework, which could create new opportunities for anti-system actors and/or enfranchise politically immobilized groups or classes, which later could be used for populist goals. This was the story of breakdown of the second French Republic (1848-51). Otherwise, in this dissertation I did not detect any strong effects of other historical legacies on democratic stability.

**Two Paths to Self-Sustaining Democracy**

The main argument of this dissertation states that long periods of open-outcome elections were likely to result in self-sustaining democracies provided that there was no regime discontinuity between a period of open-outcome elections and full democracy. The process through which non-democratic regimes practicing open-outcome elections made transitions to self-sustaining democracies occurred through two historical paths: democratization from PA monarchy (which usually proceeded through an intermediate stage of competitive oligarchy) and democratization from colonial autonomy. The former historical process is presented schematically in Figure 1-3.

The competitive oligarchies which transitioned from PA monarchies (Belgium, the Netherlands and Sweden) functioned under a low risk of breakdown but under an increasing pressure to democratize. Subsequently, they transformed into self-sustaining democracies through extensions of suffrage, while Danish PA monarchy transformed directly to democracy in 1901 as it had functioned under universal male suffrage already since 1848. Yet, if a PA
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34 The historical sources used to write this chapter and Figure 1-3 are provided in the BDD dataset. If a country is described in a more detail, sources are provided in the text.
monarchy transitioned to democracy or competitive oligarchy through regime discontinuity, such a democracy or competitive oligarchy functioned under a high risk of breakdown. The experience of regime discontinuity during the transition largely explains, as I would argue, the failure of the first French democracy (1848-51), the failure of democracy in Germany and Austria in the interwar period, and the failure of competitive oligarchy in Brazil (1831-40), while Japan, where democracy broke down in 1932, remains a deviant case.

The historical development of Britain and Switzerland was slightly different. Britain’s political system before the 1832 electoral reform could not be called fully competitive due to the existence of rotten boroughs (about half of constituencies belonged to this category). Because the government could easily control the deputies elected in rotten borough constituencies, its electoral defeat was unlikely. Nevertheless, other constituencies retained free electoral competition. Hence, Britain experienced the stages of PA monarchy with partially free elections (1689-1784), semi-competitive oligarchy (1784-1832) and (fully) competitive oligarchy (1832-1885) which transformed to democracy through extension of suffrage. The British competitive oligarchy was self-sustaining because it had been achieved through consolidation of the principle of free electoral competition, which had already been established, although partially, before the 1832 reform. Finally, Switzerland remained a loose confederation of cantons until the 1847 civil war. Democracy was achieved in the majority of cantons in the period 1815-48 through a painful process of civil unrest, coups and extensions of suffrage. Hence the Swiss democracy, which was established in 1848 at the federal level, preserved stability because it had already been practiced in the majority of cantons for the periods ranging from fifteen to thirty-three years.

It is important to emphasize that competitive oligarchies were not self-sustaining if they had not been preceded by PA monarchies. In fact, such regimes were to the same extent
unsustainable as first-time democracies. If the monarch fully yielded to middle class pressure and a competitive oligarchy or democracy was established directly from absolute monarchy, it usually broke down. This pertained to monarchical competitive oligarchies in Romania (1866-67) Hungary (1867-72) and in Piedmont (1850-57); one should note the Italian political system after 1860 was a direct continuation of the Piedmont’s system. Moreover, republican competitive oligarchies and democracies established in some Latin American countries in the nineteenth century were also usually short-lived and transformed into non-competitive oligarchies or dictatorships. Competitive oligarchies, if their establishment was not preceded by a sufficiently long period of a PA monarchy, were equally short-lived as first-time democracies because they faced the same basic dilemma of consolidation. Lacking mutual expectation that election outcomes will be honored, it was more beneficial for an elite faction currently in power to renege and rig elections or conduct a coup than to organize free elections, given the expectation that their opponents would do the same once in power. This game took the shape of a simple prisoner’s dilemma. In other words, the principle of free electoral competition had to be first habituated under monarch’s guidance in order to later survive in a democracy or competitive oligarchy. During the period of gestation under PA monarchy, the political elites had developed sufficient commitment to the principles of constitutionalism and free electoral competition so that they did not deviate from these principles once they came to power in a democracy or competitive oligarchy.

One should note that in contrast to competitive oligarchies or democracies (not preceded by PA monarchies) PA monarchies were reasonably self-sustaining as they functioned in a state of relative equilibrium. The regime of PA monarchy constituted a compromise between the monarch and the middle class. The middle class received a tangible stake in governance as its
rights were protected by a written constitution and the consent of a freely elected legislature was necessary to adopt legislation and budget, but the monarch and the aristocracy preserved the ultimate control over the political system and retained the executive power. In this situation, it was not beneficial for the monarch to renege and rig elections because the compromise would be undermined and the middle class would be more likely to organize a revolution and get rid of the monarchy altogether. On the other hand, the middle class found it more beneficial to accept the status quo than to stage a revolution, because the risk involved was high; a failed revolution would result in reintroduction of absolutism. Moreover, the incentive of electoral manipulation under a PA monarchy was smaller than under democracy or competitive oligarchy: a government responsible to the monarch did not need to win elections in order to remain in power in contrast to a government responsible to the parliament. The former could continue to rule even under an opposition-controlled legislature.

Obviously, with the passage of time the pressures for responsible government intensified. At a later stage, when the power of the middle classes was stronger, most monarchs made the safe move and agreed to middle class demands of responsible government instead of risking abolition of the monarchy altogether. Hence, the monarchy was preserved when the responsible government (competitive oligarchies or democracies) emerged in Britain, Belgium, the Netherlands, Norway, Denmark and Sweden. Under the new deal, the monarch and aristocracy still preserved certain power and influence for the time being, although the prime minister became responsible to the freely elected legislature.\(^{35}\) This helped to stabilize the political systems because the interests of aristocratic elites were partially preserved and because the continuation of monarchical institutions resulted in increased legitimacy of the new regimes in

\(^{35}\) Przeworski, Asadurian, and Bohlken 2012.
general. The same positive effects would not have been achieved if republics had been established instead.

The reasons why some European absolute monarchies made a transition to PA monarchy but not others, merit further research. Generally, a legacy of discontinuities did not prevent establishment of sustainable PA monarchies, as examples of Britain and Sweden show (where absolutist monarchies were abolished in 1688 and 1809, respectively, and PA monarchies were established under new dynasties). In Spain (in 1813), Portugal (in 1821), and some Italian monarchies, monarchs first agreed to a political system of a PA monarchy under middle class pressure, but soon reneged and reestablished absolutism. In those cases the middle class, if it ever managed to reestablish constitutionalism, gave up on the idea of PA monarchy and tried other political solutions instead. This is understandable given that the trust had been broken between the reneging monarch and the representatives of the politicized society. Portugal and Spain ultimately evolved into monarchical non-competitive oligarchies, where civil liberties were largely respected, but elections had lost open-outcome character and were managed by the government. Consequently, it appears that once a monarch agreed to PA monarchs but reneged, the road to PA monarchy and hence to self-sustaining democracy became closed.

One should note that the question of suffrage was not an important element in the political game played between the monarchy and the middle classes. On some occasions, as in France in 1792 or Spain in 1813, the middle class, influenced by Enlightenment ideas, even introduced universal male suffrage, which was however largely ignored by peasant masses. The question of suffrage emerged as an element of political struggle after lower classes became politically mobilized, which occurred only at the stage of competitive oligarchy and resulted in transition to democracy through extension of suffrage. Because lower class political mobilization
occurred under the political system of competitive oligarchy, the representatives of the excluded groups also habituated the norm of electoral competition for power which had been already accepted by the elites. This also increased the probability of survival of subsequently-established democracies.

Obviously, the political dynamics was different in countries which were established after secession from another country. This pertained to several independent states which emerged in Europe after WWI. Yet, also in this case one could see the positive effect of a pre-independence period of open-outcome elections. Out of these countries, the only entirely self-sustaining democracy emerged in Ireland, which had seceded from a democracy. Democracy was also relatively sustainable in Czechoslovakia, which emerged out of a PA monarchy (the Czech lands). It was the most vulnerable to breakdown in the countries which seceded from the Russian Empire (Poland and the Baltic states), where PA monarchy was introduced recently, only after the 1905 revolution. Yugoslavia does not pertain to this group as its political system was a direct continuation of the pre-WWI system of Serbia. Finally, in a comparable case of the United States the democratic institutions survived because independence was preceded by several decades of colonial autonomy, characterized by freely elected legislatures established in each colony.

One might also notice that Ireland, Czechoslovakia, Baltic States, Poland and, at a much earlier state, the United States made a transition to democracy or competitive oligarchy through a secession coupled with discontinuity. That is, those transitions were nor made under the agreement with the home country, but were achieved through wars or popular mobilizations. However, the political dynamics in those cases was very different. In contrast to internal
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36 It subsequently survived until 1917 but under different rules than originally established. In particular, the tsar unconstitutionally reformed the electoral code in 1906, which amounted to an executive coup.
discontinuities accompanying transitions to democracy (such as in France in 1848 or Germany in 1918), session-associated discontinuities did not nullify the pro-democratic legacy of a preceding alternation-permitting regime because they could not result in crises of legitimacy of the newly-established democracies. The foreign rule with its monarchical institutions had been considered largely illegitimate in the first place, and whatever legitimacy it enjoyed was largely lost during the violent struggles for independence. The situation was slightly different in the United States, where the loyalist population was substantial, but most of the latter decided not to remain in the new republic and immigrated to Canada. Hence, the length of the preceding alternation-permitting strongly conditioned the probability of democratic survival in the post-secession democracies through the mechanism of elite continuity.

In practice, the path of democratization from PA monarchy was largely closed in the twentieth century. This was because few of the newly-independent post-colonial states were monarchies, and in those monarchies which remained, few monarchs agreed to open-outcome legislative elections. And then, if they agreed to hold such elections, they were or have been unwilling to fully democratize after some time. Nowadays, PA monarchies function in Morocco, Jordan, Kuwait and Bahrain. If the European experience is valid in this context, then one could predict that these countries will be able to establish self-sustaining democracies if the institution of monarchy is not overthrown during democratization. In any case, the path of democratization from a PA monarchy is largely a historical phenomenon.

The second path to self-sustaining democracy (or its failure) applied to a large number of post-colonial countries which achieved independence having been democratized by their colonizers. This was true about a large majority of the former European colonies (53 out of 75 ex-colonies with a population larger than 500,000 were democratic at independence). Ex-
colonies were democratized at independence in large numbers mostly because the colonial power needed to identify a legitimate authority to which the power could be transferred. However, while in some colonies elected autonomous institutions were established several decades before the independence, in majority of colonies they were granted only a few years before the independence; in fact, granting of an autonomous status was usually the final step on the road to sovereignty. Regarding the colonies which achieved independence as democracies, there was a strong relationship between the length of the colonial autonomy (i.e. duration of open-outcome elections before independence) and subsequent survival of democracy, as illustrated in Table 1-1. Fifteen colonies had experienced autonomy of eleven years of longer and in eleven of those countries post-independence democracies survived. In this group, successful cases included the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Israel, Sri Lanka, Mauritius, India, Jamaica, Trinidad and Papua New Guinea, while Burma, the Philippines, Guyana and Lebanon were cases of democratic breakdown. On the other hand, 39 colonies achieved independence and democracy having experienced shorter colonial autonomy, and in all of them except of Botswana post-independence democracies ultimately collapsed.

Hence, if the period of colonial autonomy was shorter than eleven years, its length did not have a direct effect on survival of democracy. However, the former colonies which experienced colonial autonomy lasting between four and nine years were more likely than other former colonies, already before the end of the Cold War, to re-democratize after the initial collapse of democracy and/or to establish pluralist regimes with closed-outcome elections instead of one-party states. In the first group of former colonies, only 17% (two of twelve) established long-lasting one-party regimes before the end of the Cold War. In the latter, 78% did. Moreover, some colonies also reached independence without having experienced colonial
autonomy before independence (nineteen countries among larger colonies). To this group belong most colonies in the Middle East and North Africa, the Portuguese colonies in Africa, Swaziland, Indonesia, Brunei and Vietnam. The probability of democratization was the lowest within this group. Only in Indonesia was democracy established before the end of the Cold War (in 1955), but it quickly collapsed, and only in the former Portuguese colonies there were efforts to democratize after the end of Cold War (before the Arab Spring). Hence, the length of colonial autonomy had also a strong effect on the probability of democratization in addition to the probability of democratic breakdown.

The question of why some colonies experienced long periods of colonial autonomy in comparison to others needs further research. In this regard one should note that only the British were ideologically committed to “prepare” their colonies for independence. Hence only they and no other colonizers (with few exceptions) granted long periods of colonial autonomy to at least some of their colonies.37

Thus, the British were the most likely to grant autonomy to their settler colonies, which were also the earliest to receive it, which was a function of the political learning after the loss of the thirteen American colonies. Otherwise, the length of colonial autonomy depended on the timing of British colonization. As a rule, most of the territories colonized by the British before 1850 were granted autonomy for longer than ten years, while countries colonized after 1850 were granted shorter or no periods of autonomy, and only after WWII. Although this question needs more research, my initial observations point to the middle class strength as the intervening variable between the timing of colonization and length of autonomy. The British were willing, from the ideological point of view, to grant autonomy to their non-settler colonies already during

37 Jackson 1993; Murphy 1995.
the interwar period, but only if they could transfer power at the level of elected autonomous institutions to what might be called a viable westernized middle class. Such a middle class required several decades to develop, however. Its growth necessitated acculturation to Western values which could only be accomplished through education at British schools and participation in modern civil society organizations. The latter institutions themselves needed several decades to develop; hence they managed to successfully engender a Westernized middle class by the beginning of interwar period only in the early-established colonies, such as Sri Lanka, Jamaica, or India. Consequently, such territories were granted autonomy already during the interwar period or just after WWII. On the other hand, in the territories colonized in the late nineteenth century (the British African colonies or Malaysia) a comparably strong Westernized middle class developed only after WWII, or did not develop at all. At this stage the pressure for decolonization was strong so that such colonies quickly became independent without having experienced long autonomy. It is true, then, that plantation and commercial colonies were more likely to be granted long autonomy than colonies ruled indirectly, but this was mostly a consequence of the fact that they were established earlier. For example, the early-established colonies of India and Myanmar were granted long autonomies even though they were mostly ruled indirectly. In addition, the length of colonial autonomy after WWII was still affected negatively by two major factors: the presence of a small but economically powerful settler minority (as in Kenya or Tanzania) or protectorate status (as in Malaysia, Uganda, Lesotho or Zanzibar). Both settler minorities and traditional rulers of the protectorates tried to prevent or delay establishment of internal autonomous institutions.
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38 As defined in Lange 2004.

From the point of view of a causal process, the period of colonial autonomy resembled a period of PA monarchy in independent states. In both situations, democratic norms were externally enforced by an unelected authority: the colonizer in the first case and the monarch in the latter case. Similarly as during PA monarchy, the principle of free electoral competition was habituated by the elites during the colonial autonomy and was subsequently preserved after independence. Elections were not rigged given the expectation that the political opponents would also permit open-outcome elections once in office. Long colonial autonomy also resulted in relatively high level of commitment to democracy within the military, the civil society and citizens in general. This resulted in low probability of democratic breakdown in the former colonies which had experienced long autonomy before independence.

As mentioned, first-time democracies were extremely prone to breakdown if established in the former colonies which had not experienced sufficiently-long autonomy before independence, regardless of their particular colonizer’s identity. Elites which came to power after independence in these democracies had very short or no experience with open-outcome elections. Hence, they lacked sufficient mutual trust to sustain democracy given the government’s expectation that the opposition, once in office, would perpetually exclude its opponents from power. The opposition was quickly repressed or coopted and one-party states were established in the overwhelming majority of African countries. Elite-led democratic breakdowns were also facilitated by the fact that former colonies which lacked long colonial autonomies were also characterized by weak civil societies and low levels of commitment to democracy in general.  

Hence, the elites were not constrained by the society in their anti-democratic actions. In conclusion, one could argue that British colonial experience was
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40 Chazan 1994.
positively associated with democratic survival, but mostly through the fact that the British established long autonomies in some of their colonies. Still, the British colonial experience might have had some additional positive effect on democratic survival as evident through the fact that the coefficient for British colony remained statistically significant even after controlling for periods of open-outcome elections (as shown in Chapter 3).

**Structure of the Dissertation**

My purpose when working on this project was to achieve a high degree of both external and internal validity of the findings. Hence, I decided to follow the mixed methods approach.\(^{41}\) I used the quantitative analysis to achieve high external validity, that is, in order to show that the hypothesized relationships hold in the general population of democracies. As well, the quantitative methods enabled me to establish a high degree of generalizability of the findings and avoid case selection bias. On the other hand, I used qualitative methods in order to determine the existence of causal relationships behind the detected statistical associations (which should be never automatically assumed). In case of complex social processes taking place over long periods of time, the detection of such causal mechanisms could only have been accomplished with careful analysis of a large amount of historical sources.

The results of the quantitative analysis of the effect of historical legacies on democratic stability are presented in Chapter 3. The analysis encompassed all countries which have ever democratized after 1789 if they reached at least 500,000 inhabitants in 2000. The statistical method used in Chapter 3 is called event history analysis on binary time-series cross-sectional data. Two statistical models were used in particular: logit with cubic polynomial of time as the principal model and Cox duration model as the auxiliary model. The unit of observation is
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democratic-country-year. The dependent variable is binary in case of the logit model; it is coded as 1 if a country experienced a democratic breakdown in a given year and 0 if no breakdown was observed. In case of the Cox model, the dependent variable is duration of a democratic spell in years. The primarily explanatory variable is the length of periods of open-outcome elections preceding democratization. Tests for other pre-democratic legacies are also conducted (pluralism and completeness not coupled with open-outcome elections, electoral fraud, one-party elections, regime discontinuities, etc.). These tests generally show, as theoretically predicted, that the length of open-outcome elections is positively associated with democratic survival, unless democratization was preceded by regime discontinuity. Similar results were obtained with the logit and the Cox duration models, which increases the validity of the findings. Otherwise, other legacies were shown not to significantly affect democratic survival. To test if the results were sensitive to my regime type measure, I also conducted a series of tests with alternative regime type measures and specifications of democracy. Given limited availability of the data on economic growth, models with and without this variable were also computed. The association between open-outcome elections, its interaction with discontinuity, and democratic survival was also detected in all these alternative specifications.

The qualitative part of the dissertation consists of several chapters devoted to historical narratives and case comparisons. In these chapters, I use the technique of process tracing to identify the causal process leading from long periods of alternation-permitting regimes to democratic survival. The compared cases were chosen according to the Millean methods, or the “most similar with different outcome” and “most different with similar outcome” approaches. In particular, I conduct two comparisons. In the first place, I compare two groups of countries

\footnote{See Przeworski and Teune 1970.}
which experienced long periods of alternation-permitting regimes. The first group made a transition to democracy without discontinuity while the other transitioned to democracy through discontinuity. As argued, this difference led to democratic breakdown in the second group. In another comparison, the cases from the first group are also implicitly compared to countries which did not experience alternation-permitting regimes before democratization at all. The difference, as I argue, contributed to the latter’s democratic breakdown (see below in chapter descriptions for details). Ultimately, the analysis encompasses a large number of cases which are interesting from the theoretical point of view. In fact, the majority of European countries which experienced a long alternation-permitting regime before democratization are analyzed descriptively.

But before moving to the quantitative and qualitative analyses, the crucially important step during the project’s development consisted of precise formulation of the key concepts and the choice of regime type measure with the corresponding dataset. Unfortunately, it turned out that the existing widely used datasets on regime type (Polity and PACL) were unsuitable to test the hypotheses advanced in this dissertation, for numerous reasons. Their main shortcoming points to the lack of proper measurement of countries’ regime legacies which may affect the risk of democratic breakdown. In particular, the existing measures do not properly identify to which extent the non-democratic regimes which preceded democratization met the necessary conditions of democracy. Regarding dependent polities, they cannot accomplish this task by definition because they encompass only de jure independent countries. This shortcoming pertains to all
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45 Marshall, Jaggers, and Gurr ND.

46 That is Przeworski et al. 2000 updated by Cheibub, Gandhi, and Vreeland 2010.
available coding schemes and is a serious problem, because pre-democratic regime type affected
democratic stability regardless of whether the new democracy was preceded by a dependent or
an independent regime. Otherwise, the scope of fulfillment of necessary conditions of democracy
in non-democracies cannot be assessed if a coding scheme provides only for a dichotomous
measure of democracy and non-democracy, which is the case with the measures by Bernhard et
al.\textsuperscript{47} or Boix and Stokes.\textsuperscript{48} The situation is not significantly improved if a measure adds an
ambiguous third category of semi-democracy, as the measure by Gasiorowski does.\textsuperscript{49}

To be more precise, the two most popular regime type measures, Polity and PACL,
provide disaggregated indicators of aggregate regime scores, but these indicators do not
encompass some crucial necessary conditions of democracy. For example, Polity and PACL do
not identify whether non-democratic regimes hold open-outcome (free) elections under
conditions of restricted suffrage, or whether they hold open-outcome legislative elections in a
situation when the executive is unelected. Polity identifies only whether a regime has free
elections to the executive. But if a country does not have free elections to the executive, Polity
cannot be used to determine whether the chief executive comes to power through pluralist
(multiparty) but fraudulent elections, or some other means. It also cannot be used to identify
whether the regime permits legal opposition or whether the legislature is elected through
pluralist, pluralist and open-outcome, or non-competitive one-party elections. PACL is primarily
a dichotomous measure of democracy. Regarding fulfillment of necessary conditions of
democracy, the only information it provides in disaggregated indicators considers the existence
of pluralist elections to the legislature and the type of the executive (whether elected or not). As

\textsuperscript{47} Bernhard, Reenock and Nordstrom 2001; 2004.

\textsuperscript{48} Boix and Stokes 2003.

\textsuperscript{49} Gasiorowski 1995.
well, both Polity and PACL do not measure the scope of suffrage. Finally, the existing measures of regime type do not code for the type of regime transition and legacies of previous regime transitions; they cannot be used to determine whether a transition to democracy occurred through a discontinuity and whether the discontinuity was of military or non-military character. Yet, as mentioned, all those regime legacies are of crucial theoretical interest in this paper as they may substantially affect the risk of democratic breakdown.

Other common shortcomings of the existing measures of regime type are of minor character and are discussed in Chapter 2. This chapter is otherwise devoted to the description of the regime type measure adopted in the dissertation, and detailed discussion on how it improves upon the existing measures. I called the measure in question and the corresponding original dataset “basic dimensions of democracy” (BDD). Its main goal was to address the aforementioned problems with the existing regime type classifications and categorize regimes along conceptual dimensions instead of simply dividing them into types. As mentioned, as regime dimensions I identified stateness, independence de facto, independence de jure, confederation, political pluralism, elected institutions, (possibility of) alternation in executive elections, (possibility of) alternation in legislative elections, scope of participation, restrictions on participation of political organizations and limitations on the powers of elected authorities. These dimensions are conceptualized as categorical variables apart from the dimension of scope of participation, which is measured as a continuous variable. In addition to dimensions of democracy, BDD also provides information on regime discontinuities and executive coups. Regime discontinuity is understood as a regime change effected by the force or threat of force; it does not encompass transitions to independence achieved through military struggle or secession. As regime discontinuities I have distinguished military coups (e.g. Turkey in 1980), popular
uprisings (e.g. Germany in 1918), and monarchical coups (e.g. Nepal in 2002). Executive coups are defined as forceful regime changes effectuated by the chief executive himself (e.g. in Peru in 1992 or in the Philippines in 1972). The dataset also contains a notes section with controversial coding decisions explained and sources regarding such cases provided. It is available for download at http://goo.gl/lrq4yd.50

As discussed, Chapter 3 of the dissertation is devoted to quantitative analysis, while Chapters 4-7 present descriptive case comparisons. Chapters 4, 5 and 6 describe the path of democratization from PA monarchy, while Chapter 7 describes the path of democratization from colonial autonomy. Regarding Chapters 4, 5 and 6, devoted to democratization from PA monarchy, the selected cases for comparison were chosen according to “the most similar with different outcome” principle. Accordingly, successful cases of democratization from PA monarchy were compared with unsuccessful ones. There are, moreover, two comparisons: The first takes place within the particular chapters. It compares cases which experienced legacy of PA monarchy, non-discontinuity democratization and the resulting self-sustaining democracy to a case which experienced a legacy of PA monarchy, transition to democracy coupled with discontinuity, and democratic breakdown. The other comparison takes place across chapters. Within this comparison the countries which experienced self-sustaining democracy caused by legacy of PA monarchy are compared to the cases which experienced no legacy of PA monarchy and the resulting democratic breakdown. Chapter 7, which describes democratization from colonial autonomy uses, on the other hand, both “the most similar with different outcome” and “the most different with similar outcome” methods of comparison, which take place within the chapter. “The most similar with different outcome” method was applied not to identify the

50 The author retains the right of first publication regarding any research based on the dataset.
possible causal factors (this is accomplished through quantitative analysis on a large number of observations), but to illustrate the causal process in a more elucidating way. Because the compared cases have similar values on all explanatory variables apart from the identified causal factors, and otherwise differ regarding the outcome of interest (i.e. self-sustaining democracy v. democratic breakdown), the causal process leading from the former to the latter becomes clearly visible. Accordingly, “the most different with similar outcome” method, applied in the colonial chapter, aims to increase the visibility of the described causal process. The cases described in Chapter 7 are very different, but they share the crucial similarity: legacy of colonial autonomy and subsequent emergence of a self-sustaining democracy.

Chapter 4 compares successful democratizations of Belgium and the Netherlands with the unsuccessful democratization of France (in 1848). These countries established PA monarchies and subsequently transitioned to competitive oligarchies in the same historical period. They were also characterized by similar levels of economic development. Still, Belgium and the Netherlands, in contrast to France, were ridden by politically activated religious and linguistic cleavages, the factor which should hamper their democratic consolidation according to the mainstream democratic theory.

In France absolute monarchy had been abolished in the 1789 revolution, but the country’s political development was “restarted” after the restoration of 1815, when PA monarchy was established. In 1830, King Charles X tried to reintroduce absolutism de-facto through executive coup, but was stopped by the July Revolution. Competitive oligarchy was subsequently established under a liberal branch of the ruling dynasty. Yet, the legacy of the July Revolution hampered the smooth political development of France from competitive oligarchy toward democracy because it resulted in increased probability of another discontinuity. The
government’s policy was also not helpful in this regard, as it consistently refused to extend the suffrage in spite of increasing popular pressures. Hence, the monarchy was abolished in February 1848 and male-suffrage democracy was established. The discontinuity of 1848 resulted in institutional transformation of the political system (introduction of the republic), which coupled with the rapid extension of franchise to politically immobilized groups created an opening for anti-system actors, exploited by Louis Napoleon, and resulted in quick democratic breakdown.\footnote{See e.g. Agulhon 1983; Price 2007.}

The collapse of the Second French Republic in 1851 contrasted sharply with the political development of Belgium and the Netherlands. The Dutch PA monarchy was established in 1815 and for the time being it also encompassed the territory of contemporary Belgium, which seceded in 1830 retaining the system of PA monarchy. Belgium and the Netherlands subsequently transitioned to competitive oligarchies in 1847 and 1848, respectively, through introduction of parliamentary responsibility. Because monarchical institutions were preserved during the transition, no crisis of legitimacy followed, while peaceful transition to democracy occurred through extension of suffrage in the 1890s, after the working class leadership and had habituated democratic values, while peasants embraced the latter having been politically mobilized by the activists of middle class confessional parties.\footnote{Ertman 2000; Kossmann 1978; Witte 2000.}

Chapter 5 compares the cases of Germany, Denmark and Sweden. Their political development, which took place almost concurrently, was very similar apart from the difference in the mode of democratic transition. Those cases were also characterized by similar levels of landholding inequality and economic development. In fact, Germany was slightly richer than Denmark or Sweden throughout the analyzed period, the factor which should have favored its
democratization according to predictions of the democratic theory (but it didn’t). On the other hand, a religious cleavage was politically activated, and thus it might have hampered democratization, only in Germany.

PA monarchies were established in nearly all German states, including Prussia, after the Spring of Nations in 1848-49 or in the 1820s. The unified German Empire, established in 1871, was also a PA monarchy with free legislative elections and universal male suffrage. Yet, the monarchy was abolished during the revolution of 1918, and the institutional structure of the country was transformed through introduction of the Federal Republic. In Denmark and Sweden, PA monarchies were established in 1848 and 1867, respectively, when free elections to the legislature were introduced under universal male suffrage in Denmark and restricted suffrage in Sweden. Denmark and Sweden subsequently transitioned to democracy under popular pressure. This occurred after the principle of parliamentary responsibility was introduced (in 1901 in Denmark and 1905 in Sweden) and the suffrage was extended in Sweden in 1911. However, traditional institutions were preserved in Denmark and Sweden after democratization, and the monarchs continued to influence politics until the early 1920s. Consequently, while the pro-monarchical Danish and Swedish right (Højre and General Electoral League, respectively) turned into pro-system, moderately conservative parties after democratization, the German pro-monarchical right turned into an anti-system force after World War I (as DNVP, or German National People's Party), mostly because the monarchy had been abolished and the political system lost its symbolic legitimacy. This anti-system sentiment was present also in larger segments of the society, which positively compared the imperial period with the republic, the latter characterized by poor economic performance and political instability. Hence, a large

---

potential for anti-system vote emerged, which was taken advantage of by the Nazis instead of more traditional right-wing parties during the Great Depression.\textsuperscript{54}

On the other hand, the Danish and Swedish democracies, because they had preserved the traditional institutions and symbols, were perceived as legitimate by almost the entire society. The potential for anti-system vote in Denmark and Sweden was limited in contrast to interwar Germany. In the former cases it reached the height of 4\% during the Great Depression, in the latter oscillated at about 35-40\% even before the depression and reached almost 60\% in the last free election. To put this comparison in counterfactual terms, if German Empire had democratized similarly to Denmark or Sweden, through introduction of chancellor’s parliamentary responsibility and without a rupture from the traditional institutions, the probability of survival of the first German democracy would have been significantly greater.\textsuperscript{55}

Hence, the mode of transition probably played the largest role in the Weimar’s story of breakdown. In this case, the positive legacy of the pre-democratization period of open-outcome elections was negated through the effect of the discontinuity transition. Still, several alternative explanations of the breakdown of Weimar democracy had been developed, which pointed to the effects of landholding inequality,\textsuperscript{56} anti-democratic mobilization of the civil society which had been disgruntled by the weakness of middle class political parties\textsuperscript{57} or flawed institutional design of the Weimar institutions.\textsuperscript{58} Yet, all these explanations – which are described in the chapter with more detail - failed to plausibly connect the factors they analyzed with the ultimate cause of the

\textsuperscript{54} Hertzman 1963, Holborn 1969; Mommsen, Forster and Jones 1996.
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Weimar’s breakdown – its legitimacy deficit, which was evident through the strikingly high percentage vote for anti-system parties.

Ultimately, Chapters 4 and 5 encompass all European countries which made a transition from PA monarchy to democracy apart from Britain and Norway. The latter cases were not included in the analysis because of certain idiosyncratic features. Britain established PA monarchy much earlier than other European countries, already in 1688, and made a transition to competitive oligarchy also quite early, already in the 1780s. British elections before the 1832 reform also had numerous idiosyncratic features, which did not characterize open-outcome elections held on the continent. Moreover, the historical events which otherwise made a deep impact on the Continental Europe, in particular, the end of the Napoleonic Wars and the Spring of Nations in 1848, did not significantly affect the British political history, which makes comparisons between the British and continental cases harder. On the other hand, Norway was not analyzed in detail because it was in the union with Sweden until 1905, and the important part of its political history was characterized by the struggle for full independence. During the period of PA monarchy (1814-84) Norway was de facto ruled by a foreign sovereign; hence its political status shared the characteristics of an independent PA monarchy and a colony. Subsequently, Norway developed similarly to the cases analyzed in Chapters 4 and 5. It experienced the stages of self-sustainable competitive oligarchy (in 1884-1900) and democracy (since 1900, under full independence after 1905).

I start Chapter 6 with presentation of some hypotheses regarding emergence of self-sustaining PA monarchies in Europe. I subsequently analyze political history of the only three European countries which did not experience a stage of PA monarchy, but managed to established monarchical competitive oligarchies: Piedmont/Italy, Hungary, and Romania. The
aim is to illustrate how self-sustaining competitive oligarchies could emerge and transform to self-sustaining democracies, in most cases, only if they had been preceded by PA monarchies; otherwise they degenerated into pluralist regimes lacking open-outcome elections. In this way competitive oligarchies behaved similarly to democracies and hence one can conclude that the scope of suffrage did not affect regime sustainability in the nineteenth-century Europe.

The cases analyzed in Chapter 6 are implicitly compared to the countries which established self-sustaining competitive oligarchies and democracies after long periods of PA monarchy (that is, Belgium, Netherlands, Denmark and Sweden). Similarly as many other European countries in the period (such as Denmark or Prussia), Piedmont, one of the Italian states, made a transition from absolute to PA monarchy in 1848. Yet, because of various reasons – the country’s defeat in a war with Austria, the monarch’s incompetence in foreign policy and the elite’s desire to serve as an example of liberalism to the rest of Italy – the country quickly made a successive transition to competitive oligarchy as the government’s parliamentary responsibility was effectively established in the early 1850s. Hungary had been a semi-absolute monarchy in effective union with Austria. The country’s elite unsuccessfully fought for independence in 1848-49. In 1867, mostly because of international factors, the Habsburgs entered into a compromise with Hungarians. At this stage the emperor’s position was too weak to enforce a system of PA monarchy in Hungary; hence the country became a semi-independent competitive oligarchy with the domestic government responsible to the parliament, while the government in Vienna retained control over the foreign and military affairs. However, lacking legacy of PA monarchy, the principle of free electoral competition was not entrenched among the elites. Moreover, both in Piedmont and Hungary the governments needed to win elections in order to remain in power, hence they faced much stronger incentive to manipulate the vote in
contrast to governments of PA monarchy, which relied primarily on the monarch’s confidence. For that reason the electoral competition quickly lost the open character in both countries: with the 1857 election in Piedmont and with the 1872 election in Hungary, and they made transitions to non-competitive oligarchies.\textsuperscript{59} I finish the chapter with short analysis of the political history of post-independence Romania, which illustrates the difficulties with establishment of self-sustaining PA monarchies and competitive oligarchies in newly-independent European states.

Finally, Chapter 7 and 8 are devoted to the path of democratization from colonial autonomy. This process of political development was less complicated than the process of democratization from PA monarchy; hence only two chapters were needed for the analytical purposes. In Chapters 7 and 8 three comparisons will take place: within the group of the successful cases of political development (in Chapter 7), within the group of unsuccessful cases of political development (in Chapter 8) and the implicit comparison between the successful and unsuccessful cases of political development from both chapters. The purpose of these comparisons will be to illustrate the causal process standing behind the detected statistical associations. The first comparison, presented in Chapter 7, will take advantage of “the most different with similar outcome” method, comparing democratic development of Israel, Sri Lanka and Jamaica. These post-colonial countries were very different in terms of the scope of ethnic diversity, religious composition, and the level of development. What they shared was the legacy of colonial autonomy dating from the period of British rule. Israel, Sri Lanka and Jamaica gained independence in 1948, 1948 and 1962, having enjoyed democratically-elected autonomous institutions for twenty-eight, twenty-four and eighteen years, respectively. For sure, these

democracies (especially Sri Lankan and Jamaican) have had their own serious problems. But their long-time survival was caused, as I would argue, due to the implantation of democratic patterns of behavior during the colonial period and consequent emergence of inter-elite trust necessary to conduct open-outcome elections. In this case, the norm of free electoral competition was enforced by the external actor, the British colonizer, which performed a similar function as monarchs in the European PA monarchies.

Where the colonizer did not establish a colonial autonomy for a sufficiently long period before independence, this kind of inter-elite trust did not emerge. The effect was exclusion of the opposition and democratic breakdown, usually taking place quickly after independence. To illustrate this phenomenon, I will also use “the most different with similar outcome” method in order to compare the post-colonial histories of Zambia and Kenya on one hand and Malaysia on the other. These cases shared the British colonial background, but were otherwise quite different in terms of the scope of politicization of ethnic diversity, the principal economic activity (with plantation agriculture in Malaysia and mostly subsistence agriculture in the African cases), and patterns of economic development. Their common feature, however, was a short period of pre-democratization colonial autonomy. The latter lasted for two years in Malaysia, five years in Zambia and six in Kenya; however, during most of this period in the latter two countries the legislature was elected under a highly restricted suffrage which privileged the miniscule minorities of white settlers. Hence, post-colonial democracies in both countries quickly collapsed: after only one year in Kenya and four years in Zambia. Ultimately, non-pluralist one-party regimes were established in Kenya and Zambia, and efforts at re-democratization took place only after the end of Cold War. In this regard, political histories of these countries

---

Sri Lanka experienced democratic breakdown in the 1980s according to some authors (depending on the definition of democracy used). See chapter 8 for more discussion.
resembled political histories of other African countries, regardless of their colonial background. Democracy in Malaysia survived for twelve years, on the other hand, but it collapsed after an episode of ethnic unrest, when the electoral predominance of the ruling party appeared under threat. A competitive authoritarian regime was established instead. Because of idiosyncratic factors, the Malaysian political elite was initially committed to the ideal of liberal democracy, in contrast to the elites of most African countries in the post-independence era. Yet, this support evaporated during a political crisis.

Finally, the analysis in Chapters 7 and 8 will also take advantage of “the most similar with different outcome method” to implicitly compare the successful cases of democratization, especially Sri Lanka, with political development of the unsuccessful cases, in particular Malaysia. Malaysia and Sri Lanka shared numerous common features, which included British colonialism, politicization of ethnic diversity, plantation-based agricultural economy, and underdevelopment. However, while Sri Lanka experienced a long period of colonial autonomy before independence, Malaysia did not. This ultimately resulted in shallowness of the commitment to democracy among the Malaysian elites and democratic breakdown. Moreover, paradoxically, democracy collapsed in Malaysia in spite of the conscious and deliberate efforts of the Malay elite at ethnic power-sharing and consensus-building, which were not adopted by the Sinhalese majority in Sri Lanka. The fate of democracy in Malaysia ultimately shows the inherent difficulty to overcome the structural constraints imposed by an unfavorable historical legacy.
Table 1-1. Relationship between duration of colonial autonomy and democratic survival

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>1776*</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1867*</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>1947*</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>C.A.R.</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua N.G.</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cote D’Ivoire</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equatorial G.</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>DR Congo</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1 – Date when democratized; 2- length of colonial autonomy (pre-independence period of open-outcome elections); 3 – length of colonial autonomy with elected executive (which is by definition a subset of period of colonial autonomy), 4 – Y if democratic as of 2012 (in bold), length of democratic period if broke down before 2012.

United States became independent as a confederacy with state-level democracies or competitive oligarchies in 1776 and democratized in 1789. Canada became independent in 1867 as competitive oligarchy and democratized in 1878. India became independent in 1947 as competitive oligarchy and democratized in 1952.

The list encompasses the colonies which were democratized by the colonizer, i.e. reached independence with democratically-elected institutions. Former colonies which democratized from racial competitive oligarchies are not included.
Figure 1-1. Percentages of principal regime types since 1789 among de jure states.
Figure 1-2. Number of principal regime types since 1789 among de jure states.
Figure 1-3. Path from PA monarchy to self-sustaining democracy.
CHAPTER 2
BASIC DIMENSIONS OF DEMOCRACY: A NEW APPROACH TO REGIME TYPE MEASUREMENT

Some of the main topics of research in comparative politics are concerned with factors that influence the emergence of different types of political regimes, and the effects of regime type on socioeconomic outcomes, such as economic development. Needless to say, in order to tackle these and similar problems one needs a classification of political regimes. In this chapter I outline a new measure of regime type whose development was necessary to test the central hypothesis of this dissertation, namely, how pre-democratization regime legacies affect democratic stability. I also briefly assess the most widely used measures of political regime and explain why they turned out insufficient to test the hypotheses developed in this research project. Certainly, no measure of political regimes is ideal, and in some cases different measures can best be used, depending on one's research purposes. The measure proposed in this chapter, which I labelled “basic dimensions of democracy” (BDD) is obviously no exception, but I would argue it improves upon the existing measures in significant ways. The basic discussion of the measure is provided in the main part of the chapter while a more detailed explanation of the measure’s variables is included in Appendix A of the dissertation.

A common opinion in the scholarly community holds that it is not very important which particular measure of regime type is used, as such measures are largely correlated and hence similar research results will be obtained with the use of different measures. However, as various authors show, this is not the case. Different measures of regime, even if they are correlated, are not interchangeable as they produce different research results. Hence, when conducting research

---

1 Bayer and Bernhard 2009; Cheibub et al. 2009, 2; Munck and Verkuilen 2002, 30.
on relationship between regime type and other variables, one should justify the reasons of choosing one particular measure of regime, be aware of consequences of using that measure, and, if possible, replicate one's findings with the use of other measures. The existing measures of political regime may be broadly divided into ordinal and categorical. The ordinal measures, of which Freedom House and Polity IV are the most popular, are arguably more widely used than the categorical measures. Ordinal measures code for the extent to which a regime is democratic. They implicitly assume that democracy is a latent continuous variable whose values might be expressed on an ordinal scale. Categorical measures, on the other hand, divide regimes into qualitatively separate categories. Among those, one can mention the dichotomous measure of dictatorships and democracies developed by Przeworski et al. and extended by Cheibub et al. (further called PACL), the trichotomous classification of regimes by Mainwaring et al., the measure by Boix and Stokes, which is mostly a temporal extension of PACL, the dichotomous measure by Bernhard at al., and the dichotomous measure of electoral democracy by Freedom House.⁴

**Ordinal Measures of Regime Type**

Polity IV is a widely used ordinal measure of regime type. It consists of six dimensions: 1) Regulation of chief executive recruitment, 2) Competitiveness of executive recruitment 3) Openness of executive recruitment 4) Constraints on chief executive, 5) Regulation of political participation and 6) Competitiveness of political participation. The scores on each dimension are combined to create a scale of regime type which has 21 points, where +10 indicates the most democratic regime and -10 the most authoritarian regime.

---

The measure by Freedom House is built similarly to Polity IV. It is composed of two tiers, political rights and civil liberties. The political rights tier consists of 10 dimensions and the civil liberties tier consists of 15 dimensions. The coding rules necessitate collection of information on various characteristics of political systems, such as fairness of electoral laws or the extent of corruption. The scores on each dimension are combined to create two scales, one for political rights and one for civil liberties, which range from 1 to 7, where 1 indicates the most democratic and 7 the least democratic regime. Subsequently, scholars either combine the scales or use them separately.

Certainly, there are certain advantages of using the ordinal measures of regime type. It might be argued that they provide more information than the categorical (and especially the dichotomous) measures. The ordinal measures are also useful if one is interested in information on the quality of democracy or the level of repressiveness of different regimes. However, these advantages are diminished by certain inherent problems of such measures.

The greatest of these problems lies in the lack of clear meaning of coding decisions. Recall that Freedom House and Polity IV are component indices which aggregate assessments of diverse regime dimensions into one score. Consequently, they assign similar scores to qualitatively different regimes. This problem is particularly acute in case of regimes which are assigned medium scores (called “anocracies” by Polity IV and “partly free countries” by Freedom House). For example, the middle range coding (between -4 and 3) was given by Polity IV to such countries as competitive oligarchies, where elections under restricted franchise resulted in alternation in power (as the United Kingdom and the Netherlands in 1870), PA monarchies, where legislature was democratically elected, but the executive was not responsible to the legislature (Germany and Denmark in 1895), “pluralist autocracies”, in which elections
were nominally democratic, but could not result in alternation in power because of fraudulent practices (Mexico in 1986), or limited democracies, where the powers of democratically-elected leaders were restricted by non-elected actors, e.g. the military (Guatemala in 1986).

In addition, looking at disaggregated Polity indicators does not help identify some of the basic regime characteristics. For example, Polity IV identifies whether a regime has free elections to the executive. But if a country does not have free elections to the executive, Polity IV cannot be used to determine whether the chief executive comes to power through pluralist (multiparty) but fraudulent elections, or some other means. It also cannot be used to identify whether the regime permits legal opposition or whether the legislature is elected through pluralist but fraudulent, pluralist and democratic, or non-competitive one-party elections.

Generally speaking, it is true that “anocracies” or “partly free countries”, as defined by Polity and Freedom House, respectively, mix democratic and autocratic characteristics, but those characteristics are very diverse. A regime in which the franchise is restricted, but which permits alternation in power through elections is non-democratic in a very different sense than a regime in which fraudulent elections under universal franchise cannot result in alternation in power. If one wants to measure, for instance, the effect of regime type on economic growth, then these two regimes, because they are qualitatively different, might affect this variable very differently. Polity IV and Freedom House, as they apply a single scale of democracy, fail to capture such qualitative differences and consequently should be treated as insufficient regime type classifications for numerous research purposes.

The fact that ordinal measures of democracy aggregate diverse and frequently unrelated regime characteristics in order to compute component regime scores leads to further
complications. Generally, these measures cannot be viably used to determine the extent to which regime type affects the variables which are taken into account to calculate the component scores. This results in their limited applicability. For instance, the measure by Freedom House cannot be used to determine whether democracies are less corrupt than autocracies because the extent of corruption forms part of the assessment. In other words, the extent of corruption is used by Freedom House, along with other variables, to calculate the composite political rights score. For a similar reason, the aggregate Polity IV score is not suitable to measure the extent to which democratic governments reduce the risk of civil wars. This is because Polity IV, when assessing the level of democracy, takes into account the extent to which political participation is characterized by internal violence, and this variable is highly correlated with the civil war outbreak.

More fundamentally, the ordinal measures of regime type suffer from the lack of correspondence between the ontology of their concept of democracy and the measurement of the concept. While the Polity’s or Freedom House concept of democracy is based on a set of necessary condition a country needs to meet in order to be classified as democracy, its measurement is based on the “family resemblance” model. This results in a situation when the meaning of Polity’s coding decisions is unclear. The ordinal measures are also problematic for a related reason, namely, because they tend to assess simultaneously the definitional characteristics of regimes (what regimes are) and their actions (what regimes do). Generally speaking, regimes may appear more or less democratic throughout the time even though their essence (regime type)
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remains the same. These fluctuations are captured by ordinal measures of democracy and may affect research results which aim to determine how regime type affects certain other variables.

For instance, the composite coding of Zimbabwe by Freedom House changed from 5 in 1998 to 6.5 in 2004, which indicated that Zimbabwe became less democratic. In the same period, the composite coding of Zimbabwe by Polity IV increased from -6 to -4, that is, Zimbabwe became more democratic according to Polity. In fact, the Zimbabwean regime became more repressive, so the Freedom House decreased its democracy score. However, it became more politically open in the same period (as a major opposition party emerged), so Polity, as it operates with different coding rules, increased its democracy score. Yet, I would argue that regardless of these temporal changes, the essence of the regime (that is, its type) remained the same.

Moreover, the ordinal measures suffer from ambiguous coding rules. Freedom House discloses its coding rules, but it does not disclose its component scores (that is, scores on each dimension) at all. Hence, it would be nearly impossible to replicate its coding process. Polity does disclose the component scores, which increases its transparency. Yet, the coding rules used by Polity seem ambiguous. They require a lot of subjective judgment when making coding decisions, which might result in a different coding decision if the measurement process is replicated. For instance, the dimension “competitiveness of participation” results in 0.6 (out of possible 11) points for autocracy if the participation is “suppressed” (which is one of six categories) i.e. “some organized, political competition occurs outside government, without serious factionalism; but the regime systematically and sharply limits its form, extent, or both in ways that exclude substantial groups (20% or more of the adult population) from participation.
Suppressed competition is distinguished from Factional competition by the systematic, persisting nature of the restrictions.”

Last but not least, Polity IV is characterized by considerable measurement error, which was detected quantitatively by Treier and Jackman. Yet, even qualitative examination of Polity composite scores reveals numerous controversial decisions. Recall that the Polity measure stretches from -10 (most autocratic) to 10 (most democratic regimes). It is then surprising that Argentina under Peron was given the score of -9, the same as USSR under Stalin. During the period 1916-30, assessed as democratic by most historians, Argentina received the score of 2. The score for Armenia fluctuates from 7 in 1994 to -6 in 1996 and 5 in 1998, with no dramatic change in the nature of the regime visible to an observer. The period 1993-99 in Russia is assessed as less democratic (score 3) than the period after 1999 (score 6 in 2000-2006 and 4 afterward). In 1995, at the peak of the influence of military in the Turkish politics, the country received higher score (8) than in 2008 (7). Freedom House, to be fair, is not free of controversial coding decision. In particular, according to some authors it is biased against leftist regimes. Yet, debatable coding decisions are less visible in case of Freedom House than in case of Polity.

**Categorical Measures of Regime Type**

Given all problems associated with the ordinal measures of regime type, one may want to consider using the categorical measures of this variable. Several such measures have been developed. Of the most widely used, one could refer to the already-mentioned PACL, which was extended by Boix and Stokes to the period 1800-1945, the classification by Mainwaring et al., the measure developed by Bernhard et al., the Political Regime Change Dataset developed by
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Gasiorowski and Reich, an interesting categorical measure developed by Wigell, and the “electoral democracy” measure by Freedom House. PACL is primarily a dichotomous measure which divides political regimes into two categories – democracies and non-democracies, or dictatorships. It is based on a theoretically appealing concept of democracy, according to which regimes can be in fact dichotomously divided into democracies and non-democracies, as some permit for alternation in power through elections while others do not. PACL defines democracy as a regime “in which governmental offices are filled as a consequence of contested elections”. Governmental offices include both the executive and the legislature, and contested elections are characterized by pluralism (multipartyism), ex ante uncertainty of the outcome, ex post irreversibility of the outcome, and repeatability. PACL codes independent regimes in the post-1945 period.

Generally, PACL both envisions and measure democracy as an essentialist concept. It means that a country must meet certain necessary conditions on various regime dimensions to be considered democratic. In its updated version (Cheibub et al. 2009) PACL provides some information on the extent to which the necessary conditions of democracy where met in case of the analyzed polities (for the period after 1945). This pertains to whether the legislature was elected in pluralist (multiparty) elections, whether the executive was elected and whether elections resulted in alternation in office. If all three conditions are met, a country is considered a democracy. Still, other theoretically possible dimensions of democracy, such as restrictions on the scope of participation of political parties, limitations on the scope of powers of elected authorities, or the scope of suffrage are not considered in this scheme.
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Undoubtedly, PACL has many advantages if compared to other measures. It uses straightforward coding rules and definitions which are based on easily observable regime features. Hence, the coding process can be replicated with relative easiness. Moreover, PACL uses a minimalist, procedural definition of democracy. Consequently, contrary to the measures that use substantive definitions, it might be used for a variety of research purposes, such as determination of how regime type affects the probability of civil war outbreak. Yet, the simplicity of PACL could also be treated as its disadvantage if one is interested in proper classification of non-democratic regimes. PACL is very narrow in a sense that it divides all existing regimes into two categories only. Hence it might turn out insufficient to portray the empirical diversity of non-democratic political regimes accurately. For instance, North Korea and Mexico until 2000 are classified as dictatorships by PACL, even though they were very different regime types.

The most problematic aspect of PACL lies, in my opinion, in how its definition of democracy is operationalized. As already said, PACL identifies as democracies only those polities in which governments actually lost elections and transferred power to the opposition.\(^\text{12}\) This approach has certain advantages. Certainly, democratic transfers of power are easily observable and, if one identify democracies using this criterion, his judgments will avoid subjectivity. PACL refuse to evaluate the quality of elections and does not identify democracies on this basis specifically because, as it claims, judgments on the quality of elections would be subjective and for that reason difficult to replicate.\(^\text{13}\) The coding rules applied in PACL indeed classify as democracies most countries which are widely regarded as democratic. This is because
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the majority of democracies that have ever existed indeed experienced a transfer of power. Yet, PACL’s approach to classification of democracy leads unfortunately to many problems that could be avoided if the coding rules permitted for the evaluation of quality of elections in some circumstances. PACL coding rules are also characterized by some additional difficulties which are not directly related to the problem of quality of elections. Let me now briefly describe them.

Generally, PACL identifies as democracies those regimes that hold competitive (i.e. pluralist in BDD terminology) elections both to the executive and to the legislature and have experienced alternation in power as a result of such elections. Such defined democracies cease to exist when democratic government is abolished by an unelected actor (e.g. by the military), or by the ruler himself (i.e. when the democratically-elected ruler introduces a single-party regime or unconstitutionally closes the legislature). In the latter case the whole period under the ruler who conducted the executive coup is considered undemocratic. For instance, although Fujimori conducted executive coup in Peru in 1992, the whole period under his rule (since 1990) is coded as dictatorship. One could conclude that PACL coding rules capture well transitions from democracy to clearly undemocratic (non-pluralist or non-complete) regimes, but they do not grasp equally well other types of transitions.

First of all, difficulties arise when gradual transitions from autocracies to democracies are considered. If a regime that holds pluralist elections experiences alternation in power, then under PACL we should code this regime as democracy since the moment it was first established. Consequently, as Mexico experienced transfer in power in 2000, this pluralist regime should be coded as democracy since it was first established, that is, since 1920. Clearly, as most would agree that Mexico was not a democracy throughout this period, PACL attempts to solve this coding problem by suggesting that in order to be considered democratic before the first transfer
of power, a regime must have conducted pluralist elections under the same rules as when the first transfer of power occurred. Consequently, PACL decides that Mexico should be considered democratic only since 2000 because there had been a major electoral reform in 1996.\textsuperscript{14} However, with this coding rule PACL cannot avoid subjective judgments on which electoral reforms are important enough to qualify as a change of rules under which the transfer of power occurred.

Sometimes, however, a regime widely regarded as an autocracy conducts elections and loses power even though no significant change of rules had occurred before such elections. This was true, for instance, in case of Musharraf's regime in Pakistan which lost the 2008 elections and handed over power to the opposition. Consequently, under PACL Pakistan should be coded as democracy already since 2004, when Musharraf was first elected president by the parliament and regional assemblies (even though many would claim that Pakistan was not democratic before 2008). Similarly, PACL does not capture regime transitions from democracies to undemocratic pluralist regimes, which are manifested through the fact that the new regime stopped observing the standards of democratic elections. For instance, Ukraine is coded by PACL as democracy throughout all the period 1991-2008 because it experienced transfers of power in 1994 and 2004. It is classified as such even though many would argue that the period under the Kuchma presidency was not alternation-permitting, which was manifested by the fact that the regime aimed to prevent the opposition from taking power through blatant electoral fraud during the 2004 presidential elections (see e.g. Wilson 2005). To be fair, this problem is not as serious as the previous one. This is because most democracies did not terminate through slow degeneration into autocracy (as it occurred in Ukraine); rather, they made a more visible transition to

\textsuperscript{14} Cheibub, Gandhi, and Vreeland 2009, 5.
autocracy through establishment of a non-pluralist regime. Such transitions were captured by PACL.

Even more importantly, PACL coding rules indirectly result in situations when the form of regime breakdown determines its classification as either democracy or non-democracy (dictatorship), which is very problematic from the theoretical perspective. This stems from the fact that under PACL the requirement that a regime which originates from pluralist elections must experience alternation in power in order to be classified as democracy is waived if such a regime is terminated through a non-executive coup. Some examples of regimes classified as democracies under this rule are Uganda in 1980-84, Guatemala in 1958-62, Thailand in 1975 or Bolivia in 1979. These regimes originated from pluralist elections, did not experience alternation in power and were abolished by the military. The quality of initial pluralist elections does not influence the coding decision under PACL; hence, some of these regimes were established through elections widely regarded by historians as democratic (Bolivia and Thailand), while others emerged from elections widely regarded as fraudulent (Uganda and Guatemala).

However, these regimes would not have been classified as democratic by PACL if they had been abolished by democratically-elected rulers themselves (through executive coups), and not by the military. This would result from another rule applied by PACL, which states that the regimes which were established through pluralist elections (regardless of their quality), did not experience an alternation in power and were abolished in executive coups or through introduction of one-party rule are not classified as democracies (for instance, Ghana in 1957-60 or Malaysia in 1957-69).

To further illustrate how PACL coding rules work, consider Russia in 1991-2008 or South Africa in 1994-2008, which are classified as (type 2 error) dictatorships. Type 2 error
indicates that the history has not yet provided enough information to classify unambiguously these regimes as either dictatorships or democracies as they have not experienced alternation in power through elections. However, if Medvedev and Zuma were abolished in a military coup in 2009, both regimes would be automatically reclassified as democracies throughout these periods. The same would occur if Zuma and Putin held and lost pluralist elections in 2009. If on the other hand Zuma and Putin unconstitutionally closed legislatures in 2009, their countries would remain classified as authoritarian throughout the entire periods.

The question of how such regimes as Uganda in 1980-84 or contemporary South Africa should be classified is a matter of legitimate discussion. It is however clear that the coding rules employed in PACL are sufficiently controversial to spur discussion on possible alternatives. Specifically, these rules seem to operationalize incorrectly the PACL’s own definition of democracy because they do not code as democracies some regimes which originate from elections whose outcome was ex ante uncertain (South Africa 1994) while they do code as democracies other regimes which originate from elections whose outcome was ex ante certain (Uganda 1980). Simply put, the quality of an election gives much information on whether its outcome had been in fact ex ante uncertain. Moreover, as many would argue, a regime should not be considered undemocratic only because its rulers have an intention to abolish democracy, which they eventually manage to carry out. More generally, the manner in which a regime was abolished should not determine whether it had been democratic or not.

Consequently, I propose an alternative set of coding rules that would result in a less controversial method of differentiation between regimes which do and do not permit alternation through open-outcome elections.\textsuperscript{15} In this I accept the elements of the definition of a democratic

\textsuperscript{15} I prefer the terms “open-outcome” or “alternation-permitting” to the more commonly used “free and fair” as I find it ontologically more precise. It suggests that the outcome of an election is in principle not determined in advance.
Namely, I agree that only regimes which originate from elections whose outcome is ex ante uncertain, ex post irreversible and repeatable should be classified as democratic. Yet, I develop a different operationalization of this definition. Specifically, I claim that assessing the quality of elections, although it requires judgments that are subjective to a certain degree, is unfortunately inevitable if one wants to avoid serious problems during the process of regime classification. In addition, I would argue that the quality of elections is observable and given available data, reasonable people may arrive at similar judgments in this regard. Hence, I decided to encompass the assessment of quality of elections as an element of the coding rules in BDD (see Appendix A for detailed explanation of how the quality of elections was assessed). These rules also assess the scope of uncertainty regarding coding decisions on the possibility of electoral alternation.

At this moment I should mention that I consider the possibility of alternation in power as a result of elections as the primary ontological element of a democracy. Hence, I treat as democracies all countries meeting the necessary conditions of democracy, even those wracked by a civil war (e.g. Sri Lanka in 1983-2009) - unless it led to state disintegration, and/or those characterized by significant human rights violations (e.g. Guatemala in 1966-74) – unless the violations directly impacted the quality of elections so that they lost open-outcome character. This coding decision stems from my conviction that the presence of a civil war or the scope of observance of human rights are characteristics pertaining to all regimes, whether democratic or not. Hence, one could pose legitimate research questions regarding the extent to which democracies engage in civil wars or respect human rights. If the scope of observance of human rights or experience of a civil war become constituent elements of definition of democracy, then
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such research questions cannot be asked from a logical point of view. Ultimately, as a result of this approach, certain disagreements regarding the coding of some countries as democracies in this project will stem from ontological grounds.

Regarding other dichotomous measures of democracy, Bernhard et al. propose an alternative regime type classification to PACL, which aims to avoid some of the problematic aspects of the latter’s operationalization of definition democracy. The quality of elections and the scope of suffrage are included as elements of definition of democracy in the Bernhard et al.’s regime classification. Yet, only polities with more than half adults enfranchised are considered democracies. One could argue that this coding decision is too restrictive as all polities practicing democratic elections under universal male suffrage are omitted, and the first democracy emerges in the dataset only in 1919. Ultimately, Bernhard et al. arrive at probably less controversial coding decisions than PACL, but its main disadvantage is again the dichotomous measurement of regime type (regimes which mixed democratic and autocratic characteristics are simply coded as non-democracies).

Among other categorical regime type classifications, one should mention the dataset developed by Mainwaring et al. and the Political Regime Change Dataset by Gasiorowski and Reich, which propose a trichotomous classification of regime type distinguishing between democracies, semi-democratic regimes, and autocracies. These authors argue that the trichotomous classification of regime type is better than PACL specifically because it creates the category of semi-democracy, a regime which combines democratic and autocratic characteristics. These semi-democracies are classified by PACL as either democracies or dictatorships, while almost all regimes classified as democracies by Mainwaring et al. are also democratic according
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Generally, the approach adopted by Mainwaring et al. and Reich is a step in good direction, as these authors recognize that the category of non-democratic regimes is too general. However, the creation of an additional category of semi-democracy does not solve the problem as it also combines regimes of diverse characteristics. For instance, Mainwaring et al. classify as semi-democracies such diverse regimes as Argentina under Peron (because of unfair electoral conditions), El Salvador in 1984-91 (because of massive human rights violations) or Guatemala in 1986-99 (because of influence of the military over the political process).

Finally, one should briefly discuss the explicit efforts to classify non-democratic regimes. In this regard, one of the early comprehensive classifications of authoritarian regimes was proposed by Linz.\textsuperscript{18} As well, the PACL classification divided non-democracies into monarchic, military and civilian regimes. These efforts, however, failed to distinguish between those authoritarian regimes that permit political pluralism (and hold multiparty elections) from those that do not, which is an important distinction. To encompass such regimes, Diamond suggested a category of “pseudo-democracy”, while Levitsky and Way coined the term “competitive authoritarianism”.\textsuperscript{19} Yet, the aforementioned literature lacked clear definitions of what such “pseudo-democratic” or “competitively authoritarian” regimes actually are and coding rules on how they can be empirically identified.

The more recent efforts to classify non-democratic regimes were developed mostly in order to address the deficiencies of Polity IV. Geddes divided non-democratic regimes into personalist, military, monarchic, oligarchic and dominant-party types.\textsuperscript{20} Hadenius and Teorell\textsuperscript{21}

\textsuperscript{18} Linz 2000.
\textsuperscript{19} Diamond 1999, 15-17; Levitsky and Way 2002.
\textsuperscript{20} Geddes 1999; Geddes 2003.
\textsuperscript{21} Hadenius and Teorell 2007.
added to this list a category of limited multiparty regimes as distinct from one-party and “no-party” regimes (in Geddes, dominant-party regimes could either allow or not allow opposition parties), while Kollner and Kailitz\textsuperscript{22} distinguished communist ideocracies from other one-party regimes. I would argue that these classifications, although definitely an improvement over previous efforts, still suffer from serious conceptual deficiencies because they do not distinguish between various regime dimensions. Hence, the identified regime types are classified along varying number of dimensions.

To illustrate some conceptual difficulties with the scheme developed by Geddes, one could note that personalist regimes could be at the same time of military, one-party or neither character. Nobody would deny that North Korea is both a one-party and a personalist regime, while Chile under Pinochet was both military and personalist. Otherwise, both military and one-party regimes might have a non-personalist character. This is the case if the chief executive is responsible to a wider ruling group (aka selectorate) or there are institutionalized rules of succession within the ruling group. The former was the case in Vietnam under a one-party regime and in Fiji in 1988-92 under a military regime, the latter in contemporary China under a one-party regime and in Argentina in 1976-82 under a military regime. Geddes\textsuperscript{23} notes this contradiction and classifies as one-party or military only those regimes which were non-personalist. But I would argue that it might be still of scholarly interest whether a personalist regime is of military and/or one-party character.

The addition of a category of limited multiparty regime by Hadenius and Teorell to the list developed by Geddes was certainly desirable. The regimes which permit political opposition

\textsuperscript{22} Köllner and Kailitz 2013.
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are, as I would argue, ontologically different from regimes which practice ideological monopoly. Still, Hadenius and Teorell did not recognize that political pluralism does not represent a regime type, but a regime dimension. Hence one could identify military regimes (e.g. Poland under Pilsudski in 1926-35) along with monarchies (contemporary Morocco) which have been pluralist, and other monarchies or military regimes which prohibited political opposition. Hadenius and Teorell also argue against differentiation of a separate category of a personalist regime, which I consider a mistake. In fact, the difference between personalist and other regimes represents a part of another major regime dimension which was partially identified by Geddes. There is undoubtedly a huge ontological difference between such regimes and those in which the power is held by a wider group. Consequently, because of the aforementioned problems, I find it more desirable from ontological and conceptual points of view to classify regimes along dimensions and not simply divide them into categories. In particular, the categorical differences identified by Geddes and Hadenius and Teorell are conceptualized in BDD along dimensions of political pluralism (which distinguishes between regimes which allow and do not allow for political opposition), type of executive recruitment (which distinguishes between personalist and other regime types) and a latent dimension of type of power-holding political organization (whether military, single party, etc.). Table 2-1 illustrates how various non-democratic regimes could be classified along these three regime dimensions. See also below for a more detailed discussion of the dimensions.

**Some Common Deficiencies of the Existing Regime Type Measures**

There are some problematic aspects of the existing regime type measures which characterize all such classifications. First of all, the extant measures do not explicitly code for types of regime transitions, which is an extremely relevant variable in its own right. Another problem stems from the fact that the existing measures do not code regime type in colonies. Yet,
the type of colonial regime is also an important characteristic. It is necessary to code for this variable if one is interested how the type of colonial regime affected the type of post-colonial regime. More generally, the existing regime type datasets do not distinguish between regimes which were de jure and de facto independent, coding only de jure independent countries.

This distinction is important, because many countries which were independent de jure were not independent de facto – in a sense that they were not free to change their political system (Soviet Bloc in 1945-1988), whereas some countries, especially colonies, became independent de facto before achieving de jure independence - in a sense that the colonizer did not control their internal political development anymore (for example, all French African colonies became independent de facto in 1958, but de jure only in 1960; Hungary was independent de facto but not de jure in 1867-1918). Such polities were included in the BDD dataset if they were pluralist during the period of sovereignty de facto and subsequently became sovereign de jure.

I am of the opinion that a polity should be considered as not independent de facto if the type of its political system was determined by an external power in a sense that an undesirable change in the political regime and/or the person of chief executive would result in an intervention leading to the restoration of status quo ante desired by the external power. Usually but not always, the presence of troops of the external power in question was necessary to sustain dependence de facto. Certain events on the ground, such as the removal of Egyptian Prime Minister Saad Zaghloul by the British in 1924, or Soviet interventions in Hungary in 1956 and in Czechoslovakia in 1968, attest unambiguously to the lack of independence de facto of the countries in question. Yet, the presence of foreign troops did not always indicate lack of independence de facto. On many occasions a foreign power which stationed troops did not have
the ability or willingness to influence a country’s political system, usually as long as its basic interests were respected (e.g. Panama most of the time before 1989).

I would argue that countries which were not independent de facto should not be included in the statistical analysis of regime transitions because political transitions, if they occurred there at all, were of exogenous and not endogenous character. For example, the probability of democratization of any country in the Soviet Bloc was de facto null in 1946-88. The same was true about the probability of democratic breakdown in the occupied Germany in 1949-55 or Bosnia in 1996-2010. On the other hand, countries which were independent de facto and subsequently became independent de jure should be included in such analyses. Otherwise, information on some periods of democracy which were terminated already before a country became independent de jure (e.g. Mali in 1958-60 or Georgia in 1990-91) is lost.

In addition, the existing measures of regime type do not assess the scope of suffrage. Yet, measuring this variable is necessary if one wants to fully distinguish between democracies and competitive oligarchies, especially before 1945, when the latter regime type was more common. The lack of measurement of this regime dimensions leads to some controversial coding decisions by Polity IV and PACL. For example, Belgium between 1857 and 1913 received the score of 6 by Polity; hence it was classified as democracy. In this period, elections in Belgium were free and fair, but the scope of suffrage was only 8% of male adults until 1895. On the other hand, PACL, for example, considers Brazil in 1946-60 as democracy even though less than 50% of male adults had the right to vote in this period as the literacy requirement was still enforced.

**Characteristics of the Basic Dimensions of Democracy Regime Type Measure**

Because of the aforementioned problems with the existing regime type classifications, I have compiled an original dataset of basic dimensions of democracy (BDD) which measures regime characteristics on its basic dimensions. BDD forms a novel approach to measurement of
political regimes. It does not place regimes on an ordinal scale (e.g. from the least to the most democratic). It is also not intended to divide regimes into different types, like categorical measures, although it might be used for that purpose. Instead, BDD characterizes regimes within six basic dimensions. The outcome of a regime’s classification on each dimension can be used separately or in combination, depending on one's interest in particular regime characteristics.

Otherwise, BDD can also be thought of as an effort to grasp how different regimes departure from the ideal type of democracy on various dimensions. Modern democracy is frequently conceived as a regime which meets certain conditions on various dimensions – that is, a regime which is independent, permits political pluralism (numerous political parties competing for power), holds elections under universal franchise in which incumbents occasionally lose, and in which the powers of the elected institutions are not severely restricted by a non-elected authority.

Yet, many contemporary or historically-existing regimes have not met these conditions entirely or partially. For instance, Bosnia after 1998 or India in 1936-39 met all the conditions of the ideal type democracy besides de facto independence, Russia after 2000 held multiparty elections in which the incumbents could not lose, Kuwait elected only the legislature, Turkey in 1990s permitted the military to have significant influence in politics, and South Africa before 1994 had very limited suffrage. All these regimes did not meet the ideal of modern democracy, but were partially democratic within its different dimensions. BDD aims to encompass these partial deviations from the ideal type of democracy within each of its basic dimensions. In consequence, in BDD democracy is both conceptualized and measured as an essentialist concept,
meaning that in order to classify a regime as democratic it needs to meet a certain number of necessary conditions on all dimensions.24

Because BDD is concerned only with basic regime characteristics, it may be used to analyze various effects of regime type more safely than other measures. For instance, it may be used to determine how regime type affects the civil war outbreak or the level of observance of human rights, as civil wars and human rights observance are not taken into account during the coding process within BDD, in contrast to Polity IV or Freedom House. PACL might also be used safely for the same purposes but the opportunities it offers are limited, as it distinguishes only two regime characteristics, or types.

As a consequence, BDD allows for testing of the central hypothesis of the dissertation, which is the extent to which pre-democratization regime legacies affect the probability of democratic breakdown. BDD measures regime legacies as the extent to which non-democratic regimes which preceded democratization meet the necessary conditions of democracy. As discussed, this task could not be accomplished by the existing measures of regime type because they do not properly identify the extent to which non-democratic regimes meet the necessary conditions of democracy, either through incorrect operationalization of the definition of democracy (as in Polity IV) through the fact that they provide only for a di- or trichotomous measure of regime type (as PACL) or simply through the fact that they do not code regime type in dependent polities before their democratization and independence. The latter shortcoming pertains, as mentioned, to all available coding schemes and is a serious problem, because pre-democratic regime type affected democratic stability regardless of whether the new democracy was preceded by a dependent or an independent regime.

24 Goertz 2005.
As basic dimensions of democracy, BDD identified stateness (which measures whether a country existed as a viable state or otherwise disintegrated), confederation, sovereignty de facto, sovereignty de jure, political pluralism (electoral and non-electoral), elected institutions, possibility of alternation in elections, scope of suffrage, restrictions on participation of political organizations and limitations on the scope of power of elected authorities. Two additional variables assess the scope of uncertainty of coding decisions regarding the scope of suffrage and the possibility of alternation through elections. The aforementioned dimensions are conceptualized as categorical variables apart from the dimension of scope of participation, which is measured as a continuous variable. Herein I present short descriptions of the dimensions. More formal definitions are provided in Appendix A.

The dimension of independence de facto measures whether a country’s political regime was determined by an external power. The dimension of independence de jure, on the other hand, measures whether a country was independent from the point of view of international law. If a country was independent de facto, it meant that the character of its political regime was determined endogenously. For example, Germany in 1949-55, Poland in 1945-88 or Iraq in 2003-11 were not independent de facto, even though they were independent de jure, because external powers determined their regime types. On the other hand, Cambodia in 1949-53 or Estonia in 1990-91 were independent de facto even though they were not independent de jure. In these periods the political development of these countries was no longer by France and Soviet Union, their former colonial metropolis.

The dimension of stateness measures the scope of control of the central government over a country’s population. If the central government lost control over more than 40% of a country’s population, or there if was no effective central government, the country is considered to have
disintegrated (for example, Spain in 1936-39 or Lebanon in 1973-90). No further regime characteristics are measured in a disintegrated polity. The dimension of confederation measures if a central government had a confederated character. In a confederation, the agreement of all constituent units was in principle necessary to adopt government decisions. Only confederations which subsequently transformed into federal or unitary states are included in the dataset (there are relatively few cases, for example, United States in 1776-1789 or Switzerland in 1815-48).

The dimension of political pluralism identifies whether a country had either executive or legislature (or both) which originated from pluralist elections. Pluralist elections are defined as elections in which political opposition may participate de facto and whose result is not de jure predetermined in advance. Hence, there was no pluralism in legislative elections in Tanzania before 1995, for example, because participation of the opposition was not allowed. On the other, legislative elections in contemporary Bahrain are pluralist because opposition candidates participate de facto, even though political parties are illegal, and the result is not predetermined in advance. If a regime was not pluralist, no further regime characteristics are coded apart from regime discontinuities.

The dimension of elected institutions identifies which institutions (the executive, the legislature, or both) originated from pluralist elections. If both legislature and executive originates from pluralist elections, I will characterize the regime as “complete”. Certain regimes were not complete because their executives did not originate from pluralist elections (e.g. Germany in 1871-1918 or Jordan after 1993). Occasionally, a regime was not complete because only its executive originated from pluralist elections, although such situations have been usually infrequent and transitory (e.g. Guinea in 2010-13).
The dimension of alternation measures whether the executive, the legislature, or both, originated from open-outcome elections. Open-outcome election to the executive is defined as a pluralist election which the opposition has a positive probability of winning without the need to enforce the true outcome through forceful means. Hence, presidential elections in Ukraine in 2004 or Cote d’Ivoire in 2010 were not open-outcome even though the true outcome was ultimately enforced. A legislative open-outcome election is defined as a pluralist election in which the opposition has a positive probability of winning the majority of seats without the need to enforce the true outcome through forceful means. Numerous pluralist elections have been closed-outcome, or not “free and fair”, as in Mexico in 1988 or Russia in 2010. On the other hand, certain incomplete regimes were characterized by alternation in legislative elections, as Germany in 1871-1918. The problem of distinguishing between regimes which permit alternation and other pluralist regimes is complicated and is thoroughly discussed in Appendix A to the dissertation.

The dimensions of scope of participation identifies the percentage of a country’s population older than the minimal voting age who were de facto allowed to participate in nationwide elections. The scope of enfranchisement within each gender is measured separately. The dimension of restrictions on participations of political organizations indicates whether some popular political organizations were banned, even if they could field independent candidates in elections. For example, Germany in 1878-90, when SPD was banned, or Argentina in 1958-62, when Peronism was banned, were characterized by restricted participation. Finally, the dimension of limitations measures whether the power of an elected executive authority was limited by an unelected authority, be it the military, a monarch, or an unelected legislative
chamber. For example, the power of Turkish elected institutions was limited by the military in 1983-2003, or the power of Swedish elected institutions was limited by the monarch in 1905-17.

In addition to regimes in independent states, BDD also codes regime type in polities which were dependent de facto or de jure and subsequently became independent de jure, if they experienced at least pluralism. In the context of dependent polities (colonies), pluralism occurred if a dependent territory enjoyed a legislature with at least 50% members elected in pluralist elections and which could enact binding legislation. For example, there was pluralism in Ghana in 1946-51, but French African colonies did not enjoy pluralism in 1946-57 because their elected legislatures had only advisory powers apart from the prerogative to accept or reject budget. I will define a regime in a colonial territory as complete if its executive power was at least partially elected. For example, India experienced completeness in 1920-37 under the dyarchy system, when in each province ministers responsible to the local legislature administered the domains of education, healthcare, agriculture and local government, while the administration of law and justice was reserved to British officials. Because few colonial territories enjoyed even partially-elected executives, such a lenient definition of completeness is in this case necessary. Otherwise, the understanding of the dimensions of alternation, scope of participation and restrictions on political participation is the same regarding dependent and independent regimes.

In BDD I adopted a relatively liberal understanding of democracy. I classified a regime as democratic if it was characterized by independence de facto, pluralism, completeness, open-outcome executive and legislative elections, and enfranchisement of at least 50% of male adults. Regarding the last requirement, I admit that it is obviously less demanding than the contemporary standards of democracy, but I am against applying contemporary standards in this regard to 19th-century and early 20th-century regimes, which were usually considered
democracies at this level of enfranchisement by their contemporaries. Consequently, the
definition of democracy adopted in BDD will treat as democracies some regimes which were not
treated as such by some other coding schemes (i.e. restricted democracies, such as Argentina in
1958-62, limited democracies, such as Turkey in 1983-2003, or democracies with male-only
suffrage, such as France in 1871-1940). In any case, the flexible character of BDD permits
adoption of stricter definitions of democracy regarding the scope of participation and other
dimensions. Hence, BDD enables examination of whether substantive results of research depend
on the particular definition of democracy used.

BDD also codes for other regime characteristics which are not directly relevant to the
assessment of whether a polity met the necessary conditions of democracy. Those include
territorial changes which affect a polity’s population, type of legislature (if not elected in
pluralist elections), type of executive recruitment (if not through open-outcome elections),
transitions in executive authority and regime discontinuities. Below I discuss some of the more
controversial or conceptually new characteristics of these variables. Otherwise, variables applied
by BDD are discussed in greater detail in the last part of the chapter.

The necessity of assessment of the extent to which a country’s population changed as a
result of territorial changes is self-evident. Otherwise, I coded for the type of executive
recruitment in order to distinguish between various types of regimes which did not select its head
executive through open-outcome elections. Given coding of this variable, several types of
regimes which were neither democracies nor competitive oligarchies could be identified. Those
included hereditary absolute monarchies (e.g. Russia before 1905), hereditary monarchies in
which the executive power is shared between the monarch and chief executive responsible both
to the monarch and a polity’s ruling group (e.g. Germany in 1871-1918), other personal regimes
(e.g. Spain in 1939-76), regimes in which there is institutionalized rule of periodic succession within one political organization (e.g. Mexico under PRI), regimes in which there is institutionalized rule of periodic succession between two or more political organizations (e.g. Spain under turno in 1876-1923) and regimes in which there are no institutionalized rules of succession but the chief executive is responsible to and might be recalled by the ruling group (e.g. Soviet Union after 1956 or Italy in 1860-1919).

Hopefully, coding for type of executive recruitment will increase the scope of understanding of how non-democratic regimes differ. From this point of view, BDD presents a different understanding of how non-democracies could be categorized in comparison to the existing coding efforts.\textsuperscript{25} Namely, it classifies such regimes along two basic dimensions: political pluralism and type of executive recruitment. As already discussed, this approach results in higher conceptual clarity because, from the empirical point of view, regimes characterized by various types of executive recruitment could either be pluralist (permit political opposition) or not.

I also admit that it is ontologically sensible to recognize another dimension which would identify a type of political organization used to maintain power. Along this dimension, regimes could be categorized as military, one-party and other (along the lines of Geddes). However, I refrain from doing so at this stage of the BDD project because of various empirical and conceptual problems pertaining, in particular, to the identification of military regimes. From the historical perspective, the distinction between military and non-military regimes has often been blurred. Suharto in Indonesia or Nasser in Egypt came to power initially as military leaders, but their regimes gradually became civilian. Many leaders achieved power as leaders of militias or guerillas which did not form part of the official armed forces (or in a situation when such forces

\textsuperscript{25} Geddes 1999; Geddes 2003; Hadenius and Teorell 2007; Köllner and Kailitz 2013.
did not exist). It is unclear whether such leaders established military or non-military regimes. Finally, one should note that some regimes had simultaneously one-party and military character. For example, Ne Win’s personalist military regime in Burma operated through a single Burma Socialist Program Party. Further conceptual effort is necessary to clearly define and identify one-party and military regimes.

Admittedly, the dimension of type of executive recruitment does not directly code for constraints on chief executive, the concept which is of the central importance in the Polity project. Yet, depending on the type of executive recruitment, the scope of constraints on chief executive can be assessed with information provided by BDD. Certainly, the least constrained the chief executive was in personal regimes and hereditary absolute monarchies. Otherwise, the scope of constraints depended on the size of the ruling group and whether the regime permitted political opposition (which was coded under “political pluralism” dimension).

Regarding the variable “type of legislature,” which pertains to legislatures not elected in pluralist elections, I have distinguished between regimes which had no legislature, those which had a legislature elected in single-party elections without candidate or party list choice (e.g. in the Soviet Union before 1988) and those which had a legislature formed in elections allowing for choice among many candidates from one political organization, or in conditions when the candidates were required to support the government (e.g. Tanzania in 1964-95). Certain minor subtypes of non-pluralist legislatures were also identified.

Finally, I have coded for various types of transitions in executive authority and regime discontinuities. Regarding transitions in executive authority, I distinguished between the transitions within the same regime and transitions which led to a regime change. The former encompassed transitions resulting from pre-determined rules of succession (e.g. Mexico 1994),
situations when the chief executive is recalled by his ruling group (e.g. Soviet Union in 1964), deaths or incapacitations of chief executive not resulting in a regime transition (e.g. Albania in 1985), and under an alternation-permitting regime - situations when a head executive from the same party or the ruling coalition takes over (e.g. United States in 1989). The transitions resulting in a regime change were divided into alternations as a result of open-outcome elections (e.g. Poland 2007) and resignations/ impeachments/ deaths (if they actually led to a regime change, e.g. Armenia 1998, Guatemala 2003, and Malawi 2002 - respectively). The variable “transitions in executive authority” also encompasses executive coups, which were defined as forceful and unlawful regime changes effectuated by the chief executive himself (e.g. in Peru in 1992 or in the Philippines in 1972).

On the other hand, the variable “regime discontinuities” encompasses transitions in executive authority effectuated through force or the threat of force. Here I distinguished regime discontinuities which occurred as a result of military coups (e.g. Argentina 1976), civilian popular uprisings (e.g. Ukraine 2004), monarchical coups (e.g. Nepal 2002) and foreign interventions or war victories. Military coups encompass also civil war victories and regime transitions effectuated by armed uprisings (e.g. Nicaragua 1979). This understanding of the variable was motivated by the fact that in many countries, especially before 1945, the distinction between official armed forces and various private militias which engaged in military coups was extremely blurred.

Time-wise, BDD encompasses regime type in all sovereign countries after 1789 (i.e. after the first modern democracy, United States, emerged) if they reached at least half a million inhabitants before 2000. As mentioned, BDD also covers periods of pluralism in dependent
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26 The most informed historical sources assess the scope of enfranchisement in the United States at the time as approximately 60% of white adult males (and, consequently, 50% of all male adults).
territories if they subsequently became independent de jure. Hence, for example, the coding of
the Philippines starts in 1907 when it was granted a legislature with more than half elected
members, still as a colony. Allover, this resulted in inclusion of 190 countries, of which 132 have
ever experienced democracy, and 36491 of country-half-years. Of these country-half-years, 6.5%
enshambled polities which were non-sovereign both de facto and de jure, 3.4% to polities
which were sovereign de jure but not de facto, and 1.7% to polities which were sovereign de
factive but not de jure. Adoption of country-half-year instead of a country-year as a unit of
observation was motivated by the fact that some countries experienced two or even more regimes
during one calendar year. If country-year was accepted as a unit of observation this information
would be lost. Still, for the purpose of quantitative analysis (Chapter 3), I adopted country-year
as a unit of observation. Finally, I should mention that I envision BDD as an open coding project.
Consequently, mistaken coding decisions will be corrected in the future. This should not change
the substantive results of the research published on the basis of BDD because I expect such
revisions to be minor. Moreover, coding on certain variables might change as a result of how
these variables are defined in BDD. In particular, certain countries remain in the uncertainty zone
regarding the possibility of electoral alternation as of 2014; they might be recoded from
democracies to non-democracies, or vice versa, in the future. Moreover, readers will be invited to
publicly post comments on coding decisions they find controversial and engage in discussion.
Such comments will hopefully lead to identification of possible coding errors
Table 2-1. Examples of non-democratic regimes classified along basic dimensions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Power concentration</th>
<th>Power-holding organization</th>
<th>Permit opposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Korea</td>
<td>Personalist</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>Non-pluralist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile 1973-90</td>
<td>Personalist</td>
<td>Military</td>
<td>Non-pluralist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia since 2002</td>
<td>Personalist</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>Pluralist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soviet Union 1956-90</td>
<td>Oligarchical-non-institutionalized</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>Non-pluralist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China since 1992</td>
<td>Oligarchical-institutionalized</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>Non-pluralist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>Monarchy</td>
<td>Court &amp; Bureaucracy</td>
<td>Pluralist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>Monarchy</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Non-pluralist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico 1920-2000</td>
<td>Oligarchical-institutionalized</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>Pluralist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burma 1990-2008</td>
<td>Oligarchical-non-institutionalized</td>
<td>Military</td>
<td>Non-pluralist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua 1936-79</td>
<td>Personalist</td>
<td>Military</td>
<td>Pluralist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland 1926-35</td>
<td>Personalist</td>
<td>Military &amp; Party</td>
<td>Pluralist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain 1881-1923</td>
<td>Oligarchical-institutionalized</td>
<td>Two parties</td>
<td>Pluralist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran 1989-</td>
<td>Oligarchical-non-institutionalized</td>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>Pluralist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 3
THE EFFECT OF LEGACY OF OPEN-OUTCOME ELECTIONS ON DEMOCRATIC SURVIVAL: QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

This chapter applies the statistical methods of research. Its main purpose is to detect associations between particular regime legacies and democratic survival. Statistical methods have been the dominant research strategy in political science in recent decades, although this situation has changed recently as an increasing number of scholars have recognized the limits of quantitative analysis. Hence, more traditional qualitative methods came again to be recognized as one of the legitimate methods of investigation. These methods have certain advantages as they allow for detection of causal processes, appropriate formulation of concepts and adequate description of cases. Still, qualitative study of a small number of cases is unable to arrive at wide-reaching generalizations. This can usually be accomplished only with statistical analysis of a large number of observations. Statistical methods also allow for detection of general empirical patterns and elimination of alternative explanations. Nevertheless, they can never prove existence of a causal relationship. In other words, because of omitted variable bias, one can never be sure whether really-existing causal patterns are hidden behind detected statistical associations.\(^1\) As mentioned, having recognized the drawbacks and advantages of both approaches, I decided to use in this dissertation the “best of both worlds” strategy, using both qualitative and quantitative methods (what is otherwise called a mixed methods approach).\(^2\) Hence, the statistical analysis performed in this chapter will be enhanced in the subsequent chapters by qualitative analysis, whose purpose will be to determine whether the detected statistical associations reflect really-existing causal processes.

---

\(^1\) Freedman 1991; Tarrow 2004.

\(^2\) Laitin and Fearon 2008; Lieberman 2005.
I devote the first section of this chapter to outline the main hypothesis of this dissertation, which states that democracies preceded by non-democratic regimes practicing open-outcome elections were more likely to survive than other democracies. The first section also ponders upon the possibility that other regime legacies, apart from the legacy of open-outcome elections, could have affected democratic stability. Subsequently, I describe statistical models which could be used to predict duration of democracy and outline the characteristics of the regression technique used in the chapter, which is logit model with cubic polynomial of time. The next section is devoted to the description of the explanatory variables and the dataset used for the statistical analysis. Subsequently, I present the results of the regression models. I decided to describe the results mostly in terms of predicted probabilities in order to increase the accessibility of the findings. The final section concludes.

**Regime Legacies Favoring Democratic Survival**

In Chapter 2 democracy was characterized as an essentialist concept. What it means in practice is that a country must meet several conditions on various political dimensions in order to be classified as democracy. One may ask, however, which of the dimensions of democracy is ontologically the most relevant? When answering this question it is important to notice, first of all, that some dimensions of democracy are nested within each other. Regimes which allow open-outcome elections to the executive are at the same time complete, yet not all complete regimes allow for such elections. On the other hand, all complete regimes are pluralist as a matter of definition, but not all pluralist regimes are complete. Hence, the possibility of alternation stands above completeness and pluralism within the ontological pyramid of the dimensions of democracy, which makes it a likely candidate for the most “essential” among those dimensions.
Nevertheless, some regimes have been alternation-permitting (that is, characterized by open-outcome elections) even though they were not democratic. This pertains to regimes which elected only the legislature (e.g. PA monarchies), regimes which were not sovereign (i.e. colonial autonomies), or regimes in which suffrage was restricted (i.e. competitive oligarchies). Otherwise, however, such regimes were very much alike democracies because they shared with the latter the most essential democratic characteristic: the practice of open-outcome elections.

Hence, building on the initial hypotheses developed in the introduction, I postulate that democracies preceded by an alternation-permitting regime should be more likely to survive than other democracies. The positive effect of pre-democratization alternation-permitting regime will also depend, obviously, on the length of such a regime. Consequently, I hypothesize that other regime legacies, apart from the legacy of open-outcome elections, will not enhance the chances of survival of once-established democracies; even if such pre-democratization regimes met some of the necessary conditions of democracy (for example, permitted pluralist, but fraudulent elections).

The main hypothesis of this dissertation, according to which democracy is the most likely to survive in the countries which, before they democratized, resembled democracies to the largest extent (i.e. non-democratic regimes with open-outcome elections), might not strike the reader as particularly revealing. The problem is that no existing large-n statistical study on democratic survival has been devoted to test this hypothesis, and a definitive list of non-democratic regimes alternation-permitting regimes has not been compiled. Hence, the results of the existing quantitative studies on democratic stability might as well be misleading. For example, I hypothesize that the British colonial experience did not have a positive effect on democracy per se, but mostly through the fact that the British established colonial autonomies in
some of their dependencies for reasonable periods of time. The British established such regimes both in their settler and non-settler colonies, although they were much more willing to do so in the former. In any case, once the regime type is controlled for, the positive effect of the British colonial experience on democratic survival could as well be much smaller. As mentioned in the introduction, I hypothesize, however, that the positive effect of pre-democratization alternation-permitting regime on democratic survival might disappear if democratization is accompanied by a regime discontinuity, which could take a form of a military coup or a popular uprising. There are various ways in which regime discontinuity could nullify the beneficial effect of open-outcome elections. If the previous regime was considered legitimate by a large part of the population, but was abolished in order to introduce democracy, the newly-established democracy could be considered as lacking legitimacy and hence functioning under a high risk of breakdown (as Weimar Germany did). Otherwise, if a democracy was abolished through a regime discontinuity and subsequently reestablished, the newly-established democracy would function under a high risk of yet another regime discontinuity (as happened in Chile regarding the democracy established in 1933). This would result from ready availability of patterns of anti-democratic action.

Regarding the effect of other historical legacies on democratic stability, at this stage I have no clear theoretical expectations. The previous experience of democratic breakdowns might increase the probability of a next democratic breakdown, as it provides for repertoires of political actions which could be used to abolish democracy. Yet, this negative effect might be diminished through simultaneous positive effect of previous attempts at democratization; in other words, political actors could learn from the mistakes of the past. It is also possible that the pre-democratic legacies of executive coups and military coups affect the probability of democratic
breakdown in different ways. Whether this is the case will be established empirically; yet, I have no theoretical reasons to expect that the legacy of executive coups is more favorable to democratic survival in comparison to the legacy of military coups. On the other hand, I suppose that a legacy of military coups will increase the probability of military coups in general and in the same way, the legacy of executive coups will increase the probability of executive coups, but these effects will pertain to all types of regimes, not only democracies. This particular problem is also beyond the scope of this project.

Before moving to the statistical analysis, the reader might want to visualize the prevalence of non-democratic alternation-permitting regimes throughout history. The list of such regimes is provided online (at http://goo.gl/NcCwAu), while Figures 1-1 and 1-2 in this chapter depict the historical frequency of alternation-permitting regimes after 1789, when coding of the BDD project starts. The figures reveal similar patterns as the “global trends in governance” graph, which shows the number of autocracies, “anocracies” and autocracies since 1800 as classified by the Polity IV project. In the context of the BDD classification, anocracies roughly correspond to competitive oligarchies and “other pluralist regimes”, while polities classified by Polity IV as autocracies correspond to absolute monarchies, PA monarchies and non-pluralist republics. The difference is that in contrast to Polity IV, BDD project provides precise definitions of these basic regime types (see Chapter 2). As seen on Figures 1-1 and 1-2, the political history after 1789 was characterized by gradual disappearance of non-pluralist hereditary monarchies, which were the default regime type as of 1800. Instead, they were gradually replaced by regimes which aimed to implement or at least pretended to implement the Western idea of popular representation. Such regimes were first established in a large number when American colonies achieved independence in the first half of the nineteenth century and
during the liberalizing movement in Germany in 1819-20. Otherwise, the nineteenth century was characterized by relative importance of PA monarchies and competitive monarchies, which were in principle a transitional regime form between absolute monarchy and democracy.

Still, the efforts to establish democracies in numerous Latin American and European countries failed. Hence, the late nineteenth century was also characterized by wide prevalence of “other pluralist regimes,” most of them nowadays labelled as competitive authoritarianisms. These regimes organized closed-outcome but pluralist elections, in this way paying a lip service to the idea of popular representation, or “pretending to be democratic”. The number of such regimes reached 44% in the 1880s, whereas it has oscillated only at about 20% after the end of the Cold War. Most of “other pluralist regimes” were in fact not personal dictatorships, but implemented various forms of institutionalized rules of succession, which could either take place within one political party (as in Colombia in 1863-1905) or as an exchange between two political parties (as in Spain in 1881-1923). Hence, contrary to some claims, hybrid regimes, which mix autocratic and democratic characteristics, are not a new phenomenon; indeed, they are a regime form characterized by a long “tradition” dating back to the Directory period of the First French Republic (1795-1799).

As noticed by Boix and as visible in Figures 1-1 and 1-2, the prevalence of democracy as a regime type depended on the character of international environment. During the periods of hegemony of democratic powers, the percentage of democracies rose, and it diminished when the influence of non-democratic powers was on the rise. The victory of democratic powers in WWI
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3 Levitsky and Way 2002; 2010. In the nineteenth century, two types of other pluralist regimes predominated: republics (mostly in Latin America) and monarchies with the chief executive being a prime minister indirectly elected in pluralist but closed-outcome elections (as in Italy, Spain or Romania). The latter type would also likely be classified as competitive authoritarianism by Levitsky and Way, but given that few such regime types existed after 1945, one can only speculate.

4 Boix 2011.
increased the percentage of democracies from 34% in 1914 to 46% in 1922. The wave of democratic breakdowns in the 1930s was associated with the rise of Nazi Germany, which resulted in a decrease in the percentage of democracies to 24% in 1938. The victory of the United States created a pro-democratic environment after the end of WWII, and the percentage of democracies increased to 49% in 1946. It gradually fell to 26% in 1976, the fact associated with growing influence of the USSR, the support given by the US to allied dictatorships during the Cold War, and the failure of democracy in most countries which reached independence in the 1960s.

Moreover, the Cold War was characterized by wide prevalence of non-pluralist republics (which exceeded 50% of all regimes in the 1970s). The popularity of this regime type was associated not only with the Soviet influence, but also with the availability of the ideological framework of a one-party state provided by Communist and Fascist ideologies. Contrasting, before WWI the percentage of non-pluralist republics did not exceed 10% of all regimes. Non-pluralist republics became again rare after the Cold War. In this period, which was characterized by US hegemony and growing importance of the European Union, the number of democracies rose sharply again, reaching the maximum of 65% in 2012. These long-term trends clearly indicate that democracy, sooner or later, is poised to become the default regime form, similarly to hereditary non-pluralist monarchy before the French and American revolutions.

The Statistical Model

Because the interest of the dissertation lies in estimation of how explanatory variables affect duration of democracy, the nature of the data makes necessary the application of event history analysis. Moreover, the analyzed data are of binary time-series cross-sectional (BTSCS) form, as many variables, such as GDP per capita or economic growth, change their values over time. Several models might be used to perform duration analysis on BTSCS data. These models
might be roughly divided into semi-parametric and parametric duration models.\(^5\) In this regard, the former are usually more preferable than the latter, as the semi-parametric do not assume a hazard ratio, but calculate it basing on the data. Among the semi-parametric models which permit time-varying covariates, one of the most popular is Cox duration model. Yet, this model adopts the proportional hazard assumption, which is unfortunately frequently violated. To address this problem, several alternatives have been specified, which similarly to the Cox model take into account the effect of time on the outcome variable.

Carter and Signorino\(^6\) discuss logit models with duration dependence, which are very similar to duration models. These include complementary log-log model (a logit model with fixed effects in the form of time dummies), logit models with splines, and finally logit model with cubic polynomial of time (later CPT logit). All these models, in contrast to a simple logistic regression, account for temporal dependence of data. The authors determined through Monte Carlo simulations how various logit models with duration dependence perform in terms of modeling hazard ratios. Regarding this task, they found that logit with splines and CPT logit outperform logit with time dummies, but CPT logit is much easier to apply and interpret than logit with splines. CPT logit can also be interpreted intuitively as it enables calculation of probability of democratic breakdown in a given year and the cumulative probability of breakdown. Because of these advantages I use CPT logit as the principal statistical model in this chapter, but I also conduct a robustness checks using the Cox semi-parametric model on the same dataset.

\(^5\) See Box-Steppensmeier and Jones 2005 for overview.

\(^6\) Carter and Signorino 2010.
CPT logit is quite simple to apply. The process consists of including variables of time (t), time squared (t²) and time cubed (t³) in regression models; in my case this is the time since democratization for each particular year when a country was democratic. If the largest value of time is big (in case of BDD dataset it is 221 years), the time variables can be rescaled through division by 100 or 1000 to facilitate interpretation. CPT logit also includes the possibility of modeling of non-proportional hazard. This takes place through inclusion of interaction terms between the time variables and particular explanatory variables. Subsequently, likelihood-ratio tests comparing the extended and nested models should be conducted to determine if the extended model improves upon the nested (simple) model. If there is no improvement, a simple model, which assumes proportional hazards, should be used.

In case of BTSCS data, the recent trend in political science is to include country and year fixed effects in regression models. Applying fixed effects involves imputing into the dataset dummy variables for each particular country and year. This way, country- or year-specific measured and unmeasured variables are controlled for. This approach has one big disadvantage, however: it excludes from the analysis all variables whose values do not change within a particular country or a particular year. For that reason, I could not include fixed effects in the regression models because if I did, I would not be able to detect the effect of pre-democratic regime type or regime discontinuities (legacy variables) on the probability of democratic breakdown. This is because the values of these variables do not change within a particular democratic episode, and numerous countries had only one democratic episode.

---

7 Signorino and Carter 2010, 282-83, 289.
Explanatory Variables

The explanatory variables included in the following statistical models may be divided into two types. Legacy variables (or pre-democratization regime characteristics) have the same value for each observation in each democratic episode. Moreover, some of these variables are nested within each other. All alternation-permitting regimes are pluralist as a matter of definition (and some of them might be also complete), although obviously not all pluralist regimes are alternation-permitting or complete. Consequently, to identify the independent effect of each regime characteristic on democratic breakdown, I included the following regime characteristic in the regression models: Length (in years) of pre-democratization periods of open-outcome elections,\(^9\) completeness (that is, completeness and pluralism without open-outcome elections), and pluralism (that is, pluralism without completeness or open-outcome elections).\(^{10}\) As well, I conducted additional tests to determine if the effect of periods of open-outcome elections on subsequent democratic survival depended on the scope of suffrage and possible completeness (i.e. freely-elected executive in addition to the legislature) during such periods. I also included interaction terms of the legacy variables with time variables to determine if their effect changes over time. Because the legacies of open-outcome elections, pluralism and completeness are at the same necessary conditions of democracy, I expect that their experience before democratization will help democratic survival. However, due to the ontological reasons already discussed, experience of open-outcome elections will likely have a much stronger pro-democratic effect in comparison to the other legacies. In the regression models I also included dummies for democratic periods preceded by regime discontinuities, executive and monarchical coups,

\(^9\) A regime with open-outcome elections could be democracy, competitive oligarchy, PA monarchy, PA republic or colonial autonomy.

\(^{10}\) The length of a period which started and terminated in the same calendar year was assumed to last 0.5 years.
closed-outcome (fraudulent) but pluralist election (Fraud), and one-party (non-pluralist) elections. I expect that the legacy of all these events could have a negative effect on the probability of democratic survival. Such legacies could provide a ready repertoire of anti-democratic political behavior, which could be used by actors aiming to abolish democracy.

Regarding the measurement of legacy variables, open-outcome elections, completeness and pluralism, as well as other regime legacies, were counted if they terminated no longer than twenty years before democratization. For example, Guinea-Bissau democratized in 2005. Within 20-year time horizon preceding the 2005 democratization, it had experienced two periods of open-outcome elections: 1994-1999 and 2000-2003, one-party elections in 1989 and regime discontinuities (military coups) in 1999 and 2003. Hence, the democratic period which started in 2005 was preceded by eight years of open-outcome elections, and the democratic period which started in 2000 was preceded by five years of open-outcome elections. To increase confidence in the findings, additional models were computed with application of shorter, 10-year time horizons for legacy variables.

Apart from the aforementioned variables measuring political legacies, which derive from the BDD dataset, the quantitative analysis also includes several control variables which have been found to affect democratic breakdown. In this regard, an extensive body of research determined the positive effect of economic development on democratic survival. As well, it was found that democratic breakdowns happen more often during economic recessions. Given these findings, I included GDP per capita (income) and real GDP Growth in the regression models.

---

Data for GDP per capita come from the Gapminder Foundation.\textsuperscript{12} Gapminder provides GDP estimates measured every ten years or even more rarely regarding some countries, so I had to impute data to estimate GDP level during some democratic spells. Obviously, regarding democratic country-periods for which GDP estimates were provided in 10-year increments it is not possible to calculate economic growth. Hence, separate regression models are computed with this variable included.

Following Boix,\textsuperscript{13} who detected a strong effect of international environment on mean level of democracy, I suspected that this variable could similarly affect the probability of democratic breakdown. I generally followed Boix’s coding of the variable with some minor changes. Still, as an alternative measure of international environment I also applied the percentage of democracies in a given year in the world (percent democratic). In his original paper, Boix coded international environment as either strongly anti-democratic (-2), anti-democratic (-1), neutral (0), or pro-democratic (1). Because few democratic periods fell under the strongly anti-democratic category, I merged the two lowest categories. I also recoded this variable from ordinal to categorical, with neutral international environment being the omitted category in the regression models. In my view, this factor operated differently in different regions of the world. In the Americas, I coded international environment as neutral before 1944, pro-democratic in 1945-52, anti-democratic in 1953-60, pro-democratic in 1961-68, anti-democratic in 1969-76, and pro-democratic after 1977. This was motivated by the fact that European powers had very limited influence over the politics in the region, and during the Cold War the political dynamics there was strongly affected by policies of the respective US

\textsuperscript{12} Gapminder Foundation (http://www.gapminder.org/data/) uses mostly data from Maddison 2006 to estimate GDP and additional sources to cover countries omitted by Maddison.

\textsuperscript{13} Boix 2011.
administrations. During this period, Democratic administrations were supportive of democracies and Republican administrations were supportive of friendly dictatorships, while the Reagan administration also adopted a pro-democratic attitude.

In Europe international environment was coded as anti-democratic before 1849, neutral in 1849-1932, anti-democratic in 1933-44, and pro-democratic after 1945 regarding the NATO members. The negative coding before 1849 reflects anti-democratic attitudes of the leading powers of the era united in the Holy Alliance, which organized numerous interventions against liberalizing regimes (e.g. French intervention in Spain in 1823 or Russian intervention in Hungary in 1849). The coding changed to neutral after the Spring of Nations in 1849, which reflected the fact that several liberal states were established in the period and no particular regime type came to be preferred by great powers. Subsequently, international environment became again unfavorable to democracy due to the influence of Nazi Germany after 1933. Finally, pro-democratic pressures characterized NATO members in Western Europe already since 1945. The rest of the world was coded as neutral on international environment till 1944, anti-democratic in 1945-87 and pro-democratic after 1988. In this case, pro-democratic pressures were visible only since the end of the Cold War in 1988, after the USSR stopped supporting its client states, and Western donors launched a policy of aid conditionality.

Regarding the relationship between various colonial backgrounds and democratic survival, the extant research points to the positive but relatively small effect of the British colonial legacy.\textsuperscript{14} On the other hand, Spanish and French backgrounds were shown to have a negative effect on democracy.\textsuperscript{15} Hence, I controlled for colonial legacies in the regression


\textsuperscript{15} Bernhard, Reenock, and Nordstrom 2004.
models. In this I distinguished between periods of democracy directly initiated by a particular colonizer (captured by dummies for “colonies”) and periods of democracy of former colonies not initiated directly by colonizers (captured by dummies for “colonial backgrounds”). So, for example, during its first period of democracy (1958-61) the Republic of Congo was coded as French colony because it was left independent by the French as a democracy. Its subsequent period of democracy (1992-97) was coded as characterized by French colonial background. Following the previous findings, I expected that the British colonial legacy would positively affect democratic survival, but the effect of this variable would significantly diminish once pre-democratic regime type is included in the analysis. I predicted that other colonial legacies would not increase the probability of democratic survival in comparison to the British legacy because among the colonizers only the British adopted policies which favored the growth of free press and civil society, which later helped post-colonial democracies survive.

I also decided to control for the effect of ethnic diversity on democratic survival given the popularity of theoretical propositions according to which the former factor hampered democratic consolidation.\footnote{E.g. Horowitz 1985; Lijphart 1977; Przeworski 1991.} Regarding the influence of this variable, until recently the most frequent approach was to include the index of linguistic fractionalization as a measure of ethnic diversity in regression models. If treated this way, ethnic diversity was found to influence democratic survival in a negative way, but the detected effect was small.\footnote{See e.g. Bernhard, Reenock, and Nordstrom 2004; Przeworski, Cheibub and Limongi 1998.} Yet, the index of linguistic fractionalization has been criticized on two basic grounds: it does not take into account the fact that the majority of ethnic divisions do not become politically activated, and it ignores non-linguistic sources of ethnic differences.\footnote{Wimmer, Cederman, and Min 2009, 318.}
To address these deficiencies, Cederman et al.\textsuperscript{19} compiled Ethnic Power Relations (EPR) dataset, which includes several indicators of politically relevant ethnic relations. Among those, the percentage of population excluded from executive power in a country (exclpop, or Excluded Population) has consistently emerged in several publications as the most significant predictor of ethnic conflict outbreak.\textsuperscript{20} Consequently, instead of the linguistic fractionalization index, I decided to use the latter variable as a measure of politically-relevant ethnic divisions. Unfortunately, the EPR project covers only the period after 1945. For that reason, I could not include excluded population in the main regression models as it would significantly decrease the overall number of observations. In consequence, I computed a separate model with this variable included. I generally hypothesize that as the percentage of the population excluded from access to power increases, so will increase the grievances of those groups, which will raise not only the risk of ethnic conflict, but also the probability of democratic breakdown. In other words, democracies with a large number of people excluded from power on ethnic grounds will be less sustainable than other democracies.

As additional controls I included number of previous attempts at democracy plain and squared (democratic attempts), a variable indicating a legacy of racial disenfranchisement (racial disenfranchisement), scope of suffrage during a democratic period in a given year (suffrage), scope of women’s suffrage, dummy for democracies established in British settler colonies (immigrant), and time variables (plain, squared and cubic). Previous attempts at democracy might or might not increase the risk of democratic breakdown, as discussed in the introductory part of the chapter. Democratization after a period of racial disenfranchisement entailed

\textsuperscript{19} Cederman et al. 2009.

\textsuperscript{20} Wimmer, Cederman, and Min 2009; Cederman, Min, and Wimmer 2010.
replacement of the white elite by indigenous elite which had not participated in the electoral politics under restricted suffrage; hence the new leaders’ commitment to democratic values could be in doubt. Consequently, I expected that democracies established after a period of racial disenfranchisement would be more prone to breakdown. On the other hand, I predicted that former settler colonies should enjoy more sustainable democracies because they were inhabited by immigrants who had participated in electoral politics at home. I also decided to include the scope of suffrage as a predictor given the Dahl’s observation\textsuperscript{21} that democracies which evolved from competitive oligarchies were less prone to breakdown than other democracies. As a result, democracies with restricted male suffrage could be more sustainable than other democracies. I mostly included women’s suffrage given the expectation that lack of inclusion of this variable would draw criticism from Feminist-influenced scholars. On the other hand, the time variables were included in order to detect if the risk of democratic breakdown diminished solely as a result of the passing time. Because this relationship could be either linear or curvilinear, the terms for squared and cubed time were added.

Finally, I did not include presidentialism or trade openness as predictors of democratic survival in the following regression models because nearly all recent studies did not detect a significant effect of these variables on democratic breakdown.\textsuperscript{22} As well, I could not control for income inequality in this chapter, even though it has been theorized to affect democratic survival, because data on this variable were not available for the period before 1978. In the light available qualitative sources on the subject, I consider a widely-used dataset by Vanhanen as an unreliable

\textsuperscript{21} Dahl 1971, chap. 3.

\textsuperscript{22} E.g. Reenock, Bernhard, and Sobek 2007; Cheibub 2007.
indicator.²³ Vanhanen’s data have frequently been used as a proxy for income inequality in pre-industrial societies, with higher percentage of family farms indicating lower inequality. This dataset has serious problems, however. First of all, data on the percentage of family farms in several countries provided by Vanhanen are contradicted by statistics on the matter provided in historical sources. Moreover, the measure itself is misleading given that in several regions of the world there have been other forms of land ownership, other than family farms, characterized by high equality of land distribution.

Take, for example, one region: Balkans in the late nineteenth century. Vanhanen gives the following percentages of family farms there: Bulgaria 1908 – 52%, Greece 1868 – 35%, Romania 1888 – 26%, Hungary 1878 – 39% (first dates available). On the other hand, historical sources give the following percentages of the land in holdings larger than 50 hectares: Bulgaria 1879 – 7%, Romania 1859 – 51%, Hungary 1867 – 48%, while Greece is characterized as overwhelmingly dominated by family farms with no quantitative statistics available.²⁴ To give another example, nearly all countries in Sub-Saharan Africa supposedly have 20% or 25% of family farms according to Vanhanen. It is hard to say where these numbers come from and why only two values characterize nearly all the countries in the region. In fact, the percentage of family farms in Sub-Saharan Africa has been probably even lower, but in spite of this the pattern of land distribution has been relatively equal given that most land has been owned collectively by farmers.²⁵ A finer measure of landholding inequality is necessary to arrive at this conclusion, however.

²⁴ Janos 1982, 85, 295; Lampe and Jackson 1982, 185; Sugar, Hanak, and Frank 1990, 238.
²⁵ See e.g. Griffin, Khan, and Ickowitz 2002, 293.
Democratic Survival Dataset

The dataset used to compute CPT logit models predicting democratic survival forms a subset of the BDD dataset with only democratic country-years included (the file, which also contains data for replication analyses is available to download at http://goo.gl/FCMnVW). It features 135 countries which have ever democratized and experienced altogether 318 democratic episodes. Included were democratic periods of countries which counted at least 500,000 inhabitants as of 2000. The first year covered was 1789, when the government of the United States was established. This yielded 5400 country-years, which encompassed 28% of the BDD dataset (in other words, 28% of country-years in the BDD dataset were democratic).

The dependent variable is democratic breakdown in a given year. There were 202 instances of democratic breakdowns recorded. Generally, breakdown was coded when a country stopped meeting one of the necessary conditions of democracy. These included such events as introductions of one-party states, undemocratic (closed-outcome) elections, regime discontinuities (through military coup or a popular uprising), executive coups, or state disintegrations (these are more thoroughly explained in Chapter 2). Among the types of democratic breakdowns, 49% were military coups, 23% closed-outcome elections, 13% executive coups, 7% introductions of one-party states, 5% monarchical coups, and only 2% civilian popular uprisings. The correlations between the type of breakdown and legacies of particular political events are shown in Table 3-1. One should note that the percentages exceed 200% because most democratic episodes were preceded by various types of legacies. These correlations were calculated given the observation that a democracy may die, let’s say, as a result of a military coup, but otherwise military coups could terminate various types of regimes. Nevertheless, once a military coup occurs in a country, it may increase the risk of military coups in the future, including the risk of democracy-terminating military coups.
The correlations in Table 3-1 show that legacies of some political events did influence the form of democratic breakdown, although the relationships were not strong. In particular, just 46% of democratic breakdowns occurred in countries characterized by a legacy of military coups, but 70% of democratic breakdowns which took the form of military coups occurred in countries characterized by this legacy. Hence, legacy of a military coup increased the risk that a democracy would be abolished by a military coup (but, as it will be shown, it did not increase the risk of democratic breakdown on its own). Legacy of monarchical coups was also a very strong predictor of future monarchical coups. The same was true about democracy-terminating popular uprisings: they were likely only in countries which experienced similar events in the past; although otherwise a popular uprising was a very rare form of democratic breakdown (nearly all popular uprising resulting in a regime transition terminated non-democratic regimes). Still, democracy-terminating fraudulent elections, executive coups and introductions of one-party states were not more likely in countries characterized by legacies of such events. One should note, moreover, that the last form of democratic breakdown was particularly popular in countries characterized by legacies of colonial or imperial rule (most of the cases occurred in Sub-Saharan Africa after decolonization). Indeed, most post-colonial democracies were not abolished in military coups, but by the elected rulers themselves: either through fraudulent elections or through introduction of one-party states.

The prevalence of democratic breakdown after 1810 is shown in Figure 3-1. One could conclude that the rate of breakdown was associated with the character of the international environment. The first democracies which ever emerged faced a very high risk of breakdown, as they had to tackle anti-democratic policies of the great powers before the Spring of Nations. After 1848 the prevalence of breakdown diminished rapidly, however. Subsequently, the periods
of frequent democratic breakdown were the Great Depression in the 1930s and the height of the Cold War in the 1960s and 1970s, when numerous post-colonial democracies collapsed. After the end of the Cold War, the incidence of democratic breakdown decreased to the lowest historical levels.

One should note that for the purpose of regression analysis, I did not treat as democratic breakdowns foreign invasions aka exogenous regime discontinuities as a result of which a democratic government was abolished (for example, Georgia in 1921 or Belgium in 1940); periods of democracy interrupted by exogenous discontinuities were in consequence treated as continuous unless the interruption was longer than ten years. Otherwise, the length of an average democratic period was 6.2 years, and the oldest democracy to have broken down was 40 years old (Chile in 1973). As of 2012, there existed 87 democracies out of 162 countries in the dataset.

Descriptive statistics of the explanatory variables are presented in Table 3-2. Table 3-3 presents simple associations between explanatory variable and democratic survival. These tables show that legacy of an alternation-permitting regime was indeed associated with democratic survival: democracies which broke down were on average preceded by 8.8 years of an alternation-permitting regime, whereas democracies which survived were preceded by 36.1 years of alternation-permitting regime. Otherwise, as expected, democratic survival was positively associated with GDP per capita, economic growth, age of democracy, settlement by immigrants from democracies, pro-democratic international environment, and dummy for being colonized by the British. Political exclusion on ethnic grounds, regime discontinuities, executive coups and electoral fraud, along with dummies for French colony, French colonial background and Spanish colonial background were negatively associated with democratic survival, while other variables seemed to have a marginal effect.
Results of Regression Models

The basic results of CPT logit models are outlined in Table 3-4. Six models are presented. Models 1 and 4 are basic models without interaction effects. At the same time, Models 1, 2, 4 and 5 include democratic spells only while Models 3 and 6 include spells of democracy and competitive oligarchy (that is, competitive oligarchy and democracy is treated as one type of polity in those models). Models 1, 2 and 3 adopt a 10-year time horizon for legacy variables while Models 4, 5 and 6 adopt a 20-year time horizon. Models 2, 3, 5 and 6 exclude all the control variables which were not shown to improve fit according to the results of Bayesian information criterion (BIC) tests. However, all model versions are presented in Appendix B to the dissertation (Tables B-1 and B-2). Models in Table B-1 apply a 20-year time horizon while models in Table B-3 apply a 10-year time horizon for legacy variables. The results were quite similar regardless of the time horizon, however.

Those indicate that the main legacy variables of interest, length of open-outcome elections before democratization, had a very strong effect on the probability of democratic breakdown. Still, as indicated in Table 3-4 by a highly significant interaction term between open-outcome elections and discontinuity, the effect of open-outcome elections disappeared if a democracy was preceded by a discontinuity (a coup or popular uprising resulting in a regime transition). Consequently, the probability of breakdown of those democracies which were not preceded by open-outcome elections (97 democratic spells) was as high as those which were preceded by both open-outcome elections and a discontinuity (119 democratic spells). Indeed, those first-time democracies which had been preceded by a long period of open-outcome elections but which had also experienced a discontinuity ultimately collapsed (France after 1848, Chile after 1915, Germany after 1919), while those which had experienced a long period of open-outcome elections and no discontinuity usually survived (e.g. United Kingdom, India,
Belgium or the Netherlands). As already elaborated, discontinuities nullified the positive effect of open-outcome elections because they either undermined the legitimacy of new democratic regimes or created political opportunities for new political actors, who did not belong to pre-democratization elites and for that reason were not committed to democratic norms and procedures. However, pre-democratization discontinuities did not affect the probability of breakdown independently as indicated by insignificant coefficients for this variable in the models. Discontinuity was significant only through its interaction effects with open-outcome elections. The BDD dataset distinguished between two types of discontinuities – military coups and popular uprisings. Yet, BIC statistics showed that inclusion of both types of discontinuities (military coups and popular uprisings) was not warranted. Better fit was achieved if these two variables were combined into a single variable.

BIC tests also indicated better fit of those models which did not distinguish between periods of open-outcome elections characterized by completeness (i.e. those in which both executive and legislature were elected) and the periods of open-outcome elections in which only the legislature was elected. As well, those models which distinguished between periods of open-outcome elections under independent states and colonies were shown to have worse fit (they are shown in Table B-5 in Appendix B to the dissertation; note the insignificant interaction term between open-outcome elections and colony). In other words, the practice of open-outcome elections before democratization had a similarly positive effect on democratic survival regardless of whether these were elections both to the executive and the legislature, or only to the legislature, and whether they occurred under colonial autonomy, PA monarchy or competitive oligarchy. I also interacted periods of open-outcome elections with scope of suffrage experienced during such periods, time variables and dummy for secession (which was coded as “1” if a
country had experienced a period of open-outcome elections as a part of another country, as Ireland did for example). All these interactions were substantially and statistically insignificant (results are shown in Table B-6 in Appendix B to the dissertation). In consequence, one can conclude that the effect of the periods of open-outcome elections had similarly negative effect on the probability of democratic breakdown regardless of the scope of suffrage during such periods, and regardless of whether they were experienced as a part of another country or not. Given the insignificant interaction between time variables and open-outcome elections, one could moreover conclude the effect of open-outcome elections did not diminish as democracies aged. To put it differently, the legacies of open-outcome elections and its interaction with discontinuity lasted for the entire length of democratic episodes. This result is quite surprising and difficult to interpret. It might be the case that legacies of open-outcome elections were indeed extremely long-lasting. Otherwise, one could conclude that democracies preceded by long periods of open-outcome elections started their lives already as consolidated democracies – which were immune to breakdown - and this immunity had resulted from the experience of such elections. As democracies preceded by long periods of open-outcome elections aged, such periods became distant historical memories, but their positive legacy in the form of “immunity to breakdown” persisted. From this point of view, the effect of open-outcome elections may be compared to the effect of a vaccine applied early in life of a patient.

Open-outcome elections also did not affect democratic survival positively if they were characterized by racially-based disenfranchisement (as indicated by the substantial significance of the variable “racial disenfranchisement”). In practice, the legacy of racial disenfranchisement applied to three cases only: Zimbabwe (democracy collapsed in 1985), Namibia and South Africa (survived as of 2013). In all fairness, one should admit that this variable would be
meaningless if democracy had survived in Zimbabwe. In this situation it would be excluded from the regression model given that all democracies established after a period of racial disenfranchisement would survive. As a consequence, the observation “Zimbabwe 1985” is the most influential in the dataset; in fact, it is almost five times more influential than the second observation on the influence scale. Nevertheless, I would argue that high significance of racial disenfranchisement reflects the qualitatively different form of democratization of racial comparative oligarchies in comparison to non-racial competitive oligarchies. In the former case, democratization through extension of suffrage entailed elite replacement. Entirely new parties came to power as a result of the first elections under universal suffrage in Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa (ZANU-PF, SWAPO and ANC), while parties representing the previously-dominant white minorities were unable to obtain votes of their non-co-ethnics and became marginalized. In this situation, the support for democratic norms and values among new majority elites could not be taken for granted and indeed, it turned out dubious in case of the ZANU-PF leadership. Therefore, one could argue that survival of democracy in Namibia and South Africa after 1990 was helped mostly by pro-democratic international environment and relative wealth of those countries, while the legacy of open-outcome elections from the period of racial oligarchy played a much smaller role. However, another factor might have played a role undermining the democratic prospects of Zimbabwe. In the latter country the scope of participation during the racial oligarchy was much smaller than in Namibia and South Africa (3-4% v. app. 12% and 15%, respectively). This could have resulted, in case of Zimbabwe, in smaller extent to which democratic norms came to be habituated by the disenfranchised majority.

---

26 As indicated by the Pregibon’s influence statistic (STATA command predict cook, db)
In contrast to racial competitive oligarchies, democratization of non-racial competitive oligarchies entailed mostly elite continuity, and not replacement. In non-racial competitive oligarchies, the same parties, which managed to obtain support of the newly-enfranchised social groups, played a dominant role before and after the extension of suffrage. These were, for example, the Catholic and Liberal parties in Belgium, Conservative and Liberal parties in Britain, or Liberal Democratic, Catholic and Anti-Revolutionary parties in the Netherlands. The only new political party, which emerged on the political scene after the extension of suffrage, were the Social Democrats, but they formed their first governments several decades later. Hence, the pre-democratization elites, who had already become committed to democratic values and practices, could play a dominant role also after democratization. Obviously, elite continuity in this case was facilitated by the fact that in Europe suffrage restrictions had been based on income and not ethnic-racial distinctions.

Otherwise, the results of the regression models showed that competitive oligarchies, if they were not preceded by a PA monarchy (or, which was historically rare, colonial autonomy) were as prone to breakdown as democracies. This was indicated by statistical and substantial insignificance of the suffrage variable. To put it differently, the pre-democratization experience of competitive oligarchy was beneficial for survival of democracy, but all competitive oligarchies which transitioned to self-sustaining democracies were themselves preceded by long periods of PA monarchy. For example, Dutch competitive oligarchy (1848-1897), which transitioned to democracy in 1897, was preceded by a PA monarchy in the period 1815-1848. Swedish competitive oligarchy (1905-11), which transitioned to democracy in 1911, was preceded by a PA monarchy in the period 1866-1905. On the other hand, competitive oligarchies
in Bolivia (1880-1888) or Romania (1866-67) collapsed as they had not been preceded by a PA monarchy, or the period of PA monarchy was very short.

Regarding other legacy variables, BIC statistic used to compare the nested models gave strong indication that their inclusion did not improve the models’ fit. This pertained, first of all, to pluralism and completeness. Hence, the practice of pluralist but closed-outcome elections before democratization did not increase democratic stability. In addition, (legacies of) one-party elections, electoral fraud, executive coups, colonial backgrounds and democratizations by particular colonizers were shown not to improve the fit. The models’ fit was also not improved by inclusion of time variables (ordinary, squared and cubic). One could then conclude that the probability of democratic breakdown was not affected by the age of a democracy. Some democracies have indeed functioned in a consolidated form (i.e. they have been immune to breakdown). But this did not result from their age, but rather from the effect of particular explanatory variables (legacy of pre-democratization open-outcome elections, affluence, or pro-democratic international environment). Hence, if a rich democracy suddenly becomes poor, or in case of a change of international environment, even apparently consolidated democracies could become prone to breakdown again (which was seen in such cases as contemporary Venezuela or Chile in the 1970s). Only legacy of open-outcome elections results in democratic consolidation in the true sense of the term.

Among legacy variables, the only factor apart from open-outcome elections which positively affected democratic survival was British colony. This variable encompassed democratic spells established directly by the British (e.g. Ghana 1957-60). Contrary to my theoretical expectations, although colonies left as democracies by the British were more likely to survive than other post-colonial democracies also because they were preceded by longer periods
of colonial autonomy, the effect of being democratized by the British had an additional positive effect on democratic survival. Holding other variables constant at their means, the yearly probability of survival of democracies established by the British was twice larger in comparison to other democracies. This effect, however, disappeared at the subsequent instances of democratization of the former British colonies, as shown by the insignificant coefficient for British background.

Regarding the effect of other variables, the results of the regression models also provided further confirmation of the existence of some empirical relationships already identified in the literature. This pertained to the effect of income per capita, economic growth and international environment on democratic survival. In addition, the model with competitive oligarchies and democracies treated as one polity (Table 3-4, Model 6) showed the positive effect of British settler colonies on democratic survival even after controlling for open-outcome elections (variable “immigrant”). The models with growth included are shown in Appendix B (Table B-4); their results were otherwise nearly the same as the results of the basic models from Table 3.4. The number of observations was smaller, however, due to the fact that yearly data for GDP per capita were not available for numerous democratic country-spells.

The effect of income was particularly strong. Very rich democracies were immune to breakdown regardless of the values of other explanatory variables. Otherwise, holding other variables constant at their means, democracies characterized by mean level of income were six times less likely to break down than very poor democracies. Democracies turned out vulnerable also to economic recessions. When value of economic growth dropped from mean to minimum, the probability of breakdown increased nine times (democracies were again immune to breakdown at the highest values of this variable). A more realistic drop, similar to many real-life
recessions (let’s say from 0% to -10%) increased the probability of breakdown twice. The results also indicated that the probability of democratic survival was significantly affected by the character of international environment. A turn in international environment from anti-democratic to pro-democratic (such as occurred, for example, in 1988-89 in Africa) increased the probability of survival five-times for an otherwise average democracy.

On the other hand, the percentage of population excluded on ethnic grounds (excluded population) affected democratic survival only marginally, although negatively as predicted. Because this variable covered only the period after 1945, it could not be included in the main regression models alongside the legacy variables and income as it would significantly reduce the number of observations. Instead, I computed a separate model with this variable included (Table 3-7, Model 2). As well, the worldwide percentage of democracies did not affect democratic survival; it was insignificant once international environment was included in the models. In other words, international environment affected the rate of democratic survival and consequently the percentage of democracies in the world. Finally, one should note that the results of models with democracies only (Table 3-4, Models 2 and 5) and with democracies and competitive oligarchies treated as one polity (3 and 6) were very similar. This shows that the survival of democracies and competitive oligarchies was affected by the same set of factors. These regimes were also equally prone to breakdown regardless of the scope of suffrage and regardless if women were enfranchised (as these variables were not shown to improve the models’ fit).

In addition, because logit coefficients cannot be interpreted intuitively, I computed predicted probabilities to illustrate the impact of particular explanatory variables on democratic breakdown. Those probabilities were computed for certain values of explanatory variables (usually minimum and maximum values, while other variables were held constant at their means)
on the basis of Model 5 in Table 3-4. Regression diagnostics indicated that this model was not affected by the problem of multicollinearity; hence it could be safely interpreted.\(^{27}\) The probabilities computed on the basis of Model 5 are shown in Table 3-5 and 3-6. Table 3-5 shows predicted probabilities of democratic breakdown during a year, while Table 3-6 shows cumulative probabilities of breakdown (that is, probabilities that a democracy will die before it reaches a certain age). The cumulative probabilities were predicted for the more interesting combinations of the explanatory variables.

In Table 3.5, the first row shows the probability of breakdown in a year of a democracy not preceded by a regime discontinuity. As seen, the probability was effectively zero if such a democracy was preceded by a maximum length of open-outcome elections (in all calculations, values of other variables are held constant at their means). It rose to 0.13% for a democracy preceded by a mean length of open-outcome elections (39 years) and to 1.8% for a democracy not preceded by open-outcome elections. If a democracy was preceded both by a period of open-outcome elections and a discontinuity (row 2), the positive effect of open-outcome elections was largely reduced. The probability of breakdown of such a democracy was 0.4%, 1.1% and 1.4% if it was preceded by a maximum, mean and minimum length of open-outcome elections, respectively. Additionally, rows 3 to 6 in Table 3-5 illustrate the effect of income, international environment, British colonialism and economic growth on democratic survival. Yearly probabilities of democratic breakdown were computed for minimum, mean and maximum values of these variables, while the values of other variables were held constant at their means.

The calculations shown in Table 3-6 have two goals: first, to illustrate the survival rates of typical young democracies, which usually functioned under anti-democratic or neutral

\(^{27}\) As determined with the STATA Collin command.
Situation 1 shows a cumulative probability of breakdown of a poor democracy functioning under negative international environment. However, this democracy was preceded by a long period of open-outcome elections and no discontinuity. Hence, its probability of breakdown was very low: there is 95.4% chance that it would survive until the age of 25. Situation 2 illustrates the cumulative probability of breakdown of the same democracy as in situation 1, with one change: it was preceded by a discontinuity. In this case the probability of breakdown was much higher: there was only 17% chance that it would live until the age of 10, and 1% chance that it would live until the age of 25. In situation 3, the same democracy was preceded by no discontinuity but also by no period of open-outcome elections whatsoever. In this situation, the cumulative probability of breakdown was even higher than in situation 2: there was only 3% chance that the democracy in question would survive until the age of ten. Finally, situation 4 shows the same democracy as in situation 3, but now it functioned under a neutral international environment. In this case, the probability of survival was much higher, as there was 76% chance that the democracy in question survived until the age of ten. In addition, rows 5 to 10 in Table 3-6 depict the effect of other explanatory variables on cumulative probability of democratic breakdown: British colonialism, income and international environment. Regarding those calculations, the values of other variables were held constant at their means.

Additionally, to illustrate better the effect of open-outcome elections and regime discontinuities on the probability of democratic breakdown, I computed two graphs (based on the results of Model 5 in Table 3-4). Figure 3-2 shows how different lengths of period of open-outcome elections affected the yearly probability of breakdown of a democracy functioning
under anti-democratic international environment. Four lines were computed depending on the level of GDP (either minimal or mean) and occurrence of discontinuity before democratization. It is clearly seen that if a democracy was preceded by a very long period of open-outcome elections, it was immune to breakdown throughout its existence. On the other hand, democracies which were not preceded by periods of open-outcome elections or preceded by a period of open-outcome elections and discontinuity functioned under a very high risk of breakdown. The probabilities at high level of GDP were not computed due to a minimal probability of breakdown regardless of the length of open-outcome elections (indeed, only one democracy broke down at the level of GDP higher than the sample mean).

Figure 3-2 shows the cumulative probability of breakdown of selected really-existing democracies as they aged given the counterfactual (in some cases) assumption of democratic survival. Among those democracies, India’s democracy (democratized in 1952) was preceded by 25 years of open-outcome elections; Tanzania’s (1961) by one year, Germany’s (1919) by 69 years and discontinuity, Denmark’s (1900) by 53 years and Italy’s (1919) had not been preceded by a period of open-outcome elections. The values of GDP per capita in those countries at the first year of democratic existence were, correspondingly, 588, 681, 4058, 3769 and 3600 constant US$. Otherwise, I used the real values of GDP per capita and international environment to compute the probability of breakdown in the subsequent years. Hence, the sudden increase in the probability of breakdown of the Italian hypothetical democracy was caused, for example, by a change in international environment in 1933.

As seen, the Indian democracy’s cumulative probability of breakdown after 30 years was relatively high (60%), but it was still much lower than Tanzania’s, which reached the same cumulative probability at the age of four. The difference is explained by the fact that Tanzania
lacked a pre-democratization period of open-outcome elections. In fact, democracy in India ultimately survived, while the first Tanzanian democracy collapsed after a few years with introduction of one-party state. Germany, Denmark and Italy democratized at similar levels of GDP per capita and in contrast to Tanzania and India they initially functioned under neutral, and not anti-democratic, international environment. The Danish democracy had been preceded by a long period of PA monarchy and it consequently functioned under a very low risk of breakdown. Italy had lacked a period of open-outcome elections as it transitioned from an oligarchical system characterized by institutionalized electoral manipulation, or *transformismo*. And Germany transitioned from a PA monarchy, but the transition was accompanied by a regime discontinuity during which the monarchy was abolished. As a result, both German and Italian democracies functioned under a high risk of breakdown, and the stories of their collapse are well known.

Additionally, to determine if my quantitative results depended on the definition of democracy used in BDD, I replicated the models using the coding schemes by Polity IV, PACL (extended by Boix and Stokes 2003) and Bernhard et al. 2001. In the replications, I applied the periods of democracy as identified by these coding efforts. Obviously, Polity IV, PACL and Bernhard did not code regime types on the dimensions identified in BDD. Hence, in the replications I used BDD to code type of regime which existed before democratic spells identified by these schemes. The results are presented in Tables B-8, B-9 and B-10 in Appendix B. I also replicated the analysis using the BDD measure with exclusion of democratic spells characterized by restrictions on participation of political organizations and limited power of elected executives (Table B-2 in Appendix B). Another replication with BDD measure was done with Cox regression instead of CPT logit (Table B-7). In all instances, the results were substantively similar; the length of period of open-outcome elections and its interaction with discontinuity
were statistically significant and affected democratic breakdown in the predicted direction. This
gave strong indication that the detected effect of open-outcome elections was really-existing
empirically. It was not purely an artifact of a particular measure of regime type or a regression
method used in the chapter.

The Effect of Colonial Autonomy on Democratic Survival: Comparison to the Effect of
Other Colonial Legacies

Finally, I also computed separate regression models to compare the effect of colonial
autonomy (open-outcome elections in colonies) to the effect of other colonial legacy variables
identified in the recent literature. These models encompassed only democratic periods
experienced by former colonies. The variables in question were European settler mortality, type
of British rule (direct or indirect) and Protestant missions’ legacy (number of Protestant
missionaries in 1923, percentage of Christianized population in 1900, and duration of Protestant
missionary activities before 1960). These variables were derived from theoretical work by
Acemoglu et al., Lange, and Woodberry, respectively. According to Acemoglu et al.,\(^28\) the
prevalence of democracy in post-colonial world was associated with a territory’s feasibility for
European settlement, as measured with settler mortality rates. In the areas of their settlement,
Europeans established high-quality representative institutions, whereas in areas where they could
not settle, they established extractive institutions which inhibited growth and democratization.
An alternative argument was presented by Lange,\(^29\) who argued that in former British colonies
the prevalence of democracy was associated not with the extent of European settlement, but the
type of administrative rule. Direct rule by the British, as established in settler and plantation
colonies, was related to wider prevalence of democracy, whereas if the British rule was indirect

\(^{28}\) Acemoglu, Johnson, and Robinson 2001.

\(^{29}\) Lange 2004.
(as in most of Africa), the power of native authorities was preserved, and such authorities subsequently hampered the progress of democratization. Woodberry\(^{30}\) included both settler mortality and the type of British rule in regression models and found that the effect of these variables largely disappeared if the presence Protestant missions was controlled for. Hence, according to Woodberry, the prevalence of democracy in former colonies was associated with legacy of Protestant missionary activity. In particular, Protestant missionaries were responsible for the development of education in local languages and growth of the civil society. These factors, on the other hand, contributed to the spread of democracy at a later stage. Protestant missionary activity was the most widespread in the British colonies, but its scope was very diverse also within this group.

The results of regression model which compare the effects of colonial autonomy to the effect of other colonial legacies on democratic breakdown are show in Table 3-7 (Models 3, 4 and 5). Because the colonial legacy variables covered different countries and time periods, it was appropriate to compute several regression models with each variable included separately in addition to open-outcome elections. Consequently, models in Table 3-7 include varying subsets of democratic episodes experienced by former colonies. In addition, for the purpose of comparison I computed Model 1, which includes all democratic episodes established in former colonies (i.e. democratic episodes experienced by countries which were never colonized are not included in this model).

The models in Table 3-7 show that once open-outcome elections are included, the effect of other colonial legacy variables turns statistically insignificant, although it still goes in the predicted direction (apart from “percent evangelized in 1900” and settler mortality). As well, the

\(^{30}\) Woodberry 2004; 2012.
substantial effect of open-outcome elections was much stronger and it was statistically significant at the standard levels. In addition, Model 1 exhibits very similar results to the models which include all population of democracies (shown in Table 3-4). This indicates that the effect of open-outcome elections on democratic stability was substantially similar regardless of its institutional context (whether practiced under colonial autonomies or PA monarchies/competitive oligarchies).

One could then conclude that survival of democracy in the former colonies was primarily associated with the length of colonial autonomy, and not with the suitability of European settlement, type of British administrative rule, or the prevalence of Protestant missionary activity. Admittedly, the British were more likely to grant longer autonomies to the colonies where they practiced direct rule and where settler mortality was low; Protestant missionaries were also slightly more likely to be more active in the colonies which enjoyed autonomy. This is evidenced by negative, although relatively weak, correlations between open-outcome elections and British indirect rule and settler mortality (-0.22, -0.28), and positive correlations of open-outcome elections with Protestant legacy variables (0.1 on average).

Still, one should note that the British established long autonomies in some of their colonies characterized by high extent of indirect rule, high settler mortality and low penetration by Protestant missionaries (e.g. India). Granting of autonomous institutions by the British depended on three factors: the prevalence of European settlement (with settler colonies, such as Australia, enjoying autonomy since their establishment), the timing of colonization (colonies established before 1850 were more likely to be granted autonomy) and the type of British rule at the macro-level (protectorates, such as Swaziland or Uganda, where the least likely to enjoy long autonomies).

---

31 Model 1 in Table 3-7 also exhibits very similar results to a model which includes only periods of democracy established in countries which did not experience colonization (not shown, available upon request).
autonomies). Still, one should note that the colonial legacy variables were originally used by the respective authors to predict mean level of democracy and not the probability of democratic survival. In consequence, they still might affect the probability of democratization, although it was shown that they largely did not affect the survival of once-established democracies.

**Final Remarks**

This chapter took advantage of quantitative methods in order to test the central hypotheses of the dissertation. Its main conclusion points to the importance of political processes which occurred before a country’s democratization. I included various pre-democratization historical legacies in regression models in order to assess their effect on democratic survival. These were open-outcome elections, closed-outcome (fraudulent) elections, one-party states, military coups, popular uprisings, executive coups, the effects of being democratized by particular colonizers and the effect of various colonial backgrounds. Among those legacies, only the effect of open-outcome elections had a strong positive effect on democratic survival. Open-outcome elections were practiced before democratization in three non-democratic regime types: PA monarchies, competitive oligarchies, and colonial autonomies. The longer these regimes functioned before democratization, the higher were chances of survival of newly-established democracies. However, the effect of open-outcome elections was nullified if the process of democratization entailed forceful abolition of a non-democratic regime practicing open-outcome elections (as in Germany in 1918). In other words, a PA monarchy or competitive oligarchy needed to transform into a democracy peacefully, without an institutional breakdown, so that its positive legacy could persist. This legacy was also not present if a non-democratic regime which existed before democratization practiced racially-based suffrage restrictions (as in Zimbabwe before 1979). Otherwise, it was shown that competitive oligarchies were as prone to breakdown as democracies unless they had been preceded by long-lasting PA monarchies.
This chapter also established that in case of former colonies, the legacy of open-outcome elections (i.e. colonial autonomy) was the principal factor responsible for democratic survival. Its effect was much stronger and statistically significant in comparison to the effect of Protestant missions, type of British administrative rule, and suitability for European settlement. With few exceptions, only the British established long autonomies in some of their colonies. However, being democratized by the British also had a small positive effect on democratic survival, which was independent from the effect of colonial autonomy. Other historical legacies affected democratic survival neither positively nor negatively. This pertained to such diverse variables as particular colonial backgrounds, the length of political pluralism (i.e. the practice of multiparty, but fraudulent elections), degree of political exclusion on ethnic grounds, legacy of one-party states, and military or executive coups. Otherwise, the statistical analysis presented in this chapter confirmed the importance of certain factors for democratic survival. This was true about the level of development, international environment (whether pro- or antidemocratic), and economic growth.

The findings of this chapter give strong indications that the causal character of certain relationships could be disproved (regarding the variables which did not show substantial significance in the regression models). However, they still do not definitely prove the existence of causal relationships regarding the variables which showed substantial significance. The causal character of the relationship between open-outcome elections and democratic survival could only be convincingly determined with application of more qualitative, descriptive methods, which would trace the causal process leading from the former to the latter. The subsequent chapters are devoted to this type of analysis. They show how the practice of open-outcome elections before democratization led to the habituation of democratic norms and procedures among the elites, and
this subsequently increased the probability of democratic survival. In the following chapters, democracies characterized by legacy of open-outcome elections are also compared to otherwise similar democracies lacking this legacy in order to better illustrate the workings of the causal mechanism. The language of historical narrative used to develop this analysis will also make the remaining part of the dissertation, hopefully, more accessible to most readers.
Table 3-1. The relationship between types of democratic breakdown and legacies of political events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of breakdown</th>
<th>Military</th>
<th>PU</th>
<th>Exe. Coup</th>
<th>Mon.</th>
<th>Fraud</th>
<th>One party</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All (202)</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military (100)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU (3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exe. Coup (27)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon. Coups (11)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud (47)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One party (14)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Military – military coup, PU – popular uprising (resulting in a regime transition), Exe. Coup – executive coup, Mon. – monarchical coups (a coup organized by a monarch who was not a chief executive), Fraud – fraudulent (closed-outcome) elections, One party – introduction of a single-party state/legacy of such a state, Other – legacies of absolute monarchies or colonial/imperial rule. Legacies were measured within a 20-year time horizon before democratization.
Table 3-2. Descriptive statistics for models with BDD measure of democracy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Means for democratic spells</th>
<th>Means for all years</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open-outcome elections (years)</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluralism (years)</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completeness (years)</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP GDP per capita (thous. US$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time democratic (years)</td>
<td>29.86</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent democratic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffrage</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of previous attempts at democracy</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-dem. int. environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-dem. int. environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded population</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British colony</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French colony</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US colony</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other colony</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French background</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British background</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish background</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other background</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinuity</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive coups</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single party elections</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: In column 2, democratic spells were treated as one observation (for calculation of means of legacy variables only) with n=318. In other columns an observation was country-half-year (n=5400, n=4999 for growth). Legacy variables were measured within 20-year pre-democratization time horizon.
Table 3-3. The relationship between democratic breakdown and means of independent variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Years with no breakdown (n=5198)</th>
<th>Years with breakdown (n=202)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.-outcome elections (years)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluralism (years)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completeness (years)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP GDP per capita (thous.)</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP growth</td>
<td>-44.1</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time democratic (years)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent democratic</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffrage</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic attempts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded population</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-dem. int. environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-dem. int. environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British colony</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French colony</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US colony</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other colony</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French background</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British background</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish background</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other background</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinuity</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive coups</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-party elections</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: An observation was country-half-year (n=5400, n=4999 for growth). Legacy variables were measured within 20-year pre-democratization time horizon.
Table 3-4. Logistic regression models predicting occurrence of breakdown of democracies (models 1, 2, 4 and 5) and democracies and competitive oligarchies (models 3 and 6) in a given year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1 (Dem.)</th>
<th>Model 2 (Dem.)</th>
<th>Model 3 (D+CO)</th>
<th>Model 4 (Dem.)</th>
<th>Model 5 (Dem.)</th>
<th>Model 6 (D+CO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legacy horizon (yrs.)</td>
<td>Legacy horizon (yrs.)</td>
<td>Legacy horizon (yrs.)</td>
<td>Legacy horizon (yrs.)</td>
<td>Legacy horizon (yrs.)</td>
<td>Legacy horizon (yrs.)</td>
<td>Legacy horizon (yrs.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-outcome elections (years)</td>
<td>-0.013*</td>
<td>-0.056***</td>
<td>-0.062***</td>
<td>-0.017**</td>
<td>-0.068***</td>
<td>-0.075***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinuity</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>-0.179</td>
<td>-0.194</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>-0.258</td>
<td>-0.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial disenfranchisement (yrs)</td>
<td>0.047*</td>
<td>0.051*</td>
<td>0.058**</td>
<td>0.062**</td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP income per capita (thous. 2000 US$)</td>
<td>-0.247***</td>
<td>-0.277***</td>
<td>-0.28***</td>
<td>-0.238***</td>
<td>-0.247***</td>
<td>-0.254***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-democratic international environment</td>
<td>(0.364)</td>
<td>(0.198)</td>
<td>(0.186)</td>
<td>(0.371)</td>
<td>(0.199)</td>
<td>(0.186)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-democratic international env.</td>
<td>1.233***</td>
<td>0.796***</td>
<td>0.718***</td>
<td>1.317***</td>
<td>0.673***</td>
<td>0.635***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British colony</td>
<td>-1.181**</td>
<td>-0.905**</td>
<td>-0.791**</td>
<td>-1.358***</td>
<td>-0.92**</td>
<td>-0.789**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent democratic (and comp. oligarchy)</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffrage (% male adults)</td>
<td>2.24*</td>
<td>1.807*</td>
<td>(0.898)</td>
<td>(0.885)</td>
<td>(0.898)</td>
<td>(0.885)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s suffrage</td>
<td>-0.482</td>
<td>-0.474</td>
<td>(0.274)</td>
<td>(0.280)</td>
<td>(0.274)</td>
<td>(0.280)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French colony</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>-0.256</td>
<td>(0.404)</td>
<td>(0.407)</td>
<td>(0.404)</td>
<td>(0.407)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US colony</td>
<td>-0.177</td>
<td>-0.343</td>
<td>(0.489)</td>
<td>(0.488)</td>
<td>(0.489)</td>
<td>(0.488)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other colony</td>
<td>-0.841</td>
<td>-1.003</td>
<td>(0.591)</td>
<td>(0.600)</td>
<td>(0.591)</td>
<td>(0.600)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French background</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>-0.152</td>
<td>(0.346)</td>
<td>(0.356)</td>
<td>(0.346)</td>
<td>(0.356)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British background</td>
<td>-0.489</td>
<td>-0.648</td>
<td>(0.340)</td>
<td>(0.342)</td>
<td>(0.340)</td>
<td>(0.342)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other background</td>
<td>-0.375</td>
<td>-0.337</td>
<td>(0.485)</td>
<td>(0.498)</td>
<td>(0.485)</td>
<td>(0.498)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic attempts</td>
<td>-0.094</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>(0.230)</td>
<td>(0.239)</td>
<td>(0.230)</td>
<td>(0.239)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3-4. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1 (Dem.)</th>
<th>Model 2 (Dem.)</th>
<th>Model 3 (D+CO)</th>
<th>Model 4 (Dem.)</th>
<th>Model 5 (Dem.)</th>
<th>Model 6 (D+CO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legacy horizon (yrs.)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic attempts (squared)</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
<td>(0.033)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive coups</td>
<td>0.517*</td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.252)</td>
<td>(0.230)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral fraud</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.210)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.216)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single party elections</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.253)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.258)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluralism (years)</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completeness (years)</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squared time</td>
<td>-0.003*</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.003*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubed time</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR Chi2</td>
<td>393.73</td>
<td>378.57</td>
<td>409.64</td>
<td>394.88</td>
<td>382.67</td>
<td>416.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>5400</td>
<td>5400</td>
<td>6025</td>
<td>5400</td>
<td>5400</td>
<td>6025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic episodes</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R2</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Logit regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses. The dependent variable is dummy for democratic breakdown in a given year. Models 1, 2 and 3 apply a 10-year horizon for legacy variables while models 4, 5, and 6 apply a 20-year horizon for legacy variables.

* $p|z| < 0.05$.  ** $p|z| < 0.01$.  *** $p|z| < 0.001$.  
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Table 3-5. Predicted probabilities of democratic breakdown during a year for young, average-aged and old democracy given particular values of explanatory variables (in %).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open-outcome elections (no discontinuity)</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.-o. elections + discontinuity</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International environment</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British colony</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Values computed on the basis of Model 5 in Table 3-1 (other variables held constant at their means). In case of growth, values computed on the basis of Model 3 in Table B-3 in Appendix B. Regarding international environment, minimal various referred to anti-democratic, mean value to neutral, and maximum value to pro-democratic environment.
Table 3-6. Predicted cumulative probabilities of democratic breakdown given particular values of explanatory variables (in %).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Age of democracy (years)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Situation 1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation 2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation 3</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation 4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Colony</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Not British Colony)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Income</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Income</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-dem. int. environment</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-dem. int. environment</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Values computed on the basis of Model 5 in Table 3-4 (other variables held constant at their means unless indicated in the notes). EL stands for open-outcome elections, PIE for pro-democratic international environment, NIE for anti-democratic international environment, GDP for income, D for discontinuity.

The first four rows provide some relevant estimates which were computed in light of the observation that nearly all democracies preceded by long open-outcome elections democratized at low or medium levels of income and during periods of anti-democratic or neutral international environment.

Situation 1: Democracy which is unlikely to survive given its low income and the negative effect of anti-democratic international environment, but which is nevertheless preceded by long period of open-outcome elections and NO discontinuity (EL = 79, PIE = 0, NIE = 1, GDP = Min, D = 0).

Situation 2: Democracy which is unlikely to survive given its low income and the negative effect of anti-democratic international environment, which is preceded by long period of open-outcome elections and discontinuity (EL = 79, PIE = 0, NIE = 1, GDP = Min, D = 1). In this case the positive effect of open-outcome elections was nullified by regime discontinuity.

Situation 3: Democracy which is unlikely to survive given its low income and the effect of anti-democratic international environment, which is in addition NOT preceded by period of open-outcome elections and discontinuity (EL = 0, PIE = 0, NIE = 1, GDP = Min, D = 0).

Situation 4: The same as situation 3, but the conditions for survival of democracy are more positive: neutral international environment and mean level of income (EL = 0, PIE = 0, NIE = 0, GDP = Mean, D = 0).

For open-outcome elections I assumed the high value of 79, which was the maximum value of its interaction term with discontinuity. The maximum value of open-outcome elections was otherwise 196 years. At this value, the predicted probability of breakdown was 0 regardless of the age of democracy. At the maximum value of income, the probability of breakdown was also zero, hence I computed the predicted values for mean income instead.
Table 3-7. Logistic regression models predicting occurrence of democratic breakdown with inclusion of colonial legacy variables and population excluded from power on ethnic grounds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open-outcome elections (years)</td>
<td>-0.077***</td>
<td>-0.091***</td>
<td>-0.074***</td>
<td>-0.078**</td>
<td>-0.108**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinuity</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>-0.205</td>
<td>0.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.-outcome elections x discontinuity (years)</td>
<td>0.066**</td>
<td>0.077**</td>
<td>0.055*</td>
<td>0.071*</td>
<td>0.142*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial disenfranchisement (years)</td>
<td>0.067**</td>
<td>0.079**</td>
<td>0.067**</td>
<td>0.106**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP income per capita (thous. 2000 US$)</td>
<td>-0.21***</td>
<td>-0.226***</td>
<td>-0.194**</td>
<td>-0.211**</td>
<td>-0.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International environment</td>
<td>-0.779***</td>
<td>-0.735***</td>
<td>-0.786***</td>
<td>-0.759***</td>
<td>-0.685**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British colony</td>
<td>-0.697**</td>
<td>-0.597</td>
<td>-0.577</td>
<td>-0.778</td>
<td>0.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded population</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Exposure to Protestant Missions</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant Missionaries per 10,000 pop. in 1923</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Evangelized by 1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Settler Mortality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of British Indirect Rule in 1955</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR Chi2</td>
<td>202.08</td>
<td>237.78</td>
<td>138.00</td>
<td>154.08</td>
<td>43.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>2995</td>
<td>3778</td>
<td>2370</td>
<td>2275</td>
<td>738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic episodes</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R2</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Models with BDD measure of democracy with 20-year time horizon for measurement of legacy variables. Model 1 includes only democratic periods in former colonies, Model 2 includes all democratic periods and controls for excluded population, Model 3 controls for Protestant legacy variables, Model 4 for European settler mortality, and Model 5 for the type of British administrative rule (whether direct or indirect). Logit regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses. Because models with categorical measurement of international environment were unstable, I converted this variable into an ordinal measure (with values of -1, 0, 1 denoting anti-democratic, neutral and pro-democratic international environment, respectively).

* p|z| < 0.05. ** p|z| < 0.01. *** p|z| < 0.001.
Figure 3-1. Yearly rate of democratic breakdown (in %) averaged per decade.
Figure 3-2. Probability of breakdown in the first year of existence of democracies functioning under anti-democratic International environment depending on the length of pre-democratization open-outcome elections.
Figure 3-3. Cumulative probabilities of breakdown of selected democracies.
CHAPTER 4
DEMOOCRATIZATION FROM PA MONARCHY VIA COMPETITIVE OLIGARCHY IN FRANCE, BELGIUM AND THE NETHERLANDS

This chapter begins the qualitative part of the dissertation. Its goal is to illustrate how PA monarchies transitioned to self-sustaining democracies, through the intermediate stage of competitive oligarchy, unless the transition was accompanied by a regime discontinuity. The histories of three countries will be compared to illustrate the causal process: France, Belgium and the Netherlands, which experienced similar political developments apart from the crucial difference regarding the character of democratic transition. Because France established its first democracy through regime discontinuity, it was characterized by high risk of breakdown which resulted from a deficit of legitimacy and creation of political opening for anti-system actors. This unfavorable legacy did not plague monarchical democracies which were established in Belgium and the Netherlands at a later stage, which for that reason functioned under a very low risk of collapse.

The similar phase of political histories of France, the Netherlands and Belgium (at the time a part of the Netherlands) began in 1815 with establishment of PA monarchies. In both countries, the dynasties which ruled before the French Revolution were restored to the throne, and constitutions provided for open-outcome legislative elections under restricted suffrage, governments responsible to the monarch, and a limited set of civil liberties. In 1830, the July Revolution toppled the restored Bourbon regime and established a more liberal monarchy headed by Louis-Philippe from the Orleans dynasty, while Belgium achieved independence as a PA monarchy having seceded from the Netherlands. France transitioned to competitive oligarchy when the principle of the parliamentary responsibility became respected after 1836. Similar developments occurred in Belgium in 1847 and the Netherlands in 1848. Still, the monarchs continued to influence policies and the choice of prime ministers in those countries: in France
until the end of the July Monarchy in 1848, in Belgium until 1857, and in the Netherlands until the 1868 constitutional crisis. The period of PA monarchy endowed competitive oligarchies in France, Belgium and the Netherlands with a legacy of open-outcome elections and constitutional government. This legacy also contributed to democratic stability of Belgium and the Netherlands after their democratization (in 1894 and 1897, respectively).

Yet, the development of self-sustaining democracy in France was achieved with much greater difficulty. The French competitive oligarchy was abolished in a popular revolution in 1848, whereas the upheavals of 1848 in the Netherlands and Belgium resulted only in a breakthrough to responsible government and an extension of suffrage, respectively. Because it was established after the monarchical institutions were abolished, the French Second Republic suffered from a deficit of legitimacy, as it was not accepted by supporters of the monarchical form of government. In fact, the legislative elections held in 1848 and 1849 produced oligarchical majorities which preferred to reintroduce a monarchy. Moreover, the discontinuity of 1848 resulted in establishment of an entirely new political framework (a presidential system of the government coupled with extension of suffrage to politically un-mobilized masses). This created a window of opportunity for anti-system actors. The 1848 direct presidential election was won by the nephew of Napoleon I, who seduced the peasant masses by the vision of a resurrected empire and, given the prohibition of reelection, abolished democracy in the 1851 coup and reestablished the empire a year later. The same negative legacy of discontinuities, which created several competing narratives of a legitimate political order, also contributed to the failure of the democratic experiment during the so-called Liberal Empire, and the inherent instability of the Third Republic. The Liberal Empire was established in 1869 when Louis-Napoleon, in order to avoid the fate of his predecessors, who were overthrown in popular revolutions, agreed to
liberalize the regime under popular pressure. A government responsible to a democratically-elected parliament took over in 1869, but it was abolished a year later when France lost a war with Prussia. Clearly, the legitimacy of a democracy based on republican foundations was shaky (as it turned out in 1851), but a democracy based on imperial foundations also proved unable to endure a severe crisis. Also the French Third Republic, established in 1871, was characterized by a high degree of instability. Until the 1877 election, it was ruled by politicians who preferred to abolish its political system in favor of a monarchy (whether it would be a democratic constitutional monarchy along the British model was unclear). Until the 1893 election, anti-system and pro-monarchical rightists obtained between 16% and 36% of the seats. In 1889, a proto-fascist movement led by a populist general threatened the republican regime with a military coup. Even in the interwar period, the French republican regime stood on a rather shaky ground. This was indicated by the fact that France was the only country defeated by Nazi Germany that established a constitutionally legal collaborationist regime. This regime rejected the democratic legacy of the republic in favor of authoritarianism. The behavior of the French right-wing elite contrasted sharply with elite behavior in other Western European countries occupied by Nazi Germany, whose constitutional governments preferred the exile in London, and where collaboration with the occupiers was a marginal phenomenon. Ultimately, the inherent unsustainability of the French democratic regimes, which contrasted sharply with the stability of Belgian and Dutch democracies, dated back to the revolution of 1848 which terminated the monarchical competitive oligarchy.

**Legacy of Ancien Régimes**

The French Revolution of 1789 abolished the absolute monarchy and undermined the nobility as the ruling social class, but a stable system of PA monarchy was not established at this stage of the French history (although it was initially envisioned by the 1791 constitution). The
failure of the first attempt to create a PA monarchy in France stemmed from the inability to reach a compromise between the middle classes and the monarchy. King Louis XVI and his aristocrats could not agree on anything less than reintroduction of absolutism and conspired to this effect. The majority of the middle classes aimed to deprive the monarch of the real power or abolish the monarchy altogether. This stemmed from the radicalization of the French middle classes in this period caused by the popularity of the Enlightenment ideas. By this I understand their preference for political solutions running contrary to the material interests, such as introduction of universal male suffrage. In this situation, PA monarchy turned out an unlikely compromise.

The king lost the remaining influence after the flight to Varennes in June 1791. A popular uprising on 10 August 1792 abolished a moderate revolutionary government. Subsequently, a republic was introduced. A radical government of the Jacobine faction ruled France between May 1793 and July 1794, applying widespread political terror against its opponents. After the palace coup of July 1794, a more moderate middle class group came to power, but the so-called Directory regime lacked legitimacy both on the left and on the right of the political spectrum. It was abolished in a military coup in November 1799 by a young general Napoleon Bonaparte, who introduced a modern form of an authoritarian regime. The next opportunity to establish a PA monarchy came in 1814, when the emperor was deposed as a result of failure of his international adventures.

The revolutionary period (1789-1815) left France with several political legacies, some of which hindered the prospects for creation of a self-sustaining democratic regime. Several competing narratives of a legitimate political order were created as a result of the revolution: the legitimist order, which rejected the legacy of the revolution, or at least its republican legacy; the republican order, which could entail either a moderate bourgeois republic or a radical socialist
republic; and the imperial political order associated with a populist authoritarian rule. While a bourgeois republican order entailed universal suffrage and, at least theoretically, respect for civil liberties, and a radical republic entailed radical transformation of the society even if freedoms were to be sacrificed, the legitimist and imperial political orders could be associated with authoritarian, oligarchical (i.e. under legislature with restricted suffrage) or even democratic forms of rule. In any case, the question of a legitimate political order divided the French society and provided a source of political cleavage which persisted well into the early twentieth century.¹ But this type of political cleavage was not in itself a fatal obstacle to creation of a successful PA monarchy, as the British history after the 1688 coup, or the Glorious Revolution, shows. In Britain the elite was divided between the supporters and opponents of the Stuart dynasty, but the former gradually became reconciled with the new political order.

Otherwise, revolutionary politics remained mostly an urban affair as the rural massed remained un-politicized during the period. Although several elections under wide suffrage were held during the revolutionary period, they were largely ignored by the peasantry. Only in the 1789 election to the third estate, which were held under nearly universal male suffrage, was the turnout relatively high (it reached 50%). This vote was indirect, however, and did not result in election of effective peasant representatives, but deputies representing the politicized professional middle class. In a series of local and provincial elections held in 1790, still between 40% and 60% of the voters took part. But turnout remained very low in the elections held subsequently, all of which were indirect: Only 20% voted in the September 1791 legislative election, in which about 60% of male adults enjoyed the suffrage, and only 10% voted in the September 1792 legislative election held under universal male suffrage. The decreasing turnout

¹ Fortescue 2005, 3-5.
stemmed from voter fatigue, unimportance of national issues for the rural voters, and
dissatisfaction with the revolution. An oath of loyalty to the regime was required before voting
during the revolutionary period, and many peasants refused to take it because of the
government’s persecution of the church. In any case, voters with active pro-monarchical
sympathies were generally prevented from the exercise of suffrage. Turnout also did not exceed
25% during the three legislative elections held under the Directory. The Directory government
did not yet develop effective mechanisms to ensure the desired outcome; hence when partial
elections resulted in pro-monarchical victories in 1797 and 1798, the unfavorable returns were
simply cancelled.²

While the rural masses largely ignored constitutional politics during the revolutionary
period, peasants were happy to take advantage of the breakdown of state order so that to abolish
the feudal institutions by force in the period 1789-91, change which was ratified by the
revolutionary regime. Seigniorial rights, the tithe to the church and other feudal privileges were
abolished and equality before the law was introduced. A class of smallholding peasantry was
established, but peasant victory was partial. The large estates which were directly owned (i.e.
demesnes) were retained by landlords, bought up by the large bourgeois (if confiscated), or
restored during the Napoleonic and Restoration period. Ultimately, only 10% of arable land
changed hands during the revolution, and peasant came to own directly only about 40% of the
land. After 1815, the landholding structure of France was mixed with smallholding peasants
functioning alongside large estates cultivated by farm workers.³

² Cole and Campbell 1989, 40; Crook 1993.
³ Fortescue 2005, 34; Gildea 2008, 91-92
The revolutionary period created other legacies. The lower middle class and urban poor became politicized. A revolutionary tradition of the social republic and a narrative of legitimate rebellion persisted within these strata. Hence, the probability of a successful popular uprising against the government was higher in France in comparison to other countries. Most of the middle and upper classes, however, struck by the revolutionary terror and fearful of its recurrence, abandoned the ideals of the Enlightenment and turned politically conservative. The Catholic Church, persecuted by the revolutionary regime, entered into a firm alliance with political legitimism and conservatism, while the tradition of anti-clericalism persisted among republicans. The middle classes remained suspicious of the associational life, which had become a source of radicalism during the revolution. Hence, restrictions on civil society persisted in France throughout various regimes and were abolished only in 1901. Because political parties were considered associations, they could fully develop, from the organization point of view, only after that date as well.4

In contrast to France and exceptionally for Europe, the Netherlands before 1795 had a republican form of the government. It was a confederation of several provinces which was, however, throughout most of its history ruled by a hereditary executive officer, or stadtholder. The office had traditionally belonged to the Orange Dynasty. The republican political system was not competitive, though. At the provincial level, the power was held by a self-perpetuating oligarchy. The offices were either hereditary or for-life, and in the case of a vacancy new officials were coopted. The closed character of the political system caused frustration among the middle classes, for whom the ideas of the Enlightenment became increasingly popular. In 1787 the so-called Patriots staged a revolt demanding creation of a modern representative government,

4 Huard 2000; Tombs 1996, 115.
but the movement was crushed with Prussian military help. But at least some of the demands of the Patriots were realized when the French revolutionary army crossed the Dutch border in January 1795. A Patriot-led revolution, supported by the French troops, abolished the oligarchy and established Batavian Republic governed by a modern constitution.  

Part of the Dutch middle classes, and to some extent the occupiers, were motivated by a sincere desire to spread the ideas of the French Revolution into the Netherlands, even though the republic remained to a large extent a French puppet state. Universal male suffrage was adopted, and freely elected National Assembly met in 1796. The legislature enacted a constitution which was a compromise between supporters of the unitary and federal forms of state, but the document was rejected in a referendum in August 1797. The pro-federalist government lost the September 1797 election, but the Unitarian faction which came to power did not have enough support to force through its own constitutional project. Subsequently, developments in the Batavian Republic closely followed political changes in France. Two French-organized coups in 1798 brought various revolutionary factions to power. Napoleon Bonaparte orchestrated a coup in 1801 which ended the practice of open-outcome elections and established a conservative authoritarian regime. In 1806 a puppet Kingdom of Holland was proclaimed, ruled by the Napoleon’s brother Louis. But when the latter turned out insufficiently subservient to the French interests, the kingdom was directly annexed to France in 1810. In this way the country ultimately shared the fate of Habsburg Southern Netherlands (future Belgium), which had been annexed by France already in 1792.

__________________________
5 State 2008, 112-18
7 Southern Netherlands were the Netherlandish provinces which remained under the Spanish sovereignty after the Northern Netherlands seceded as the Dutch Republic in 1581. The main reason of the split was religious differences,
The first democratic experiment in the Netherlands did not leave a durable political legacy. The first reason was related to the fact that the revolutionary regime was to a large extent imposed and controlled by the French. Moreover, enactment of the universal male suffrage was not coupled with political mobilization of the lower classes. Electoral turnout remained very low; it reached the maximum of 43% in the 1797 constitutional referendum. Supporters of the Orange Dynasty and the ancien régime were not allowed to participate in the political process, which undermined the legitimacy of the elected authorities. At any rate, it is doubtful whether peasants, if politically mobilized, would support the radical ideas espoused by the middle classes. In any case, after the country regained independence in 1815 suffrage was dramatically reduced, but it did not result in any social protests.

Although its political legacy was ambiguous, the French occupation was a watershed period in the history of the Netherlands and Belgium from the point of view of state organization. In particular, the French abolished the feudal structures and introduced unitary state organization. The newly-created Kingdom of the Netherlands was characterized by administrative uniformity, a modern judicial system, a single civil code and a land registry. Equality before the law was established; hereditary offices were eliminated along with privileges of the nobility. The creation of a modern state was a precondition of the establishment of a truly democratic polity, and it was accomplished by the French. Consequently, the Kingdom of the Netherlands created by William I in 1813 was a fundamentally different state in comparison to the feudal Dutch Republic.\(^8\)

---

Periods of PA Monarchy

Bourbon Restoration in France

The Bourbon dynasty was restored to the French throne in April 1814 after Napoleon’s defeat by the forces of the Sixth Coalition. Ideologically, the coalition would have preferred restoration of the absolutist system in France, but such a step was considered unfeasible given that it would likely provoke another revolution in the country. Hence, a compromise solution was imposed on the Bourbons: they would be installed in power provided that they agreed to rule the country according to a constitution. The latter introduced a system of PA monarchy with severely restricted suffrage. Crucially, elections remained open-outcome during the period. The compromise with the upper middle classes would be meaningless if the dynasty controlled the electoral process, and rigging elections entailed a risk of another rebellion (which ultimately became a reality in 1830 after the Bourbons broke some crucial elements of the “deal”). Hence, a political system with open-outcome elections was self-sustaining, even though it was ultimately established as a result of the international pressure. The Bourbon Restoration entailed also re-establishment of the position of the formerly-ruling landed aristocracy, which, although admittedly weakened during the revolution, dominated the government during the period, and whose position was envied by the upper middle class, who were qualified to vote under the restricted suffrage, but were still not allowed to occupy higher government positions. Two members of the Bourbon dynasty ruled during in the period: Louis XVIII (1814/15-1824), considered politically pragmatic, and Charles X (1824-30), whose reactionary policies contributed to the fall of the regime. The Louis XVIII’s rule was briefly interrupted by the Napoleon’s One Hundred Days (March-June 1815). The reinstallation of the Bourbon
government in June 1815 was accompanied by a period of state-tolerated right-wing terror and massive purges of active Bonapartists from the army and the civil service. ⁹

The constitutional charter of 1814 was from the legal point of view freely granted by the king (octroyed). Under the document, the sovereignty derived from the monarch, and not from the people. However, the charter preserved the basic achievements of the revolution: equality before the law, rudimentary civil liberties, a representative legislature, and security of the property confiscated after 1789. It provided for a two-chamber parliament. The lower chamber was elected by an extremely narrow suffrage: only 1.5% of male adults were enfranchised. The 1815 and 1816 elections under restoration were indirect. Only the 1817 electoral law introduced direct elections. The electorate was restricted to those who paid property taxes; hence the suffrage qualifications privileged the landowning interests. The upper chamber was composed of hereditary or life-long peers appointed by the monarch, who enjoyed the right to appoint new peers at any time. He also retained the power of absolute veto over legislation, was free to choose and dismiss ministers, and could dissolve the lower chamber and call new elections. ¹⁰

The Napoleon’s brief return brought about conservative attitudes among the upper classes, which, along with the intimidation of liberal voters, contributed to the victory of ultra-royalists in the August 1815 election. The lower chamber proved more royalist than the king himself, and its desire to fully restore the ancien régime had to be hampered, as the government feared it could lead to another revolutionary upheaval. Hence the chamber was dissolved and the government resorted to manipulation of the suffrage and gerrymandering to elect a more moderate assembly in 1816. This proved successful and the 1816 and subsequent elections (until


1820, one-fifth of the chamber was renewed annually) brought moderately liberal majorities. The government subsequently pursued fairly liberal policies, weakening press censorship and abolishing the ministry of police in 1819. The same year, responding to conservative obstructionism in the upper chamber, the king created additional sixty peerages and nominated liberal peers for the posts. Consequently, the upper chamber remained more liberal than the lower house in the first half of the 1820s.\textsuperscript{11}

Nevertheless, policies of the moderately liberal (so-called doctrinaire) government brought about unsympathetic reactions from the other Great Powers. As well, conservative attitudes among the voters were on the rise after the election of a radical deputy in 1819\textsuperscript{12} and assassination of an ultra-conservative duke in February 1820, the event which led to the resignation of a doctrinaire Prime Minister Élie Decazes. Hoping to obtain a more conservative majority, the king altered the electoral law in 1820 introducing double vote for the wealthiest 25% of electors. This contributed to the conservative victory in the November 1820 election. Subsequently, press censorship was tightened and detention without trial reintroduced. In December 1821 an ultra-royalist Jean-Baptiste de Villèle became prime minister and remained in office until January 1828. Supported by the future King Charles X, he pursued a policy of repression against the liberal opposition. The former assumed the throne in September 1824 after his brother died, and turned out to be a more conservative ruler.\textsuperscript{13}

Numerous parliamentary factions could be distinguished during the Restoration, but the borders between them were fairly fluid. Still, the first period of stable parliamentary politics


\textsuperscript{12} By the department of Isère, which, curiously, despite highly restrictive suffrage, constantly produced radical Republican deputies before 1848 (and intransigent anti-Bonapartist during the Second Empire).

\textsuperscript{13} Cole and Campbell 1989, 41-42; Gild\textsc{ea} 2008, 43-47; Price 2007, 104-11.
contributed to the emergence of a modern party system in France. The staunch supporters of the monarchy formed the ultra-royalists faction. They favored a return to the ancien régime, but were divided on what such a step should entail in practice. Some of the ultra-royalists supported the charter, while others considered it as exceedingly liberal, but in practice they usually formed a unified political front. This faction was staunchly pro-Catholic and favored decentralization, that is, restoration of pre-revolutionary provincial privileges. In the early years of Charles XVIII’s rule the ultra-royalists were, paradoxically, opposed by the monarch on pragmatic grounds. So-called doctrinaires, or constitutionalists, were in favor of a moderately liberal constitutional monarchy which entailed genuine application of the charter. They dominated the government until the resignation of Prime Minister Decazes in February 1820. Liberals emerged as an important faction after the 1827 election. They were left of the doctrinaires, but frequently voted with the latter. Liberals demanded introduction of the principle of ministerial parliamentary responsibility, opposed the power of the aristocracy (which dominated the government and the civil service after 1820), were anticlerical, and favored a moderate extension of the suffrage. Finally, a few republicans were also elected to the chamber, but their role remained marginal.14 On the wave of the monarchy’s popularity after the 1823 intervention in Spain, a conservative lower chamber was elected in 1824. However, during the term of this legislature the public opinion turned against the government because of the enactment of several unpopular bills: provision of an enormous indemnity for the property confiscated during the revolution (1825); introduction of heavy penalties for sacrilege (the 1825 law, although never applied, stirred massive discontent); reintroduction of inheritance based on primogeniture (this 1826 law was supposed to strengthen the political power of the landed aristocracy 1826); dissolution of the

14 Price 2007, 91-93.
Paris branch of the National Guard (which was a middle class-dominated citizens’ militia created during the revolution) and constant attempts to repress the press. The last issue united the left- and right-wing opposition against the government.\textsuperscript{15}

The crucial moment in the history of the Restoration was the election of November 1827. At the beginning of the year, the government majority in the lower chamber had already become tenuous. In May 1827, the parliament managed to pass a bill which reduced the prefects’ arbitrariness regarding the compilation of voter lists, and the government lost a series of by-elections in May and June. Worryingly to the regime, in addition to the Liberals, a substantial group of right-wing opposition deputies emerged, who were monarchical and pro-Catholic, but opposed the Villèle’s government and its policies regarding restriction of civil liberties. In addition, an economic crisis led to growing discontent among business circles. Anticipating further reduction of its strength with the passage of time, the government asked the king to call snap elections.\textsuperscript{16}

During the Restoration and the July Monarchy the electorate and consequently the electoral districts were small. Some provincial cities such as Dijon or Grenoble had only a few hundred voters.\textsuperscript{17} Initially, most voters were apathetic and cynical, which was the legacy of the meaningless character of the Napoleon’s electoral exercises. But already in 1817 the electorate came to grasp the importance of elections and the turnout increased. In the 1827 election, it reached 84%. Voter mobilization was also helped by government and opposition campaign efforts.\textsuperscript{18} From the point of view of the social composition, the electorate was dominated by

\textsuperscript{15} Kent 1975, 6-7, 10-11, 14, 108; Magraw 1986, 39-41; Price 2007, 116-21, 124-25.
\textsuperscript{17} Kent 1975, 60.
\textsuperscript{18} Kent 1975, 104-05, 127.
landowners, who formed more than half of voters. The other half was composed of entrepreneurs, civil officials and the wealthiest professionals.\textsuperscript{19} There were no official ballots, although the vote was secret. Voters personally wrote their preferred name on a piece of paper, folded it, and handed to the poling officer who inserted the ballot into the box. An election took two days: on Saturday voters elected polling station commissions, which organized the actual balloting on Sunday.\textsuperscript{20} If no candidate achieved an absolute majority, a runoff vote was held on Monday. A candidate could stand in numerous constituencies and be elected simultaneously. If the same candidate won multiple elections, by-elections were held. This confusing practice was a characteristic feature of the French elections and persisted well into the Third Republic.\textsuperscript{21} Polling stations were organized only in provincial towns, which was a considerable hardship for rural voters. If such a voter decided to participate in the Saturday election of polling station officers, and if a runoff was necessary, he might have to spend three days away from home. In spite of the dramatically increased suffrage, a similar polling procedure was used during the Second Republic, but secrecy of the ballot was compromised due to the rapid increase in the number of voters.

The government did not remain neutral in elections during the Restoration. Prefects were expected to help government candidates get elected. This included financing and distribution of pro-government campaign literature, organization of voter meetings, provision of entertainment for pro-government voters, and covering government voters’ transportation expenses incurred in getting to the polls. Vote buying was fairly absent, however, because voters were already very wealthy. Other electoral malpractices were also rare and electoral regulations were largely

\textsuperscript{19} Kent 1975, 64-65.

\textsuperscript{20} Kent 1975, 76-79.

\textsuperscript{21} Kent 1975, 127.
respected. For example, before the 1827 election the government instructed the prefects to prepare lists according to the law so to avoid the opposition’s allegations of fraud. Otherwise, pro-government candidates were also openly supported by the Church.\textsuperscript{22}

Before the November 1827 vote the opposition focused its campaign on the issue of press freedom. In particular, it called for the revocation of an ordinance from June 1827 which introduced censorship of periodicals. Because of the censorship, anti-government activists could not use newspapers to promote their views and resorted to pamphlets instead. Opposition-oriented newspapers were only allowed to inform voters about the process of electoral registration and polling procedures in a neutral language. But as it had done in some previous elections, the opposition press managed to publish lists of candidates it supported.\textsuperscript{23} Moreover, the opposition established two country-wide associations which distributed pamphlets and helped register supporters. As had been the case previously, a sort of a central electoral committee was established in Paris which coordinated the campaign. Owing to these mobilization efforts, the opposition narrowly won the election in November 1827. The count was as follows: 195 pro-government deputies, 199 deputies of the liberal opposition, thirty-one of the right-wing opposition, and five of uncertain standing. Given the results, Prime Minister Villèle resigned in January 1828.\textsuperscript{24} The king conceded defeat and a moderate ministry was appointed, but it was short-lived. In August 1829 Charles X nominated as prime minister an ultra-royalist aristocrat Jules de Polignac, whose appointment was considered as the first step leading to the future
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overthrow of the constitution. The Polignac’s ministry prepared the infamous decrees which sparked the uprising in July 1830, toppling the Restoration regime.²⁵

The underlying cause of the July Revolution was the economic crisis, which had started in 1828 and contributed to the increasing pauperization of the proletariat of Paris. The more immediate cause was a series of political blunders committed by the monarch and his government. These included continuous refusal to recognize the principle of the government’s parliamentary responsibility. In March 1830 the chamber again demanded nomination of a more liberal ministry, but this was refused by the king, who called new elections. The vote was held in June and August 1830 and ended in a decisive opposition victory. On 26 July 1830 the king issued a series of decrees using emergency powers provided by the constitution. He imposed severe restrictions on the press, dissolved the chamber before it even met, further restricted the suffrage, introduced public voting, and scheduled new elections for September. The legality of these measures was dubious, as the emergency powers were not designed to promulgate ordinary legislation for which agreement of the legislature was necessary.²⁶

On 27 July 1830 newspapers were printed in Paris without authorization, which triggered government repression, while employees closed factories and workshops in order to facilitate the outbreak of a popular uprising. The revolt indeed erupted on the next day and resulted in defeat of the government troops. However, the lower class insurgents aimed to establish another republic, while the middle classes sought to preserve the oligarchical political system established at the Restoration. The bourgeoisie was afraid of another wave of revolutionary terror, confiscation of property, and wars with reactionary European powers. With difficulty, the

²⁵ Magraw 1986, 41-42; Price 2007, 123.

popular uprising was contained and proclamation of a republic averted. On 9 August 1830 Louis-Philippe was proclaimed king by the assembled chambers.\textsuperscript{27} The new monarch came from the Orleans branch of the Bourbon dynasty. His progressively-inclined father participated in the revolution under the name of Philippe Égalité and was executed during the Reign of Terror, while the young Louis-Philippe fought in the revolutionary army and escaped to exile in 1793.\textsuperscript{28} Hence his elevation to the throne could be treated as an amalgamation of the French revolutionary and legitimist traditions. The Orleans dynasty could guarantee a parliamentary monarchy ideologically based on the liberal revolutionary ideals.

The newly-assembled chamber also enacted limited constitutional changes (which were technically illegal because it had not been elected as a constituent assembly). The constitution was altered so that it no longer derived from the monarch’s will, but reflected the popular sovereignty. The change was also evident though the new monarch’s title being the King of the French. The sovereign was no longer allowed to issue ordinances in case of emergency, and censorship of the press was prohibited. The upper house remained composed of peers nominated by the king for life, but the category of hereditary peers was abolished. Further constitutional changes were enacted in April 1831. First of all, local government councils elected through a relatively broad suffrage were introduced (app. 30-35\% of male adults). In the cities and some rural regions, these municipal councils came to be dominated by the Republican opposition and supported efforts at liberalization. In addition, the National Guard was reestablished. In the latter institution about 40\% of adult Frenchmen were eligible for service and its officers were elected. During the July Monarchy, the National Guard was dominated by officers from the lower middle

\textsuperscript{27} Beik 1965, 29-30; Fortescue 2005, 14-18; Price 2007, 151-83.
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classes and was characterized by widespread pro-Republican sympathies. The intense middle class participation at the local level, both in the National Guard and in the local government, contrasted sharply with the exclusion of this group from the power at the national level. Both the suffrage and eligibility requirements for the lower chamber were lowered in 1831, but the change was minimal as the scope of enfranchisement increased from 1.5% to about 2% of male adults; it subsequently reached 2.6% at the 1846 election. This was a much lower level of enfranchisement than in contemporary European constitutional monarchies (e.g. 5% in Belgium, 12% in the Netherlands, 17% in Britain, and 90% in Baden). The tax-paying suffrage requirement, in the absence of income taxes, still referred only to property taxes. Hence the small enfranchised minority consisted of large landowners and those who invested in real estate. Landowners and renters formed 40% of the electorate in 1842. The size of electoral districts in July Monarchy rarely exceeded one thousand voters and hence elections retained a club-like character. The electoral process remained largely free, but the government tried to increase its majority by backing the parliamentary candidatures of civil servants, who then could be counted on as loyal supporters. Otherwise, prefects influenced voter choice through personal connections and offers of patronage, continuing the pre-1830 political practice.29

From the historical point of view, the July Monarchy was a continuation of the Restoration regime and it built on its legacy, which from the point of view of the future democratic development was largely positive. First of all, the Restoration introduced the principles of free electoral competition and respect for constitutionalism into the French politics. “The restoration political system did have one major achievement to its name. It introduced

France to modern parliamentary government, and for long enough for it to take root [...] The restoration may have lacked the gaudy plumage of other post-revolutionary French regimes, but it left a more lasting constitutional legacy.”

One should note that all important political changes during the Restoration were enacted under the influence of election results. “The restoration political system, although still very much a 'limited monarchy', was slowly evolving into a parliamentary one. In a country where free and meaningful voting had previously flourished only at the beginning of the Revolution before withering under Napoleon, the importance of this development should not be underestimated.”

There was also a large degree of legalistic and elite continuity between the restoration and July Monarchy. The 1814 charter remained in force with some minor modifications. The position of the legislature was strengthened and this of the monarch weakened, but parliamentary responsibility was not explicitly introduced; it subsequently evolved through the political practice and this way the French political system advanced to the stage of competitive oligarchy.

The Liberal and doctrinaire factions active during the Restoration became the backbone of the regime after 1830. However, the elite which came to power in 1830 did not learn from the mistakes of Charles X and his aristocracy. It refused to compromise on the issue of suffrage with the politically active, but disenfranchised social strata, and enacted repressive measures which stiffened political opposition. When a popular uprising indeed broke out in 1848, few were prepared to defend a regime which was widely considered as plutocratic and unrepresentative. Hence, France lost a chance to gradually evolve into a democratic constitutional monarchy through extension of suffrage, similarly to Britain, Belgium and the Netherlands.

---
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United Kingdom of the Netherlands and its Demise

The establishment of PA monarchy in the Netherlands and Belgium was, as in France, directly caused by the Napoleon’s military defeat. After the battle of Leipzig, revolts broke out in several Dutch cities and there were calls to reestablish independent Netherlands under the House of Orange. The French troops withdrew mostly voluntarily. The heir to the Stadtholder’s throne, William I, landed in the Netherlands on 30 November 1813 enjoying widespread popularity, and took over the power from the provisional government on 2 December. In the face of deep unpopularity of the pre-1795 oligarchical system, and inability to introduce absolutism in a country with a legacy of representative institutions, he announced that a modern constitutional monarchy would be established. In June 1814 the Great Powers decided to form a union of the Northern and Southern Netherlands. The decision mostly resulted from the British desire to weaken France and turn the Netherlands into a reasonably strong continental power. Many doubted if the united Netherlands would become a viable country. Two centuries of divergent histories had resulted in creation of separate identities in the Northern and Southern Netherlands.

The constitution of the new kingdom was originally adopted in March 1814 by an assembly of notables selected by provincial governors; hence it hardly possessed democratic legitimacy. The decision to create the union necessitated modification of the document. It was agreed that each part of the kingdom would have equal representation (55 deputies each) in the legislature, although the Belgian population was larger (3.6 million vs. 2.2 million). The constitution provided for the lower legislative chamber indirectly elected by provincial assemblies, which reflected the previously federal character of the state. The suffrage in elections

35 Kossmann 1978, 107-08.
to provincial assemblies was unequal with three estates: the nobility, towns and the country electing deputies separately. Altogether, 7% of male adults in the Southern Netherlands and 15% in the Northern Netherlands (app. 10% in the entire kingdom) became enfranchised. The upper chamber was composed of lifelong royal appointees. It could veto bills already approved by the lower chamber. Generally, the constitution provided for stronger royal power than the comparable constitution of PA monarchies in Denmark, Sweden or the Imperial Germany, and William I used his prerogatives to establish a system characterized as “liberal autocracy”.

Ordinary budget expenditures were accepted by the parliament for the period of ten years, and only in case of extraordinary expenses, such as during the times of war, the legislature was expected to enact a yearly budget.³⁶

At the meeting of notables from Southern Netherlands, who assembled to ratify the constitution in 1815, the document was rejected by a small margin. The contention was focused on the problems of parliamentary representation and religion. The southern notables, influenced by the Catholic hierarchy, demanded establishment of Catholicism as the state religion in the South and legislative representation proportional to the population. The first demand ran contrary to the principle of religious freedom, which was one of the conditions of the unification agreed with the Great Powers, and hence could not be accepted by William. Therefore the government ignored the results of the meeting arguing that the votes of the absent notables should be counted as favoring the constitution, and that some of the “no” votes were motivated by the issue of religion, hence they should be annulled because they could not be reconciled with the country’s international obligations.³⁷ Similar to the French Restoration charter, the constitution of the

Netherlands stated that the ministers were responsible to the king, and it also became the constitutional practice. The cabinet council was established only in 1823, but it had no independent power; it could debate solely the matters submitted by the king. William I preferred to govern the country personally. He frequently bypassed the legislature issuing executive decrees regarding the matters which were not clearly specified as a parliamentary domain. This first of all pertained to government spending.  

The Southern Netherlands were linguistically divided with 55% of the population speaking Dutch and 42% speaking French. However, during the period of the French annexation the Flemish middle classes became Francophone. Hence, they resented the fact that Dutch was made the sole official language in Flanders in 1822, and that without knowledge of Dutch it was impossible to start a career in the civil service outside of Wallonia. The fact that Dutch was made the language of judicial proceedings created great difficulties for the Flemish legal professionals, few of whom spoke it. Another source of resentment among the middle class of Southern Netherlands was the thorough domination of the civil service by the Dutch. Since 1815, only a few officials from the Southern Netherlands assumed ministerial positions in the United Kingdom. As with the Bourbon dynasty in France, William I based his rule on the support of the pre-revolutionary ruling class: the nobility and the regents (the governing oligarchy under the Dutch Republic), whom he ennobled. They formed the majority of the deputies elected in the Northern Netherlands, and entirely dominated ministerial positions until the 1848 constitutional changes.

---

The elections to the provincial assemblies in the Netherlands were not government-controlled. Hence, the opposition in Southern Netherlands elected numerous representatives to the parliament. In the late 1820s the lower chamber’s political sympathies were divided geographically. Nearly all Dutch deputies were pro-government, while deputies from the Southern Netherlands were divided between an anti-government majority and a pro-government minority composed of civil officials whose employment depended on the administration’s favor. Hence, although the government controlled the majority in the chamber regarding votes on most issues, its preponderance could not be taken for granted. For example, a bill on press freedom was narrowly defeated in the legislature in December 1829. At the time, all Dutch deputies and seven deputies from the Southern Netherlands opposed the bill, while forty-seven of the latter were for. However, enough votes were subsequently found in the chamber to defeat the government’s proposal on the appropriation of the decennial budget.

An unusual coalition of orthodox Belgian Catholics and Liberals emerged in the lower chamber in the 1827-28 over the issues of press and education freedoms. This parliamentary faction was called the Union for Redress of Grievances. Catholics were frustrated over the government’s limitations on the establishment of Catholic schools, the closing of all Catholic seminaries apart from the one which was government-sponsored, and the support given to secular schools, while Liberals, frustrated by judicial persecution of radical newspapers and journalists, demanded complete press freedom and introduction of a parliamentary government. Even though Belgian Liberals did not agree with most of Catholic demands, they decided to form a coalition so that the latter would support their demands in turn. The cooperation between Belgian Liberals and Catholics turned out to be crucial during the Belgian revolution of 1830.
Given that their demands were not fulfilled, the Belgian opposition resorted to a build-up of political organization in order to mobilize its supporters and win the elections to the provincial councils and consequently, to the lower chamber. As a result, it won the 1829 election in the Southern part of the Kingdom. Subsequently, in January 1830 more than 350,000 signatures were collected in support of the petitions demanding freedom of education, introduction of the French as the official language in the Flemish areas, and freedom of the press. These efforts were directed by parish priests and most of the signees were illiterate peasants, who did not fully understand what they were supporting. The government responded with some concessions, but they were widely considered as inadequate in the South.\(^{40}\) After a harsh winter of 1829/30, the economic situation in the Southern provinces was poor and the anti-government attitudes common. In this light the William’s decision to organize festivities marking the anniversary of the union was very badly received in the South, where the popular opinion was agitated by the example of the July Revolution. At the last moment, the procession marking the anniversary was cancelled, but a patriotic opera was shown in Brussels on 25 August. As viewers were leaving the building, a riot was started and the insurgents quickly took control over Brussels. The Dutch army attempted to retake the city between 23 and 26 September, but the endeavor was unsuccessful. Given the military failure, the king and the legislature conceded on 29 September 1830 to administrative separation of the Kingdom. But at this stage the Liberal-dominated Belgian provisional government already demanded secession. The Belgian units deserted the army, and Northern troops withdrew to fortresses and over the former border. Belgian independence was declared on October 4.\(^{41}\)


\(^{41}\) Kossmann 1978, 152-54; Mallinson 1970, 54-55.
After the loss of Belgium, the opposition to the William’s rule was initially limited. Because both liberal and Catholic causes were associated with the Southern rebellion, these ideological currents became unpopular. The main cause of discontent in the kingdom were high costs of maintaining a standing army. The opposition on this issue forced William I to sign a peace treaty with Belgium in 1838. The deputies also resented the monarch’s abuse of constitutional prerogatives. The growing disagreement was indicated by the parliament’s rejection in 1839 of a bill which would authorize the government to spend a loan outside of legislative oversight. Two ministers resigned as a result. The necessity to revise the constitution after the Belgian secession created an opportunity for political change. The amendments adopted in 1840 increased the powers of the parliament. Legal responsibility of the ministers and the requirement of countersignature of royal decrees were introduced. The budget was made biennially and the distinction between the extraordinary and ordinary budgets was abolished. William I opposed the amendments, but the parliament threatened that it would reject the annual budget for 1840 if the royal consent was not granted. But the king was unwilling to rule under limited powers and abdicated. A convenient excuse was provided by his plans to marry a Belgian Catholic countess, which outraged public opinion.

Ideologically, the enfranchised Dutch middle class was fairly conservative. Only in the 1840s, relatively late in comparison to Belgium and France, did political liberalism develop in the Netherlands. The liberal opposition in the parliament was led by Johan Rudolph Thorbecke, a professor at the University of Leiden, who was a member of the lower chamber in 1844-45 and one of the proponents of the 1840 amendments. His proposal of a liberal constitutional reform,

---
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which would introduce parliamentary government and ensure greater press freedom, was vehemently criticized by the king and rejected in 1845 in the lower house, which was at the time dominated by the Conservatives. As of 1844, the Liberal faction led by Thorbecke numbered only nine out of fifty-six parliamentarians. However, sooner than expected were the Thorbecke’s proposals to be realized.

After Belgium achieved independence, its middle classes established a more liberal form of a PA monarchy in comparison to the united Netherlands. Elections to the Constituent Assembly were held on 3 November 1830 and the assembly met on 18 November. The election was direct, but the franchise was restricted in comparison to the period of the United Kingdom – only 4.5% of male adults could vote (vs. 7% before the secession). In February 1831 the Belgian Constitution was adopted. It was based mostly on the Dutch and French constitutions. The document created a strong parliament and guaranteed all relevant civil liberties, but it remained ambiguous on the question of parliamentary responsibility of the government. It declared that ministers are politically and legally responsible to the legislature, but it also gave the king the authority to appoint and dismiss them. The Belgian upper and lower chambers were elected by the same suffrage, but the right to stand for election to the former was limited to 400 persons only, which ensured its fairly conservative character.

Belgium survived as an independent country because its establishment did not threaten the interests of any of the Great Powers, while it was strongly supported by the French regime established in 1830. The secession was formally accepted on 20 December 1830 at the London Conference. In June 1831, the Belgian parliament elected Leopold of Saxe-Cobourg Gotha as the

---


King of the Belgians, a candidacy which was acceptable to the British. In August 1831, William I tried to retake Belgium militarily, but his initially successful offensive was halted after French troops entered the country. The creation of the independent Belgium was not without domestic opposition, however. The Orangist Movement, active in the 1840s, stood against the secession and remained loyal to William I on dynastic grounds. In 1831 Orangists incited riots in Ghent and attempted a coup in 1834. However, in the few cities, such as Ghent, where Orangists decided to participate in the 1831 election, they were soundly defeated. The movement died out after William I in 1839 recognized Belgian independence.46

Until 1839, the politics in Belgium was characterized by the continuation of the Liberal-Catholic coalition which secured the country’s independence in 1830. The political conflict proceeded along liberal-conservative dimensions and the religious cleavage was not activated.47 In 1842 the elite reached a compromise regarding the polarizing issue of primary education; it was to be financed by the state with a huge role of the Church in teaching.48 Geographically, the country was divided between rapidly industrializing Wallonia, which was a hotbed of Liberal sentiments, and rural Flanders, where the enfranchised middle class was conservative and heavily influenced by the church and nobility.49 King Leopold I took advantage of the constitution’s ambiguity regarding the ministerial responsibility and largely controlled executive power, nominating ministers who enjoyed his confidence. He generally based his rule on the support of the nobility, financial circles and the Church. The king was initially skeptical about the viability of the Belgian constitution, especially the large power it granted to the parliament.

46 Kossmann 1978, 173; Blom and Lamberts 1998, 316; Lichtervelde, Reed, and Reed 1930, 75, 105.
He considered the political process too slow for effective governance, complained that the most efficient ministers were often the ones most criticized, and considered the practice of biennial elections as ridiculous. The heavy presence of civil servants in the parliament hindered the latter’s ability to contest the executive power.\footnote{Blom and Lamberts 1998, 316; Cammaerts 1939, 75-76; Ertman 2000, 159.} However, since the early 1840s the preponderance of the church and the nobility in the political process came to be challenged by the Liberals. The first step in the process was creation of local and regional Liberal electoral societies, which supported a single slate of candidates before parliamentary elections.\footnote{Blom and Lamberts 1998, 317.}

**Periods of Competitive Oligarchy**

**Transition to Competitive Oligarchy during July Monarchy**

As mentioned, the regime of July Monarchy in France, established in 1830, did not begin its life as a competitive oligarchy as the constitutional charter endowed executive power with the monarch. Hence, since the regime’s inception the parliament struggled with Louis-Philippe over the issue of parliamentary responsibility and gradually asserted its dominance, although the king retained a great deal of influence over the government’s policy and nomination of ministers until the final days of the regime. The initial period of the July Monarchy was relatively liberal. The regime tolerated revolutionary clubs and radically associations. Yet, after the wave of repression in 1834-35 the civil society and the press were functioning under growing restrictions. Republican associations and political clubs were largely suppressed and the regime became increasingly conservative.\footnote{Agulhon 1983, 13; Aminzade 1993, 108-109.} The composition of the French elite also changed after 1830. During the Restoration the highest levels of civil service were dominated by aristocracy and the nobility, but purges conducted at the beginning of July Monarchy led to the preponderance of the
financial and industrial bourgeoisie. Still, the nobility retained importance in some areas of public administration, especially diplomacy. Numerous Bonapartist, purged after 1815, also reentered the civil service and the military.\textsuperscript{53}

In the initial years of the July Monarchy, the Parisian lower classes, disappointed by the fact that the July Revolution did not result in establishment of a republic, continued to impose direct political pressure on the government through riots and demonstrations. In December 1831, the government hardly contained riots which broke out over it refused to condemn to death legitimist ministers. A church service in memory of a legitimist duke in February 1831 provoked a particularly tumultuous riot. The rioters pillaged several churches without intervention from law enforcement. The affair ultimately led to dismissal of a moderate Prime Minister Laffitte on 13 March 1831. The situation in Paris was largely pacified during the administration of Casimir Périer (March 1831-May 1832). A member of the opposition under Charles X, Périer came to embrace increasingly conservative positions under the July Monarchy. From the opposite side of the political spectrum, the July Monarchy was attacked by legitimists. Duchess de Berry, the daughter-in-law of Charles X, staged an unsuccessful pro-Bourbon uprising in Vendée in June 1832.\textsuperscript{54} Subsequently, the regime decided to crack down on the republican opposition. In April 1834 a Republican organization, Society for the Rights of Men, was outlawed on the basis of a new law on unauthorized associations. This led to severe riots in Lyon and a well-publicized trial of Republican activists. In July 1835, during an unsuccessful assassination attempt of the king, several high officials were killed. The attempt shocked bourgeoisie public opinion and widely discredited the Republicans. As a result, a new round of repressive legislation was enacted in
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September 1835. The judicial procedures pertaining to political offences were changed, so it became less burdensome to find the accused culpable. The press law was made more restrictive and unauthorized public meetings were prohibited. It was also outlawed to publicly propagate alternative dynasties or regime types (i.e. a republic or empire). This severely limited the scope of freedom of the Republicans.55

Parliamentary factions active during the July Monarchy could be divided into two basic groups: the pro-dynastic factions, which supported the Orleans dynasty, and the opposition. Among the dynastical factions there were doctrinaires or the “Resistance” (led by Casimir Périer and later by François Guizot), center-left (with such politicians as Adolphe Thiers, and later Louis-Mathieu Molé) and the dynastic left or the “Movement”. The doctrinaires aimed to preserve the political system in its current shape and resisted any attempts at reform. The Center-left was willing to cooperate with the dynastic left, was flexible in its policies, and did not in principle oppose the extension of suffrage. The dynastical left preferred a moderate extension of suffrage and favored liberal policies. The opposition was divided into legitimists and republicans.56 The latter managed to elect a dozen of deputies at each election in spite of the high property requirements for suffrage. Republicans were popular in the localities characterized by the radical bourgeoisie during the revolution, or those where the elite was threatened by legitimist peasantry. Two principal republican newspapers operated during the July Monarchy: a moderate Le National, founded in 1830, and radical-socialist La Reforme, founded in 1845. In 1837 Central Committee of the Constitutional Opposition, which performed a function of the Republican central electoral organization, was established in Paris. It coordinated the efforts of


56 Beik 1965, 43-44; Price 2007, 205-06, 225.
local electoral committees, distributed letters and pamphlets, and helped register pro-Republican voters. Republicans emphasized the issues of government corruption, meritocratic recruitment to the civil service and civil liberties in order to mobilize bourgeois voters. They also demanded a moderate extension of the suffrage. Still, Republican supporters were divided along the class lines. The working class Republicans favored a social republic with universal suffrage, a demand which was unacceptable to most middle class Republicans.\footnote{Agulhon 1983,14-17, 18-21; Aminzade 1993, 29-30, 34-35, 108-09; Beik 1965, 71-72, 92.}

The principal political development of the July Monarchy was the emergence of responsible government and hence, transformation of the political system from PA monarchy to competitive oligarchy. One of the reasons of Charles X’s abolition was his adamant refusal to acknowledge the principle of ministerial responsibility. It was then widely expected that the government should become politically responsible under the new regime, even though the constitution stated that the king nominated and dismissed ministers. What is undoubtable is that during the July Monarchy both Louis Philippe and the lower chamber affected the composition of the government, but the relative importance of these two actors changed over time. In the period 1830-36 some of the governments were fairly strong and the respective prime ministers were hardly controlled by the king (for example, Périer or Soult), while other prime ministers were widely considered to be the king’s puppets (e.g. Mortier).\footnote{Beik 1965, 46-47.} The decisive struggle between the monarch and the assembly took place in the years 1835-1836 and ended with the chamber’s tentative victory. In March 1835, when during a parliamentary crisis five candidates for prime minister attempted to form a government, the majority of deputies forced the king to nominate their preferred choice, Victor de Broglie, for the post. Broglie’s cabinet resigned in February
1836 after an unpopular tax bill was defeated in the chamber. This was the first clear instance when the cabinet fell after it stopped being supported by the majority in the chamber, and hence could be treated as a breakthrough to parliamentarism. 59 But the parliamentary majority was still challenged by the king after the Broglie’s resignation. In September 1836 Thiers’ cabinet resigned after Louis-Philippe expressed his opposition to the prime minister’s plan to intervene in the Spanish civil war. In March 1837 the monarch failed to dismiss the Molé’s government after a military bill was defeated. The cabinet, however, obtained the legislature’s vote of confidence in May 1837 after a reshuffle. It subsequently continued in office after the November 1837 election even though its parliamentary support was in doubt. This happened mostly because Molé was still backed by the king. His government was attacked by the opposition led by Thiers, who argued that the king “should reign but not govern”, according to the British constitutional practice. Hoping to provide the Molé’s government with workable majority, the king dissolved the chamber, but after the election in March 1839 brought about his government’s defeat, Molé resigned. 60

In May 1839, the center-left opposition formed a government led by Marshall Nicolas Soult. Soult resigned after he lost a vote in March 1840. The king again referred to Adolphe Thiers, leader of dynastic left, to form the government. Thiers attempted to strengthen the parliamentarism, but was forced by the king to resign in October 1840 over his foreign policy. Subsequently, the government consisted of Orleanist Conservatives and was led by François Guizot (while Soult remained its nominal head). Guizot’s nomination was intended by the king to be a temporary solution as he preferred to alternate the right and left-wing Orleanists in office.

59 Beik 1965, 46-47.
But Guizot turned out to be a shrewd politician, and he remained in power until the fall of the regime in February 1848. He forged a disciplined faction out of conservative deputies and convincingly won the 1842 and 1846 elections. Guizot’s success partially stemmed from his unfair electoral tactics, which were strongly criticized by the opposition. At the district level, favorable returns were obtained through heavy use of patronage. Voters could be persuaded to support the government by promises of investments, such as railways, or future government jobs, while prefects forced government employees to vote for the preferred candidates. Moreover, the government supported campaigns of civil officials, whom it found easy to control once they were elected. After the 1846 election, the number of civil officials reached 63% of the government faction’s membership in the lower chamber. Still, the Guizot’s government did not “control” elections in the manner of contemporary authoritarian governments in Spain or Portugal, or non-competitive monarchical oligarchies in Hungary and Italy after 1860. The legacy of free electoral competition from the period of PA monarchy prevented July Monarchy from turning into a non-competitive oligarchy.62

The last years of the July Monarchy were characterized by increasing demands to extend the suffrage from the lower middle classes. The regime, which represented solely the interests of the very wealthy, was considered to be widely unrepresentative. The disenfranchised middle classes preferred liberalization of the existing political system, but not establishment of a revolutionary republic or a populist-authoritarian empire. The petite bourgeoisie was politically mobilized due to participation in the local government elections, in which nearly 40% of male adults could take part. In this situation, the very high tax requirement for national elections
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appeared particularly unfair. In 1847, twenty-three departmental councils adopted resolutions favoring suffrage extension and prohibition of civil officials from serving in the legislature. However, these demands and the associated reform proposals were firmly rejected by Guizot and the conservatives dominating the assembly. Guizot famously advised the disenfranchised to enrich themselves, accumulate property and thus obtain the suffrage. Another source of contention among the opposition was the conservative character of the Guizot’s regime, which kept civil liberties tightly restricted. The prime minister’s intransigence regarding suffrage extension and political liberalization forged cooperation between the dynastic left and republicans. After suffrage reform proposals were once more defeated in the assembly in March and April 1847, given formal prohibition on political meetings, the opposition organized banquet campaigns to mobilize both the enfranchised and disenfranchised supporters (the name derived from the fact that participants did not make, technically, political speeches but only raised toasts). The first of those was held in July 1847. While the lower middle classes opposed the July Monarchy on political grounds, discontent and malnutrition was also growing among the urban poor, painfully hit by growing food prices and decreased wages after the crisis of 1846. The regime’s unpopularity was on the rise because of the government’s inefficient response to the crisis, its association with grain speculators and rich bankers, and a series of corruption and ethical scandals. There is, however, historical evidence that the prime minister was changing his mind on the need of suffrage extension as of January 1848, but attempts at reform at this stage were blocked by the king.63

Some historians made comparisons of the situation in France in the late 1840s and Britain in the late 1820s (although the British political system in the period had been admittedly less

oligarchical than the July Monarchy). In both countries the tensions ran high as the
disenfranchised groups demanded reforms. In both, there emerged coalitions between the civil
society actors representing the working and the middle classes. However, the British elite
managed to preserve the competitive oligarchy by making sufficient concessions in the 1832
reform. The reform broke the coalition between the lower middle and the working classes,
enfranchising the former and denying the suffrage to the latter. In France, the inflexible July
Monarchy denied a reform and was subsequently abolished; this might have been the fate of the
British pre-reform regime if the concessions had not been granted at the right time. Comparisons
could also be made between the July Monarchy and the Belgian and Dutch monarchical
competitive oligarchies, discussed later in the chapter. If Louis-Philippe had made concessions
before 1848, his regime did have a chance to survive and France could have gradually evolved
into a self-sustaining democracy through gradual extensions of the suffrage. In this way it would
proceed along the path later followed by Belgium and the Netherlands. But in those polities the
elites did make concessions before social tensions actually erupted into popular uprisings, and
hence avoided the fate of Guizot.64

Transition to Competitive Oligarchy in Belgium

After France, the breakthrough to parliamentary government was achieved in Belgium.
As mentioned, the Belgian politics in the 1840s was characterized by electoral mobilization of
the Liberals which challenged the conservative-Catholic cabinets controlled by Leopold I. In
1845 the moderate Catholic government of Nothomb lost the elections, but Leopold I again
ominated a government of similar political predispositions. This angered Liberals and spurred
their mobilization efforts. In June 1846 the first congress of the Liberal Party was held. The party
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announced its open opposition to the government and adopted a political platform in which it declared support for the introduction of secular education, preservation of civil liberties, and moderate suffrage extension. It also discussed campaign strategy for the June 1847 election.

After a bitter and hard-fought campaign, Liberals won the vote and the king “had no choice” but to entrust the leader of the party, Charles Rogier, with the task of cabinet formation. He did so only reluctantly, though, and subsequently the administration was in conflict with the monarch over several government appointments.65

Hence, the parliamentary government was to a large extent established in Belgium at the time of the Spring of Nations in 1848. For that reasons the enfranchised middle class did not have a reason to protest, and the lower classes, apart from a few radical workers, were not yet politically mobilized. Still, the events in France caused initially much confusion and anxiety among the Belgian political elites. On 26 February 1848 Leopold, fearing that he was going to meet the same fate as Louis Philippe, his father-in-law, wanted to abdicate, but he abandoned the idea after the Liberal cabinet assured him of loyalty. Ultimately, the Belgian government remained in control without significant problems. This was because the popular sentiments ran against the French democrats and foreign agitation. Belgian democratic societies were dominated by middle class intellectuals and enjoyed limited support among the working class. Hence, a few democrats active in Brussels were easily arrested. The few popular disturbances were caused by unemployed workers, but the government alleviated the situation by organizing a program of public works. Otherwise, French Radicals mobilized armed units which planned to cross the border in order to incite a revolution and introduce a republic in Belgium and, if possible, in the Netherlands. They were composed mostly of Belgian workers who had become unemployed in

France due to the crisis, and whose revolutionary intentions were doubtful. These units were easily stopped by Belgian troops. Nevertheless, the government enacted a series of moderate reforms in March 1848 in order to further reduce the risk of a popular uprising. The scope of suffrage was slightly increased to about 8% of male adults, the stamp tax on daily newspapers was abolished, and a ban on linking the functions of a civil official and parliamentarian was introduced (so that MPs could act independently of the government). The Liberal Party convincingly won a snap election in June 1848. There was a general conviction, however, that if the Liberals had not taken over in 1847, Belgium would have been likely struck by a revolution or an uprising. It did not happen also due to the moderate and prudent attitude of Leopold I, who in contrast to Louis-Philippe did not oppose the suffrage extension and other liberalizing reforms when they were proposed (one should as well note that the suffrage in Belgium before 1848 was much wider than in France in the first place).  

Nevertheless, the struggle for parliamentary government in Belgium was not over with the appointment of the Rogier’s ministry in August 1847, as Leopold I did not abandon the efforts to nominate prime ministers whom he could control. Rogier’s cabinet resigned in October 1852 after it lost its parliamentary majority over the issue of education. Subsequently, Henri de Brouckère formed a moderate extra-parliamentary Liberal cabinet supported by the king. It survived in power mostly because the chamber was unable to form a viable alternative. After the 1854 election the representation of the right-wing deputies increased, hence Brouckère resigned and Leopold I formed another extra-parliamentary cabinet led by Pierre De Decker, this time with a center-right slant. This government encountered serious difficulties when it could not obtain the necessary majority to adopt a bill on the church’s role in the administration of charity.

---

Liberals organized several demonstrations against the charity bill, and the local election in October 1857 was fought on the issue. The vote resulted in a Liberal victory, after which De Decker resigned. The king again nominated Rogier as prime minister, and he continued in power after Liberals decisively won the November 1857 election. Leopold I clearly preferred extra-parliamentary cabinets (such as Brouckere or De Decker). If a prime minister lacked parliamentary support, the king could become the true chief executive, whereas under parliamentary cabinets the scope of his influence was limited. Nevertheless, after the 1857 crisis all Belgian governments were in principle parliamentary, although the monarch continued to interfere in politics. They influenced the choice of prime ministers or particular ministers, and tried to alter government policies on particular issues. For example, in December 1871 Leopold II dismissed a Catholic prime minister whom he disliked and nominated another politician from the Catholic Party to the post. In the 1900s he also tried to change the government’s policy over the issues of conscription and military spending.67

**Transition to Competitive Oligarchy in the Netherlands**

In contrast, the Spring of Nations marked the breakthrough to the parliamentary governments in the Netherlands. But in contrast to France, the ruling elite, and the monarch in particular, were prudent enough to initiate the changes before a likely revolt would spiral out of control. The events in France and Germany made King William II suddenly embrace liberal positions in March 1848. But his change of opinion was also motivated by the pro-democratic agitation of local Radicals, the bad economic situation, and the strongly conservative ideology of the crown prince, who was widely considered as unsuitable for rule. On 25 March the king nominated a liberal diplomat Gerrit Schimmelpenninck as the cabinet formateur. He accepted the

---
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office under two conditions: the king would accept the constitutional reforms being prepared by a commission chaired by the leading liberal, Johan Rudolph Thorbecke, and the cabinet would function along the British model, which entailed the prime minister’s exclusive right to nominate other ministers and its collective responsibility to the parliament.

The Thorbecke-led constitutional reform was backed by the Liberal public opinion and the king. The publication of the draft constitution on 11 April 1848 was followed by a petition campaign which clearly favored the changes. The proposed amendments lacked clear parliamentary support because the lower chamber as of 1848 consisted of no more than eight liberals, and about twenty-five moderates and conservatives each. Hence, curiously in comparison to other European countries, the government needed to convince a Conservative-dominated legislature to enact liberal reforms. The constitution was finally enacted in October 1848, and direct elections to the lower house were held soon afterward. Regarding the principle of parliamentary responsibility, the document adopted the ambiguous wording of the Belgian constitution, which stated that the ministers are responsible, but “the king appoints and dismisses [them] as he pleases.” Until the 1868 crisis the principle of ministerial responsibility was understood narrowly in the Netherlands: the government remained in power throughout new elections until the newly-elected parliament expressed its lack of confidence through a defeat of a government legislative proposal. Otherwise, the constitution introduced the principle of the separation of the church and state and a yearly budget. The lower chamber obtained the rights to amend legislation and to interpellation. The body was directly elected in the two-round majoritarian system for a period of four years with half of its membership renewed biennially (after 1887, elections were held every four years). The upper chamber came to be elected indirectly by provincial assemblies for nine years with 1/3 of the membership renewed every
three years (only 1,000 people could serve in this chamber because of the extremely high tax-paying requirement for membership). Civil liberties were guaranteed. Suffrage remained restricted to about 10% of male adults. This was actually a slight decrease in comparison to the pre-1848 period, when 12% of male adults could vote in provincial elections.68

The period 1848-68 in the Netherlands (similar to the years 1847-57 in Belgium) was characterized by the struggle between the monarchy and the legislature regarding the establishment of a fully responsible government. After the parliament elected in 1848 convened in February 1849, the new king (William III) tried to maintain the cabinet of Jacob de Kempenaer in power, but had to give up on the idea given the hostile majority in the chamber. Hence, Thorbecke became prime minister in November 1849 and he continued in office until November 1853.69 Politically, the decades after the 1848 reform were characterized by a conflict between Liberals and Conservatives; both groups however lacked clearly defined ideologies. In terms of political organization, they formed loose parliamentary factions. No political parties in the modern sense yet existed, but at the local level electoral associations supported candidates during the campaign and election periods, as in Belgium. Liberals aimed at full implementation of the 1848 constitution. Until the 1868 crisis they were supported not only by the secular middle class, but also by Catholics (about 35% of the country’s population), whose goal was preserve the religious equality achieved in 1848. Conservatives aimed to keep as much power as possible in the hands of the king. The strength of the Conservative faction was constantly dwindling, however, until they elected only one representative in 1888. Still, the majority of parliamentarians favored a middle-ground position between the Liberals and Conservatives. This
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group, although it did not react to the 1848 reform enthusiastically, came to support the constitutional changes once they were enacted. Hence, they blocked the king’s attempts to return to the pre-1848 system of PA monarchy. The monarch’s efforts in this regard were also hampered by his erratic personality and mistaken political strategies. Hence, William III could not obtain unequivocal support even from the generally pro-monarchical conservatives.\textsuperscript{70}

The separation of church and state adopted in the 1848 constitution disestablished the state Reformed Church and gave the Catholics the freedom to organize. The Catholic hierarchy was reestablished in the Netherlands in 1853, which led to a conservative backlash and resulted in dismissal of the Thorbecke government. Still, the Liberal leader resigned not because of a conflict with the parliament, where he still enjoyed majority support, but because the king expressed public displeasure with his policies. Against the government’s wishes, William III received a petition signed by 51,000 citizens which criticized the establishment of the hierarchy, and held private consultation with the leader of the opposition, Van Hall. Subsequently, Thorbecke resigned. Afterwards, in April 1853 William III called on Van Hall to form a cabinet, even though the Conservative politician lacked parliamentary majority. Hence, he continued in office mostly as a result of the king’s support. Van Hall resigned in July 1856 after his coalition experienced internal disagreements over education policies. Another coalition government of Conservatives and Anti-Revolutionaries (Orthodox Calvinists) ruled in 1856-58. In the 1858 elections Liberals obtained a majority, but the king was unwilling to agree to a purely Liberal cabinet. Instead, a “fusion” cabinet was formed by Jan Jacob Rochussen, which united moderate Liberals and Conservatives. This cabinet resigned in December 1860 over the defeat of its budget. Three cabinets lacking true parliamentary support, dominated by moderate Liberals,
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ruled between February 1860 and February 1862, until the parliamentary majority compelled the
king to nominate Thorbecke as prime minister again. The latter resigned in February 1866 over
internal disagreements within the Liberal coalition. After a short Liberal cabinet, the king
 nominated a conservative ministry headed by Van Nijevelt. Its parliamentary support was
dubious.\textsuperscript{71}

In 1866-68, William III made a final attempt to preserve his political power. He
intervened during election campaigns in support of the Conservatives, and kept a Conservative
cabinet in power against the wishes of the Liberal-dominated parliament. The assembly was
dissolved twice as the king hoped to obtain a Conservative majority. The first dissolution, in
June 1866, occurred after the lower chamber passed a vote in which it disagreed with the
government’s appointment of the governor of Java (the most important colonial post), which
took place without the parliament being consulted on the matter. In this period electoral ballots
were sent by the government to voters’ homes. The ministry of interior, in consultation with the
king, prepared a royal proclamation, which was sent to the electorate alongside ballots. It advised
the voters to support the government in the upcoming election. This step was criticized as being
of questionable legality. In the newly-elected chamber it was unclear whether the government
could count on the majority support. The assembly, however, rejected the foreign ministry
budget in November 1867. The cabinet resigned, and the king refused to accept the resignation.
Hence, the ministers asked the king to dissolve the chamber (it was widely considered at the time
that both steps were of dubious legality, in the light of the emerging norm of parliamentary
responsibility). The campaign was fought on the latter issue, and the opposition won. The newly-
elected legislature accepted a motion stating “that the interest of the country did not require the
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dissolution of the [previous] Chamber.” Since the cabinet refused to resign after the election, the foreign affairs budget was again rejected. Only then the cabinet resigned and the king nominated a Liberal ministry. This was the last time when a cabinet tried to continue in office against the will of the parliamentary majority. The moment marked the final breakthrough of the principle of parliamentarism in the Netherlands.72

**Politics in Belgium and the Netherlands under Competitive Oligarchy**

After the consolidation of parliamentarism, the subsequent decades in the Netherlands and Belgium were marked by the conflict over the issue of education, the emergence of mass political parties, and increasing pressures for the extension of suffrage. The legacy of PA monarchy contributed to the acceptance of the principles of open-outcome elections and constitutional legality by all relevant political forces, including the majority among the emerging social democratic movement. Moreover, in spite of the growing importance of the religious and (in Belgium) linguistic cleavages, the relevant political forces remained committed to the indivisibility of the Netherlands and Belgium as nation-states.73 Before WWI, the only significant anti-system group among the elites was the small ultramontane minority within the Belgian Catholic party. They preferred the corporatist structure of the representative institutions and called for dominant role of the Catholic Church in the political system. The ultramontane movement lost its significance after Pope Leo XIII, elected in 1878, called Belgian Catholics to recognize the principles of the liberal state and work within its institutional framework.74

---
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In the Netherlands, the conflict over the role of the churches in education, which escalated after 1868, provided an impetus for the creation of modern political parties. The traditional conservatives gradually disappeared and gave way to religiously-inspired parties, while Liberals became electorally more successful. Dutch Catholics abandoned ties with the Liberals and, encouraged by bishops, set up their own electoral associations. A similar development was observed among the religiously-inspired Protestants, who split from the secular Conservatives. The movement away from Conservatism was led by Abraham Kuyper, an influential theologian. Opposing the fact that Liberal governments promoted public secular education, he founded the Anti-School Law League in 1871, and led a petition drive against the 1878 school bill during which 300,000 signatures were collected. In 1879 Kuyper founded the Anti-Revolutionary Party. It was the first modern party in the Netherlands, characterized by mass membership and a network of local chapters. Its goal was to mobilize orthodox Calvinists (members of the so-called Gereformeerde Churches). The name emphasized that the party stood against the principles of the French revolution, as it claimed that the sovereignty should ultimately derive from God and not from the people. The party’s political goal was Protestant theocracy ruled by a member of the Orange dynasty, but its leaders admitted that this ideal had become attainable given the divided character of the Dutch society. Hence, Anti-Revolutionaries accepted the liberal constitutional framework at the national level and instead advocated for “sphere sovereignty”, meaning that Protestants should create their own institutions (such as schools or associations) in which the God’s sovereignty could be established. Finally, the Liberals were the dominant political force in the Netherlands during the competitive oligarchy.
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They were however divided into several factions with unclear boundaries. The competition from religious parties forced Liberals to organize into a parliamentary party in 1885, the so-called Liberal Union. The Liberals ruled in the periods 1868-74, 1877-79 and 1891-1901. However, with the gradual extensions of suffrage their electoral strength was steadily diminishing. The last purely Liberal government ruled the country in the period 1905-07.

In Belgium after 1857, the main political cleavage ran along the religious dimension, and the parliament was divided between the Liberal and Catholic factions. The Catholic electoral support was concentrated in the countryside and small towns (especially in Flanders), while Liberals were successful in bigger cities. As mentioned, the latter established a modern political organization already in 1847 and also for that reason were more successful at elections, controlling the government in the period 1857-70. As a reaction to the Liberal strength, the Catholics moderated their political program and expelled the unpopular ultramontane wing. But Catholic efforts at political organization lagged behind the Liberals; only in 1863 did all Catholic candidates agree on a common political program and only in 1878 the central Catholic electoral committee was formed. The early efforts at mobilization bore fruit when Catholics won the 1870 election campaigning against increased military spending. The growing popularity of the Catholic Party was caused by the increasing anti-clericalism of the Belgian Liberalism and its radical tendencies. Catholics mostly ruled the country after 1870, with a Liberal interlude in 1878-1884.
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78 Cammaerts 1939, 112-15; Emerson 1979, 124-25; Lichtervelde, Reed, and Reed 1930; Mallinson 1970, 67-69, 76-77, 229-37, 249-61.
79 Blom and Lamberts 1998, 325; Boulger 1925, 185.
The political conflict in the 1850-60s in Belgium concentrated on the issue of education, while the problems relevant to the disenfranchised lower classes were largely ignored by the elite. Liberals aimed to diminish the scope of the clerical control over schools, while Catholics intended to preserve it. The first election under the secret ballot, held in 1878, resulted in a Liberal victory. In 1879 Liberals adopted a school reform which established direct state control over municipal schools and removed the religious curriculum. This led to the so-called School Wars (1879-1884). During the period, Catholics boycotted state schools and established their own educational network. Subsequently, they mobilized electorally, won the 1884 election and modified the reform. Catholics managed to defeat Liberals arguing for political moderation, compromise on the school issue, and limited government. Ultimately, the Catholic electoral victory in 1884 led to the development of pillarization in Belgium, which refers to the growth of separate schools, associations and other institutions of the Catholic, Liberal and Social Democratic segments of the society.80

Transitions to Democracy and Periods of Democratic Politics

Failure of Democratic Transitions in France: Second Republic and the Liberal Empire

In France, the revolution of February 1848 abolished the July Monarchy and brought to power a radical republican government which introduced universal male suffrage and organized democratic elections, which it lost, ironically, to politicians belonging to the pre-1848 elite. In spite of this apparent elite continuation, the regime discontinuity of 1848 undermined in various ways the positive legacy of the constitutionalism and open-outcome elections from the period of Restoration and July Monarchy. First of all, the constitution adopted in November 1848 created an entirely new institutional framework of a presidential republic with universal male suffrage.

As mentioned before, a republican form of government was not universally accepted in French society; the Republic suffered from a deficit of legitimacy. It had clear associations with the Jacobin terror, and was unpopular among the French middle and upper classes, and certain groups in the peasantry, who considered the Bourbon monarchy as the legitimate political system. The rural population (80% of the total, including 55% of peasants), was at best ambivalent about the republic, but had fond memories about the imperial period. Adoption of the universal male suffrage offered the rural masses the first real opportunity to express opinions at the ballot box. More importantly, the new institutional framework created political opportunities for anti-system actors, unassociated with the political elite from the period of competitive oligarchy. Such opportunities would not have been present had the extension of suffrage been moderate and had the parliamentary monarchy been preserved. The person who took advantage of this political opportunity was Louis-Napoleon Bonaparte, the emperor’s nephew. He was elected to the presidency in December 1848 by the rural vote. He based his campaign strategy on the imperial narrative of legitimacy, which he subsequently used to get rid of democracy altogether. In this story, the importance of the institutional opening created by the discontinuity of 1848 is clearly visible: Louis-Napoleon would not have been elected to the post of prime minister by the parliament, he would not have gained the majority in a presidential election under restricted suffrage, and he would not have been able to conduct the 1851 coup had the masses been politically mobilized and educated. From this point of view, one could claim that universal suffrage was introduced “too early” in France, before the rural masses became politically mobilized and could consciously vote for their effective representatives. Hence, they
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were open to political mobilization by actors not committed to democracy (but again, as showed by the results of legislative elections in 1848 and 1849, this would have posed a smaller threat to democracy had France retained the parliamentary system). Regarding the urban proletariat of the main cities, it had been politicized already since the revolution, and at its instigation universal suffrage was introduced in the first place. But its leaders accepted democracy only as long as it came in the socialist-revolutionary version (itself perhaps an oxymoron). Otherwise, they were willing to rebel against democratically-elected governments if those enacted policies which ran contrary to the workers’ interests (as proven by the June 1848 uprising and the Paris Commune of 1871). From this point of view, the urban proletariat was also “prematurely enfranchised” in 1848. Only during the Third Republic did this social group develop commitment to democratic legalism.

The July Monarchy was abolished as a result of a popular uprising which broke out in February 1848 in Paris. The indirect cause of the revolt was harsh winter and the related economic crisis. Because Guizot’s government had banned political meetings, the opposition resorted to organization of banquets during which toasts were raised in place of usual speeches. The government banned such a banquet scheduled for 22 February, and the organizers – the parliamentary opposition - agreed to cancel it (fearing that it would lead to a popular outbreak). However, the students and workers who had been preparing for the event assembled anyway. Clashes with the police followed. On 23 February the National Guard, called to quell the disturbances, refused to fight and demanded resignation of Guizot. This was a crucial moment of the revolution: the National Guard, composed primarily of the disenfranchised members of the lower middle class, supported the protesters’ demands for liberalization and suffrage extension. Guizot resigned in the evening on February 23. Subsequently, in general confusion, some
demonstrators were shot in front of the prime minister’s residence and this led to the radicalization of protests. On 24 February there was a general fighting in Paris and the king’s residence was attacked. Louis-Philippe was unwilling to engage in bloody repression; hence he called off the fighting and abdicated. But because the parliament was also under assault, his son’s regency could not be confirmed. Instead, a republican provisional government was established on the evening of February 24. It was composed of moderate and radical republicans and included also one socialist worker.\footnote{Agulhon 1983, 24-26; Beik 1965, 99-106; Fortescue 2005, 55-66; Gildea 2008, 53-55; Price 2007, 342-44, 348-65.}

The provisional government was concerned that a new king could be proclaimed in a situation of a power vacuum (as in July 1830); hence it immediately announced a republic. But although symbolic gestures toward the revolutionary period and the empire were made, it was emphasized that the new regime would be a liberal-democratic republic. The provisional government proclaimed universal male suffrage, abolished slavery in the colonies and the death penalty for political offences. All restrictions on the freedom of press and association were eliminated. The first months of the republic were indeed characterized by unrestricted freedom. Under popular pressure from the Parisian lower class, the provisional government established Commission for the Workers. It was elected by the workers themselves and its goal was to improve their condition. The government also limited the working day to ten hours in Paris and eleven hours in the provinces, and created a program of public works under the name of “national workshops.”\footnote{Agulhon 1983, 27-28, 37-39; Fortescue 2005, 78-88, 92-93; Magraw 1986, 125-27.} In the provinces, there was intermittent violence directed against wealthy individuals, foresters or tax officials, which reflected old peasant grievances, but otherwise the proclamation of the republic stirred little resistance. The administration, with few
exceptions, declared allegiance to the provisional government. The upper middle class, which was the backbone of the July Monarchy, was more interested in preservation of the social order than in undermining the new regime.\textsuperscript{85}

The elections for the constituent assembly were scheduled for April 9, and there was a clear expectation in Paris that the rural population would not support socialist candidates. Hence, representatives of the Parisian proletariat pressured the government postpone the vote until the peasant masses become politically “educated”. But the postponement was symbolic; the election was held on April 23.\textsuperscript{86} The vote was free, although the government supported moderate Republicans. The turnout reached 84\%, which contrasted sharply with the countryside’s passivity during the elections of the revolutionary period. Peasants were mobilized to vote by local notables. Landowners, priests, mayors and civil servants had a rather conservative influence, but teachers or lawyers in some localities tried to mobilize lower classes to vote for left Republicans, having been encouraged for that purpose by the government. Still, the latter failed to emphasize the issues relevant to the peasantry, such as debt relief, reduction in taxes, or reestablishment of communal lands. The provisional government was also unpopular among the peasantry because it had raised taxes in order to finance the growing budget deficit and the program of public works for the urban poor. Peasants were convinced that the new taxes were being spent on idle workers in the cities who worked in useless National Workshops, and numerous tax revolts broke out in 1848. In the end, a rather conservative assembly was elected. It was dominated by the former Orleanists and Legitimists who professed only a nominal
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allegiance to the Republic. Members of the provisional government and a few radical socialists were elected from Paris and larger cities.\textsuperscript{87}

The newly-elected assembly quickly came into conflict with the radicalized Parisian proletariat. On 15 May crowds stormed the legislature aiming to dissolve it, but the legislature was saved through an intervention of the National Guard. Socialist ministers were subsequently expelled from the government and a few socialist leaders were arrested. On 21 June the government effectively dissolved the National Workshops. The workers which had been employed by this program lost their jobs. This led to an uprising in Paris, which was brutally repressed by General Louis-Eugène Cavagnac, a conservative republican, who was afterward elected chief executive on 24 June. The ruthlessness with which the uprising was crushed contrasted sharply with the Louis Philippe’s unwillingness or inability to spill blood: soldiers were more likely to obey orders given by a legitimate republican government elected under universal suffrage. Subsequently, the legislature restricted political clubs and introduced a stamp tax on newspapers, which aimed to curb the socialist press. But the assembly also cultivated the support among the peasantry: one of its last acts was reduction of indirect taxes on salt and alcohol.\textsuperscript{88}

Local elections under universal suffrage took place in July and August 1848. In most of the country, the moderately conservative class of officials from the July Monarchy was reelected. Few Left Republicans became councilors.\textsuperscript{89} By-elections held between May and September 1848
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also brought about conservative victories. On the wave of resurgence of Bonapartist feelings, Louis-Napoleon Bonaparte, the emperor’s nephew, was elected in September. He was a well-known pretender to the power and political adventurer. He participated in a Carbonari uprising against the Papal State and led two failed military coup attempts against July Monarchy in 1836 and 1840. The constitution, adopted by the assembly on 4 November 1848, was inspired by the models developed during the First Republic and in the United States. The latter provided the only example of a successful republican democracy. The document envisioned a single legislative chamber. The executive power belonged to a directly elected president who could serve only once. This provision was designed with the Bonaparte family in mind. It was hoped that it would prevent a member of this family from aspiring to power indefinitely (as it turned out, without success).

The campaign for presidential elections, scheduled for 10 December, was dominated by three candidates. Louis-Napoleon did not openly commit to any political faction and presented a rather ambiguous program. On one hand, he emphasized the traditional values of order, family and religion, but he also portrayed himself as a defender of civil liberties. When campaigning in rural areas he highlighted the issues relevant to the peasantry, such as tax relief and agrarian reform. Obviously, he was backed by Bonapartists, but was also given a tacit and half-hearted support by other conservatives, both Legitimists and Orleanists. Three reasons accounted for this: the latter could not agree on a compromise candidate, they did not have sufficient time to
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organize a viable campaign which would make such a candidate known in the countryside, and wrongly assessed Louis-Napoleon as a weak man who could be easily manipulated. Cavaignac, although he was respected for his role during the June uprising, was not popular among conservatives because he did not commit to a monarchist platform and instead adopted a center-left stance. In the end, Louis-Napoleon won by the landslide with 74% of the vote. Peasants voted for him mostly out of name recognition. Cavaignac obtained 20% of the vote. As the “butcher of Paris” he was obviously unpopular in radical cities. Finally, a socialist candidate Ledru-Rollin obtained only 5% of the vote.94

Regular legislative elections for a three-year period were held on 13 May 1849. The conservatives in the parliament organized into a loose grouping called the Party of Order, which was composed both of Legitimists and Orleanists. They would be happy to reintroduce the monarchy in France but the problem was the lack of an appropriate candidate: The Orleans dynasty had been discredited, while Comte de Chambord, the Bourbon pretender, was too reactionary even for legitimist stomachs.95 In terms of its electoral support, the Party of Order could count on votes of landless peasants working on large estates, tenant farmers (at the time, only half of the French peasantry owned land), and a part of the smallholding peasantry with Catholic and/or royalist sympathies. The votes of the former were obviously obtained through patronage or coercion by local notables. The Party of Order was challenged by socialists and left-wing Republicans. Finally, the president did not organize his own political party. Historians did not offer an explanation of this decision, although I suppose that the task would be too difficult

95 Agulhon 1983, 5-6.
to accomplish in a short time frame given enormous electoral leverage of the local notables at the
district level.\textsuperscript{96}

As expected, the elections ended up in decisive victory of the Party of Order, which
obtained 65\% of the seats with 50\% of the vote. Left Republicans or “the Mountain” obtained
26\% of the seats with 30\% of the vote, and moderate Republicans only 11\% of the seats. As
mentioned, the Party of Order gained electoral support mostly through propaganda and
“influence”, which was a term entailing patronage and coercion. It was also helped by occasional
intimidation and disruption of Republican campaign activities, and succeeded in areas dominated
by strongly Catholic smallholding peasantry, tenant farming and sharecropping. The party did
not engage in direct voter mobilization nor developed grassroots political organization. Left
Republicans won in large cities, but after their disastrous performance in the presidential
election, they made inroads into the countryside and won in several rural departments. They were
popular among certain groups of smallholding peasants, who made a vote choice independently
of the notables’ influence. Left Republican success stemmed as well from old grievances, as they
also won in Protestant or formerly-Protestant regions characterized by anticlericalism, where the
church’s position was weak. Otherwise, Left Republicans emphasized issues relevant to the
smallholding peasantry: cheap education, debt relief, inexpensive credit, low taxes; and
demeanorized the traditional Republican anticlericalism when campaigning in Catholic regions.
In contrast to conservatives, they also developed grassroots party organization based on local
clubs and newspapers with a network of subscribers. This organization built upon the
rudimentary Republican electoral network developed already during the July Monarchy. The
relative success of Left Republicans scared the Party of Order, as it showed that the movement
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could win elections if it successfully mobilized the majority among the peasantry (as it indeed happened at the 1876 election during the Third Republic). After protesting against the French invasion of Rome in June 1849, several Left Republican leaders were arrested or fled the country.97

After coming to power, Bonaparte engaged in uneasy cooperation with the conservative-dominated legislature. He initially appointed a compromise cabinet which partially represented the Party of Order. The conservatives scorned him as a populist political adventurer, who was rumored to be born out of wedlock and had a far-reaching program of social reform and economic development. But they cooperated with the president out of fear of socialism and unrestricted democracy.98 Still, Louis-Napoleon had his own far-reaching political plans. On 31 October 1849 he nominated a cabinet personally royal to himself, a step he was allowed to take according to the constitution. This caused protests in the assembly, but the latter had no legal remedies to change the situation.99 On 10 March 1850 by-elections were held to replace the twenty-one seats of the Left Republicans expelled from the parliament. The left again won in most of these districts. Scared that Left Republicans could win the upcoming parliamentary and presidential votes, in May 1850 the assembly restricted the suffrage introducing tax-paying, domicile and lack-of-criminal-record requirements. About 35% of male adults were disenfranchised, mostly itinerant workers, the unemployed, and some farm laborers: people suspected of Left Republican sympathies (whether the restricted electorate would indeed be less supportive of Left Republicans was uncertain, though). Louis-Napoleon used the opportunity to
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attack the legislature on populist grounds. He proclaimed himself in favor of reintroduction of universal suffrage, but his motion in this regard was narrowly defeated in the assembly on 4 November 1851. On this occasion the president managed to drive a wedge between Left Republicans and the former Orleanists, who both supported the constitutional legality but were divided on the issue of suffrage.\textsuperscript{100}

In any case, it was clear to everyone that the populist leader would not be satisfied with only one presidential term, as prescribed by the constitution. At first, he tried the legal means to prolong his rule. In the summer of 1850 a massive campaign was started by the president, who toured the country mobilizing supporters. His goal was to force the assembly to change the constitution. The campaign was successful: one and a half million signatures were collected in favor of the revision. The vote on the amendment which would permit presidential reelection was taken in July 1851. 62\% of the deputies voted in favor, but the threshold for constitutional changes was 75\%. After that, the coup remained only a question of time. To conduct it successfully, Napoleon dismissed the generals and police chiefs of monarchist or republican sympathies, and nominated his loyalists.\textsuperscript{101} In the meanwhile, Orleanists and Legitimists were engaged in a dialogue in order to agree on a common candidate for the French throne. The negotiations ended in failure because of the Legitimists’ unwillingness to accept a liberal constitution and the tricolor flag. The Party of Order subsequently split among Orleanists, Legitimists and supporters of the president.\textsuperscript{102}

The coup was conducted on 2 December 1851. It was obviously facilitated by the fact that Louis-Napoleon already controlled executive power. In a proclamation announcing the coup,
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the president compared the period of the Imperial Consulate favorably to the democratic
republic. He dissolved the legislature, reintroduced universal suffrage, and announced that a new
constitution would be enacted. Leaders of the opposition had been arrested the night before, but
those still at liberty attempted to organize resistance. Right-wing opposition deputies met and
formally impeached the president. Although the notables who formed the Party of Order were no
democrats, they were nevertheless committed to the principles parliamentarism and
constitutional legality, which was the legacy of the restoration and July Monarchy. But the
assembly was quickly dispersed by the police and the deputies arrested for a short period. Small
popular uprisings in defense of the constitution, which erupted in Paris, larger cities and left-
leaning rural districts in Southern France, were put down with relative ease. Altogether, about
300-400 people were killed when the unrest was being suppressed. A wave of heavy repression
followed with 26,000 persons arrested, hundreds exiled to Guyana and thousands to Algeria.\textsuperscript{103}

Subsequently, Louis-Napoleon moved to consolidate his populist-authoritarian regime.
On 20-21 December 1851 a referendum was held whose purpose was to legitimize the coup and
provide the president with the prerogative to proclaim a new constitution. The turnout was 82%,
with 92% voting in favor. However, the military personnel were forced to vote openly, while the
opposition was intimidated and did not have access to the media. The negative votes were
recorded almost entirely in the cities. Those rural areas which had opposed the coup were too
intimidated to vote against the government.\textsuperscript{104} The constitution proclaimed in January 1852
established an authoritarian political system. Louis-Napoleon was to remain in power for another
ten years (the necessity for his presidential reelection was waived when the constitutional
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amendment accepted in November 1852 changed the regime form into empire). The lower chamber of the legislature was elected every six years by universal male suffrage under two-round majoritarian system, but could be dissolved by the emperor at any time. Executive power belonged solely to the emperor. He nominated and dismissed ministers at will. The cabinet did not act collectively. Only the government could initiate legislation, and the legislature’s powers were limited. It could only suggest amendments, which had to be accepted by the emperor-appointed Council of State. Otherwise, the parliament had only the power either to reject or accept final versions of bills presented by the Council. The ultimate safeguard was the emperor’s power of the veto.105

The legislative election of February/March 1852 exhibited the regime’s openly authoritarian character. Before the vote a decree which severely limited the press freedom was issued. The press became licensed and a system of warnings was introduced. If a newspaper received a certain number of the latter, it was automatically suspended. The government made a frequent use of the warnings and other instruments of repression, which forced the press into self-censorship. A system of government-supported or “official” candidatures was also introduced. Such candidates enjoyed the support of prefects and other government employees (including priests and schoolteachers) who campaigned on their behalf. They also were provided with government funds and facilities. Patronage was delivered to influential government supporters and small bribes paid to ordinary voters. Opposition candidates, if they managed to register at all, were regularly harassed and denied campaign funds or access to the media. Opposition ballots were at times confiscated, while opposition supporters faced petty

harassment. These modern means of authoritarian control over elections brought the desired results. Out of 263 contested seats, the opposition won only eight: five legitimists and three republicans were elected, but the latter refused to take their seats. In the 1850s the opposition remained weak. Republicans were the most repressed opposition group with most of their leaders exiled or imprisoned, while the majority of Orleanist and Legitimist politicians either defected to the government camp or withdrew from active politics. Hence the 1857 legislative election repeated the pattern from 1852. In spite of significant participation of Republican candidates, the government won comfortably. Opposition candidates polled 11% of the vote, and only seven (2.5% of the total) opposition deputies were elected in large cities, including five Republicans.

Louis-Napoleon’s populist authoritarian regime claimed legitimacy as the reincarnation of the First Empire. With some regional exceptions, it was genuinely popular among peasant masses. However, this resulted mostly from a favorable coincidence as the regime ruled during a period of economic prosperity. Louis-Napoleon’s policies were not particularly favorable toward the peasantry, although the latter was not antagonized either. Otherwise, the regime engaged in constant propaganda efforts in order to consolidate the support among lower classes. The emperor was portrayed as the man of the people, and the parties of the Republican period were accused of ruining and dividing France. At the societal level, the empire severed the connection between peasants and legitimists notables. Because notables were considered
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uncertain allies who enjoyed independent sources of power, the regime preferred to rely on the peasant support obtained directly.\textsuperscript{112}

However, Louis-Napoleon was too shrewd a politician not to learn from the mistakes of his royal predecessors. He understood that he could not rule France indefinitely relying heavily on the methods of authoritarian control. As well, his personal ideology drew him towards liberalism and promotion of socially progressive policies. For instance, he endorsed free trade and rudimentary labor legislation, such as legalization of trade unions and state-supported insurance cooperatives, against the opposition of Orleanist elites. His ultimate goal was to rule over a liberal constitutional polity.\textsuperscript{113} Hence, in contrast to the previous French regimes, the Empire was gradually evolving in a liberal direction. A general amnesty for political offenders, announced in 1859, induced nearly all Republican exiles to come back to France. Since 1860 ministers were required to explain and defend government policies in the legislature, and legislative transcripts were made public. Another reform in 1861 increased the legislature’s control over government spending.\textsuperscript{114} The atmosphere during the 1863 election was more liberal than six years before, and hence the opposition substantially increased its representation. It obtained 11\% of the seats with 26\% of the vote: Seventeen Republicans and fifteen royalists were elected. The opposition deputies issues a joint statement demanding respect for civil liberties, free elections and the introduction of parliamentary responsibility. But although the regime still enjoyed apparent parliamentary majority, some of the pro-government deputies were elected due to their pro-Catholic or conservative standing, and their loyalty was not absolute.
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Many of the emperor’s supporters pressed for liberalization in order to increase the scope of control over the government’s policies through parliamentary mechanisms.\textsuperscript{115}

Further reforms were enacted in the late 1860s. In 1867, the legislature received the right of interpellation, and in 1868, the system of newspaper licensing was abolished. This led to rapid proliferation of press outlets. The May/June 1869 election was held in a fairly liberal environment, with the system of official candidates hardly enforced. To increase the likelihood of election, some official candidates preferred in fact to conceal their pro-government affiliation. The opposition campaigned with relative freedom and scored a major success obtaining 26\% of the seats with 45\% of the vote (this included forty-one legitimists and thirty republicans). Moreover, the majority of the pro-government deputies belonged to the so-called Third Party, that is, liberal Conservatives (mostly former Orleanists) who supported the dynasty but preferred to control the imperial government through the mechanism of parliamentary responsibility.\textsuperscript{116} In the light of the electoral results concessions were inevitable. The emperor could either grant the chamber’s demand of parliamentary government or face a hostile legislature. He preferred the former. A constitutional amendment was passed in September 1869, giving full powers of legislative initiative and amendment to the lower chamber, and introducing ministerial responsibility to the legislature. On 27 December 1869 Emile Ollivier, a moderate Republican first elected to the legislature in 1857 on the Republican platform, formed a responsible government dominated by liberal Bonapartists. Another constitutional amendment, accepted in April 1870, diminished the powers of the unelected upper chamber. To reinforce the regime’s legitimacy, the emperor called a plebiscite asking the voters to accept the amendments. Despite
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opposition calls to vote no, the plebiscite turned out a huge success for the emperor with 83% in favor of the changes. This showed that many opposition supporters were in fact willing to back the “Liberal Empire.”\textsuperscript{117}

Although most political scientists do not consider the Liberal Empire a democratic episode, there is no reason not to do so. After all, Émile Ollivier presided over a government responsible to a democratically-elected legislature. After the 1870 plebiscite, the elites, apart from hardline Republicans popular only in larger cities, seemed to have been reconciled with the future of France as a parliamentary monarchy presided by the Bonaparte dynasty. Louis-Napoleon was seriously ill and one of his main desires was to ensure that his son inherits the throne. In fact, according to most historians, the emperor cannot even be directly blamed for the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war. He was reluctant to attack Prussia after the infamous Ems Dispatch affair, but accepted war after being forced to do so by his own government and the public opinion (which included the republican opposition).\textsuperscript{118} Hence, the overthrow of the empire in September 1870 after the defeat at Sedan could be treated as another instance of a democratic breakdown in France. Again, the legitimacy of a democracy built on the imperial narrative was tenuous because it had to compete with other historically legitimate narratives on which a democratic French state could be built, in particular the republican and legitimist narratives. Hence, the empire did not survive the military defeat in 1870. But was the Liberal Empire truly democratic? The true test would have come if the emperor had lost parliamentary election and would have to nominate an opposition prime minister with real powers. Would
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Louis-Napoleon have agreed that? The history, unfortunately, did not provide an answer to this question.\textsuperscript{119}

**Continuity Transitions to Democracy in Belgium and the Netherlands**

In contrast to France, democratization of Belgium and the Netherlands proceeded gradually through several waves of suffrage extension. In those cases, the extension of suffrage was the final step in the process of democratization given that the principle of the government’s parliamentary responsibility had been already established after the crises of 1857 and 1868. The suffrage reforms were obviously enacted under strong popular pressure from the disenfranchised social strata. But in contrast to the French elites under the July Monarchy, the elites in the Netherlands and Belgium knew when to compromise on the issue so that to avoid a major social upheaval. In contrast to France, where as a result of the 1848 revolution all male adults were suddenly enfranchised, the enfranchisement in Belgium and the Netherlands proceeded gradually. It came not, as in France, as a result of a popular revolution, but it was achieved through elite bargaining with the representatives of the disenfranchised. Hence, solely the strata which had already become politically mobilized received the suffrage. An electorate created in this way was likely to support the established parties and unlikely to back anti-system actors in the likes of Louis-Napoleon. This contributed to the stability of the democratic systems of Belgium and the Netherlands. But the main source of this stability was the entrenchment of the norms of constitutionalism and free electoral competition among the elites. These norms had been also internalized by the representatives of the part of the disenfranchised groups, i.e. the social democrats, even before they could effectively compete in elections. But the majority of the newly-enfranchised population was mobilized to vote by the parties which had become dominant
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already during the period of competitive oligarchy. Last but not least, preservation of the symbolic components of the political system (the monarchy) also contributed to the regime stability, both under competitive oligarchy and democracy. The monarchy provided a common national narrative which increased the scope of national unity and reduced conflicts. Its preservation also increased the support for the political system among the Conservatives, who were the ruling elite during the period of PA monarchy. In contrast to France, the society in Belgium and the Netherlands was not divided among supporters of various narratives of a legitimate national government (whether legitimist, Orleanist, republican, or imperial). This, obviously, resulted from the fact that democratization in Belgium and the Netherlands, in contrast to France, was achieved without regime discontinuity.

The pressure for extension of suffrage in the Benelux was led by left-wing Liberals, who managed to elect numerous representatives to the national legislatures, and the initially extra-parliamentary social-democratic movement. In the Netherlands, left-wing Liberals founded several leagues for electoral reform in 1876 and League for Universal Franchise in 1883. The first massive demonstration demanding suffrage extension was held in 1885, and a reform which extended the suffrage from about 12% to 28% of male adults was enacted in 1887. The next suffrage reform, proposed by Left Liberals in 1892, was initially rejected in 1893. The 1894 elections were fought mostly on the suffrage issue, with opponents and proponents of the extension being present in each of the three main parties: Liberals, Catholics and Anti-Revolutionaries. The split within the Anti-Revolutionaries was the gravest, and the faction which was opposed to any concessions on the issue of suffrage ultimately formed in 1898 a separate party, the Christian Historical Union. It aimed to mobilize conservative members of the Dutch Reformed Church. In the 1894 election supporters of a moderate suffrage extension won
majority and another reform extended the franchise to 50% of male adults to be applied at the 1897 election.

The Left Liberals expected that they would achieve electoral success after the suffrage extension (although they pressured for the reform also because of sincere ideological convictions), but as it turned out their hopes remained unfulfilled. Paradoxically, the confessional parties, i.e. Anti-Revolutionaries and Catholics, along with Social Democrats, managed to mobilize the newly-enfranchised social strata. The 1888 election, which was held after the suffrage reform of 1887, resulted in Liberals’ electoral defeat. Instead, a coalition of confessional parties (Anti-Revolutionaries and Catholics) came to power and ruled until 1891. Anti-Revolutionaries were convinced by the party’s ideologue, Abraham Kuyper, that they had more common political interests with Catholics in comparison to the “godless” Liberals. One of the first steps of the new government was to enact a law which introduced state financing of 1/3 of the private school expenses. The electoral fortunes of the Liberals declined as suffrage was further extended. In the 1897 election, the first after the 1894 reform, their vote decreased from 50% to 31%, but the party remained in power as it obtained 48% of the seats due to the disproportionate effect of the majoritarian electoral system. After universal male suffrage was introduced for the 1918 election, the Liberals did not manage to obtain more than 10% of the vote and did not join the government in the interwar period.120

In Belgium, the initial efforts aiming to extend the suffrage were organized, similarly as in the Netherlands, by left-wing Liberals backed by a few progressive members of the Catholic party. The first calls for a substantial suffrage reform appeared in the late 1850s. In September 1860 Charles Woeste, one of the leaders of the Catholic Party, called for universal suffrage

claiming (as it later turned out, correctly) that the reform would be beneficial to the Catholics. He insisted that the enfranchised classes were less committed to moral values than farmers and workers, so that universal franchise would produce a more conservative parliament. However, at this stage the majorities in both Liberal and Catholic Parties firmly opposed suffrage extension. Moreover, any reforms regarding the scope of suffrage were difficult to achieve because changing the electoral census necessitated a constitutional amendment. The first bills proposing such an amendment were introduced and defeated in the parliament in 1866 and 1870. A small suffrage extension was adopted in 1871, but it pertained mostly to local and provincial elections. The suffrage at the local level increased to 160% of the national level. In 1881 Liberal-dominated National League for Electoral Reform was formed, but the right-wing Liberal government of Frère-Orban (1878-84) opposed any suffrage extensions and even disenfranchised, in 1879, some voters who had previously enjoyed the vote in local elections. Yet, under the pressure from the left wing of his party, the prime minister had to reverse the policy by widening the suffrage in provincial and local elections in 1883. Hence, the socialists were able to elect local deputies in some industrial cities after that date. Subsequently, the socialist movement became the most effective force pressing for further democratization of Belgium. Along with Catholics, Socialists benefited also to the largest extent from the extension of suffrage, while electoral fortunes of the Liberals, similarly as in the Netherlands, declined. After Liberals lost the 1884 election, they returned to power only in 1918 as a part of a wider coalition government.\footnote{Belgium 1978, 44-45, 82; Boulger 1925, 106-107, 168-69; Emerson 1979, 126-27; Ertman 2000, 173; Mallinson 1970, 80.}

In Belgium, the process of suffrage extension was characterized by higher incidence of social disturbances in comparison to the Netherlands. The role of Social Democrats in the
process was also greater, which was caused by early and more profound industrialization of the country. Early workers’ associations in Belgium developed already in the 1840s, but were not ideological and took a character of mutual aid societies. The first labor union was established in 1857. Early Belgian socialists took inspiration from the French and were ideologically close to anarchism, but the connections with the French socialist movement were severed after the failure of the Paris Commune. In the 1870s, German Social Democrats came to provide the organizational and ideological models for the Belgian socialists. The first Belgian socialist party was established in 1879 as a merger of two smaller socialist organizations, but it initially failed to mobilize workers’ associations, which remained largely apolitical. In 1885 Belgian Labor Party (BWP) was established, which united both political and civil society worker organizations. Since the beginning, Belgian Socialists were divided into revolutionaries, who aimed to topple the bourgeois regime through violence, and the reformists, whose primary goal was achievement of the socialist revolution through legal means. The first step in this regard was the suffrage extension, which would permit the party to win elections, gain power, and subsequently enact socialist legislation.

In 1886, an economic crisis brought about massive food riots, strikes and political demonstrations in favor of universal suffrage in several cities and mining districts. About seventy people were killed by the civil guard. The disturbances shocked the elites and forced the government to seriously address the social question for the first time. The government started a substantial public works program, created worker councils, and prohibited employment of children younger than twelve years in 1889. But from the political point of view the strikes ended in a failure. The radical wing of BWP, which was responsible for political violence, was expelled from the party (but rejoined in 1890). Subsequently, the reformist wing achieved the
dominant position. As a part of the strategy to gain power, the Reformists decided to participate in official political institutions. BWP took part in the 1887 local elections, held after the franchise was extended at the local level, and formed electoral alliances with Liberals. It also participated in elections to the Labor and Industry councils held for the first time in 1890, gaining majority in most trades.\textsuperscript{122} The party’s strength stemmed from the fact that it had managed to mobilize workers into a variety of civil society organizations. In the 1880s and 1890s, Belgian cities witnessed mass expansion of socialist trade unions, cooperatives, insurance companies, clubs and educational associations. At the turn of the century, there were already about 125,000 members of various socialist organizations. This way the Socialists formed the first of Belgian mass political movements, or pillars, which consisted of various civil associations of similar ideology, organizationally linked to a political party.\textsuperscript{123}

In the late 1880s, the popular pressure for universal suffrage again intensified. At this time, the secular working class was already politically mobilized by the socialists, while the leadership of both the Catholic and Liberal parties came under increasing pressure from their left-wing factions to extend the suffrage. In order to stop socialist advances among the workers, the Catholics began to organize their supporters among the lower classes and formed Christian trade unions, cooperatives, insurance companies, educational societies and clubs. In 1891 the Catholic Party sponsored the foundation of Belgian People’s League, an umbrella organization of the Catholic civil society (it subsequently reached 100,000 members in 1898). But these attempts could not be successful in a situation when political mobilization of Catholic supporters was not accompanied by their political emancipation. In 1890, 100,000 people demonstrated in

\textsuperscript{122} Belgium 1978, 46-47; Boulger 1925, 244-48; Blom and Lamberts 1998, 331-32; Emerson 1979, 132-33; Ertman 2000, 172; Strikwerda 1997, 117; Witte 2000, 76-77.

\textsuperscript{123} Strikwerda 1997, 79-80; Witte 2000, 80.
Brussels demanding suffrage extension, and the elites realized that concessions in this regard had to be imminent if a major social upheaval was to be avoided.

In 1892 the parliament was elected with the mandate to revise the constitution, but the discussions ended in deadlock as the representatives found it difficult to reach a compromise regarding the matter of suffrage. The king took the opportunity to strengthen his political position. His project of constitutional amendments provided the monarch with certain executive powers and the right to call a popular referendum. Those were, however, sabotaged by the Catholic cabinet, criticized by the public opinion, and finally abandoned. On 11 April 1893 a bill proposed by left-wing Liberals which would entail universal male suffrage and double voting for heads of families was rejected by the assembly. The BWP reacted with a call for a general strike which was surprisingly successful. As 250,000 workers stopped working and several people were killed in clashes with law enforcement, the socialist leadership became terrified as the events apparently spiraled out of their control. The assembly quickly responded by passing suffrage amendments, and the strike was halted. The reform introduced universal male suffrage modified by plural voting for some categories of citizens (heads of families or those meeting certain property, income or education qualifications), but the maximum number of votes a citizen enjoyed was three. Altogether, the number of votes was by 35% larger than the number of citizens entitled to vote.\textsubscript{124}

The first election under the new suffrage regulations was held in October 1894. The biggest winners were Catholics, who obtained 68% of the seats with 56% of the vote and remained in power. They were successful among the deeply religious Flemish peasantry and certain groups of industrial workers. Socialists were less successful than expected: They obtained

18% of the seats with the same vote percentage. Finally, the Liberal party was the least successful: it obtained 13% of the seats (with 31% of the vote) compared to 39% of the seats in 1892. Because of the electoral geography, the Liberal Party was the most disadvantaged under the two-round majoritarian system, hence it came to staunchly support the system of proportional representation (Belgium was the first country to adopt it in 1899). The Catholic Party, which won every election until 1919, tried to cultivate its lower class support through enactment of social legislation. State pensions were introduced in 1900, and other reforms provided for sick pay, shortening of working day to 10-11 hours, and state-enforced work safety standards. Still, Socialists continued to pressure the government to eliminate plural voting. In 1902 the party struck demanding universal male suffrage, but the strike ended in massive violence and was a political failure. Public opinion was alienated by the Socialist-instigated violence; hence the party changed its strategy. After a long-awaited reform introducing universal male suffrage was narrowly defeated in February 1913, Socialists again resorted to a general strike. Although 310,000 workers participated, this time the violence was averted. The strike ended in April 1913 when the government announced creation of a parliamentary commission to reconsider the matter of suffrage.\textsuperscript{125}

The struggle over the reform was interrupted by the German invasion in August 1914, and it was resumed after the end of the war. In a new political reality, marked by workers’ radicalization and the victory of the Bolshevik revolution, full democratization became inevitable. On 11 November 1918 the king and the Belgian party elites came to agreement over further social reforms and introduction of universal male suffrage. A government of national unity was formed which included Socialists. The November 1919 constituent assembly election

was already held under universal male suffrage, which was technically unconstitutional. In the
election no party achieved majority (Catholics obtained 37% of the vote, BWP 35%, and
Liberals 18%); hence formation of a coalition government was necessary. This pattern
characterized the entire interwar period: although the preferences of the electorate remained
fairly stable, no party was able to achieve parliamentary majority. Most of the time Catholics
formed coalition governments with Liberals (in 1921-25, 1927-35) but there were periods when
three main parties ruled together (1918-21, 1926-27, 1935-39) and short periods of Catholic-
Socialist coalitions (1925-26, 1939).126

In the Netherlands, the Social Democratic movement developed relatively late in
comparison to Belgium because of the slower progress of industrialization. It also played a
smaller role during the struggle for suffrage extension. Socialists drew their initial support
mostly from artisans, manual laborers and the rural proletariat. The first Dutch trade union was
established in 1861 among printers while an umbrella organization of socialist trade unions, the
General Dutch Workers Union, was founded in 1871. However, Dutch Social Democrats found it
relatively difficult to mobilize workers because of the concurrent efforts at mobilization led by
confessional parties. Only a relatively small group of secular workers was available for Social
Democratic mobilization. Within trade unions, Socialists faced strong competition from
Protestant and Catholic organizations which were developing in reaction to the growth of the
Socialist movement. The first Protestant trade union was formed in 1877. In 1888 Roman
Catholic People's League was established, which was an umbrella organization of Catholic trade
unions. It entirely dominated workers’ movement in the Catholic provinces; hence there was
hardly any socialist activity in the mining district of Limburg. The first Dutch socialist party, the

Social Democratic Alliance, was established only in 1881. Ideologically, it was a revolutionary party which evolved towards anarchism. The first socialist deputy, Ferdinand Nieuwenhuis, served in the parliament in the period 1888-1891. The Social Democratic Workers Party (SDAP) functioned initially as a faction within the Social Democratic Alliance but seceded in 1894. It assembled reformist socialists who opposed the Nieuwenhuis’ anarchism. It initially drew electoral support from small farmers and agricultural laborers, as most industrial workers were not yet enfranchised after 1897. The SDAP was ideologically committed to Marxism but aimed to realize its goals within the democratic framework. Organizationally, the party drew inspiration from German Social Democrats, and it elected its first representatives in 1897.127

After the 1897 election, about 50% of male adults enjoyed the suffrage in the Netherlands (the percentage increased to about 65% at the 1913 election). In the period, SDAP was gradually widening its electoral support until it obtained 15% of the seats (with 19% of the vote) in 1913. Still, the Socialists were convinced that they could gain parliamentary majority only under universal suffrage. Following Belgian socialists’ tactics, the party proclaimed a general strike in 1903. The move was a political failure, however, public opinion turned against the socialists after they paralyzed the country’s rail traffic. In 1909 the radical faction of SDAP was purged. The expelled activists formed a separate Social Democratic Party (later turned into Communist Party). Subsequently, SDAP made a political mistake by refusing to enter into a coalition with Liberals after the 1913 election. Being a part of the government, SDAP could have effectively pressured for a suffrage reform and social legislation, the opportunity which was effectively lost due to its ideological inflexibility. Similarly as in Belgium, full democratization of the Netherlands was achieved after the WWI. In 1917 the mainstream parties agreed on a

constitutional reform known as the Great Pacification (i.e. pacification of the long-lasting school conflict). As part of the deal, religious schools obtained state funding on the same conditions as public schools, which was a concession to the confessional parties. In order to placate Social Democrats, universal male suffrage was enacted, while Liberals accepted the agreement on the condition that proportional representation be introduced at the same time. The first election under universal male suffrage, in July 1918, brought victory to the confessional parties and was a setback for the Socialists. The SDAP obtained only 22% of the vote.\textsuperscript{128}

The party’s popularity subsequently suffered after it made an unsuccessful and a half-hearted attempt to take over power in November 1918. After the German Revolution broke out, Pieter Jelles Troelstra, the leader of SDAP, made a speech in Rotterdam calling workers to take over the power and lead a socialist revolution. He repeated the speech in the parliament. However, Troelsta was not supported by the majority in his own party and no actual steps to take over power were taken by Socialists. Instead, Troelsta simply expected the coalition government of confessional parties to resign. This did not happen. On the contrary, the government reacted by quickly moving troops to the main cities, and non-socialist parties, supported by moderate Socialists, responded with a propaganda campaign which emphasized patriotism and loyalty to the government and the House of Orange. But because of the failed attempt at revolution, other parties doubted in Socialists’ commitment to the monarchy and parliamentary democracy; hence the party was not included as a coalition partner until 1939. During the interwar period, however, SDAP abandoned its formally anti-monarchical stance.\textsuperscript{129}


\textsuperscript{129} Kossmann 1978, 558-60.
Clearly, in case of the Belgian and Dutch socialist movements, the goal of universal suffrage and the commitment to electoral politics were initially instrumental, that is, Socialists were committed to democratic principles largely because they treated it as a means to achieve power. However, Socialists were not restricted regarding the choice of political strategies; there was a vocal minority within the movement which called for the violent overthrow of the bourgeois regime and establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Nevertheless, the conditions of electoral politics in which Socialists operated induced them to adopt moderate goals and gradually embrace the values which had been already espoused by the Liberal elites: constitutionalism and the principle of free electoral competition. Gradually, and in spite of their Marxist ideological legacy, Socialist became the staunchest supporters of the democratic political framework.\textsuperscript{130}

**Democratic Survival in the French Third Republic, Belgium and the Netherlands**

In many ways, the establishment of the French Third Republic was a reiteration of the story of February 1848, with a pro-Republican mob overtaking the legislature on 4 September 1871 and forcing the court to flee the capital (while the emperor was in the Prussian custody). A radical provisional Republican government was formed which abolished the monarchy, and the February 1871 election again brought victory to conservative monarchist candidates, with the peasant vote largely controlled by local notables. The conservative government once more bloodily repressed a radical uprising led by the Parisian lower class (the Paris Commune). The history repeated itself, but there was hardly an element of farce. After 1871 France was close to establishment of a parliamentary monarchy, but this step was prevented by Republican victories

\textsuperscript{130} Strikwerda 1997, 88-93.
in the 1876 and 1877 elections.\textsuperscript{131} The Third Republic ultimately survived until 1940, but its political system was far from a consolidated democracy. In fact, because of the legacy of the previous regime discontinuities it functioned under a high probability of breakdown, at least during the first decades of its existence. The political conflict coalesced around a cleavage which was not present in the United Kingdom, Belgium or the Netherlands, which pertained to the very state form (whether monarchical or republican). The legitimacy deficit of the Third Republic was indicated by a high percentage of anti-system, pro-monarchical votes. Monarchists of the three branches (Legitimists, Orleanists and Bonapartists) obtained between 16\% and 36\% of the seats until the 1893 election, with their popular vote reaching 40\% at some elections. It was unclear what would the Monarchists have done once in power. Restoration of a monarchy could entail introduction of an authoritarian or a democratic regime, and Monarchists were divided on the issue. They were also in conflict regarding the crucial question of a legitimate pretender. Nevertheless, the high percentage of anti-republican vote constituted a potential risk to the survival of the democratic French republic. This was also because the anti-republican electorate provided a “base” upon which another populist authoritarian politician could build his ascent to power. This was the story of the Boulangist movement, which posed at a time the biggest threat to the survival of the French democracy.

The 1885 election brought resurgence of the anti-Republican right which captured 34\% of the seats. Socialists obtained 10\% and Republicans 56\%, but the latter were divided among Radicals, Opportunists and Moderates and found it difficult to form a viable coalition. Prime Minister Goblet nominated a popular Radical Republican, General Georges Boulanger as minister of war. He pursued populist policies and nearly provoked a war with Germany. On 17

\textsuperscript{131} Cole and Campbell 1989, 19, 51; Magraw 1986, 211-13.
May 1887 Boulanger was sacked as a minister of war, and subsequently developed his own political movement. In the spring of 1888 he was elected deputy in a series of electoral districts, the practice which was allowed by the French law. Boulanger’s movement was initially supported by Radicals (Left Republicans), but it quickly assumed a more conservative and monarchist direction. Generally, it merged the elements of nationalism, socialism and anti-Semitism, hence it could be considered pre-Fascist. Boulanger ran his campaign touching upon the issue of revenge against Germany over the 1871 defeat, constitutional revisions and monarchical restoration (but he remained ambiguous on the future monarch’s person). He also obtained support of the pretender from the Bonaparte dynasty. But it turned out that the general wanted to grasp the power for himself rather than leading a monarchical restoration. In January 1889 Boulanger again won an important by-election after an intense campaign. There was a wide support for a coup among the general’s supporters at this moment, but he hesitated. Given constant rumors that he would soon be arrested, Boulanger escaped abroad in April 1889. His followers obtained 13% of the seats in the September/October 1889 election, but in the absence of the leader the movement dissipated.\footnote{Cole and Campbell 1989, 56; Magraw 1986, 268; Tombs 1996, 114, 448-53.}

The monarchical right ultimately collapsed in the 1893 election and most of its politicians accepted the unavoidable reality of the republic. But the former monarchist politicians continued to mobilize the electorate on the program which emphasized such points as low taxes, support for the Church, the army and the landed interests.\footnote{Tombs 1996, 113-14.} The anti-system far right continued to enjoy parliamentary representation throughout the Third Republic, although its success was hampered by the majoritarian character of the electoral system and internal ideological divisions. Most far-
right deputies were active in the conservative Republican Federation during the interwar period. Unlike other Western European democracies, political life of the Third Republic was also characterized by significant influence of far-right movements and leagues such as a monarchist Action Française or a Catholic-corporatist Croix-de-Feu. The French far-right was fiercely anti-German, however; hence after 1933 the scope of appeal of Fascism was inherently limited in France. The underlining legitimacy deficit of the Third Republic came to the fore after another military defeat with Germany in 1940. The far right used the opportunity to establish an authoritarian government under the German occupation. It enjoyed constitutional legality in contrast to the Free France government led by General de Gaulle in London.

Contrary to the French Third Republic, the Belgian and Dutch democracies functioned under a lower probability of breakdown, although the Great Depression brought trouble also to these regimes. Similarly as in other European countries, the popularity of anti-democratic movements and parties increased, especially in Belgium. But the democracies in question were never under serious threat. This resulted from firm commitment to the democratic political system among the mainstream elites from all strands of the political spectrum: beginning with conservative Catholics and Protestants and ending with Social Democrats. As well, the overwhelming majority of the society continued to support the pro-democratic parties. This commitment, on the other hand, ultimately resulted from the long legacy of constitutionalism and free electoral competition, dating back from the period of PA monarchy. The prospects for democratic survival were also enhanced, paradoxically, through preservation of the traditional institutions. Because monarchs remained committed to democratic politics, the pro-authoritarian

movements could not take advantage of the narrative of monarchical legitimacy in order to undermine democracy (as it was the case under the French Third Republic).

Since constitutionalism characterized by open-outcome elections was established in 1815, Belgium and the Netherlands experienced no institutional breakdown and hence no elite replacement (aside from the Belgian secession in 1830, which did not however lead to elite replacement as well). Hence the first generation of politicians which adopted the norms of constitutionalism and open-outcome elections transmitted these values to the subsequent generations of politicians until they had become firmly established at the time of full democratization after the WWI. The generation which came to power after the Belgian secession started their political careers in the united Netherlands as political activists, local government councilors, or members of the parliament (the latter was true about two Belgian prime ministers, Étienne Constantin de Gerlache and Felix de Muelenaere). The introduction of parliamentary responsibility in Belgium after 1847 and the Netherlands after 1848 also did not bring elite replacement. Out of ten Dutch prime ministers serving in the period 1848-68, five were members of the lower chamber before 1848 (all of them belonged to the Liberal opposition led by Thorbecke), two were members of the government before 1848, and one was elected to a provincial council. Seven politicians served as prime ministers of Belgium in the period 1847-1884, and all of them were elected to the parliament before 1847, while five were also ministers during the period.

Even more importantly, the same generation of politicians ruled in Belgium and the Netherlands before and after extensions of suffrage. In fact, after the 1894 reform the Belgian Catholic party changed its program to attract new voters, but no new leadership emerged and the party organization hardly changed (the Catholic Party ruled continuously in the period 1884-
1918). Paul de Smet de Naeyer, Catholic prime minister in 1896-1899 and 1899-1907, had been a member of the lower chamber in 1886-1908 and was elected from the same constituency before and after the electoral reform. Frans Schollaert, Catholic prime minister in 1908-11, had served in Chamber of Representatives since 1888. Charles de Broqueville, prime minister from the Catholic party in 1911-18 and 1932-34, served in a provincial assembly since 1886 and was first elected to the lower chamber in 1892. In the Netherlands, the major suffrage extensions adopted in 1888 and 1897 did not bring to power any new generations of leaders. All three prime ministers which served in the period 1888-1897 began their parliamentary careers before 1888 (Mackay in 1875, Röell in 1877, and Tienhoven in 1878). There were five prime ministers serving in the period 1897-1918. Abraham Kuyper (prime minister in 1901-05) began his parliamentary career in 1874 and Theo Heemskerk (prime minister in 1908-13) in 1888. The other three prime minister served in the government or as local councilors before 1897.

Generally, most politicians that ruled during the interwar period in Belgium and the Netherlands began their careers in the late nineteenth century and shared the ideological commitments of their predecessors. Regarding Socialists, they became parliamentarians in significant numbers only after the suffrage was extended in Belgium in 1894 and in the Netherlands in 1897. But they became members of coalition cabinets only several decades afterward: in 1918 in Belgium and in 1939 in the Netherlands. Hence, when socialist ministers first assumed government posts, they had already accumulated a significant parliamentary experience. For example, Emile Vandervelde, the leader of BWP after the WWI, had served in the Belgian lower house since 1894.136

---
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In spite of its legacy of parliamentarism, constitutionalism and free electoral competition, Belgian democracy did experience a crisis during the interwar period, when several small, but vocal anti-system parties emerged. After the Great Depression, the coalition governments became increasingly unstable and the lower middle classes experienced a growing disillusionment with democratic politics. Motivated by the example of Italy and Germany, right-wing authoritarian movements developed. The first of those was associated with a Catholic magazine Rex, which was led since 1930 by a charismatic right-wing activist Léon Degrelle. The Rexist movement was reinforced by large influx of activists from the Catholic Action. It was also supported by certain elements from the big business. Another anti-system party was the Flemish National Union, which was established in 1933 on a wave of frustration with the fact that Flemish regionalist demands remained largely unmet. It descended from a small democratically-inclined regionalist Frontpartij, but it was not as openly committed to Fascism as Rexism.\(^{137}\)

In the 1936 elections the anti-system parties obtained 25% of the vote (Rexists 12%, Flemish National Union 7%, and Communists 6%). However, in this crucial period the mainstream parties (Catholics, Liberals and Socialists) actively defended the parliamentary regime. Instead of joining alliances with the anti-system parties, they formed a government of national unity. Although a minority of Catholic activists would welcome the alliance with the pro-Catholic Rex, the party leadership undermined all efforts in this direction. This policy was facilitated by the fact that “the bishops publicly opposed anyone who backed the principles of an authoritarian state,” the stance which undermined the Rexists’ supposedly Catholic credentials. Despite the pro-authoritarian attitudes of a part of the middle classes, “the large majority of people still rejected anti-Belgian and anti-democratic views” and “so did the Socialist and

Christian labor organizations”, that is, the most important of the civil society groups. During the interwar period, “the labor movement turned out to be one of the staunchest defenders of the bourgeois parliamentary democracy […]”138

The ruling elites’ commitment to democracy was reflected in concrete political decisions. At last, after Rexists attempted a putsch in Brussels, the prime minister under the government of national unity, Paul van Zeeland, declared martial law in October 1936 and suppressed the party. Several Rexist activists, including Degrelle, were arrested, the party’s access to media was limited, and its demonstrations prohibited. The political elite was supported by the monarchy, and in a speech on 7 November 1936 the king condemned all political movements which called for political violence. In April 1937, Van Zeeland, backed by the pro-system parties, the clergy and even the Communists, crushed the Rex leader, Paul Degrelle, in a by-election in Brussels, receiving 76% of the vote, while Degrelle obtained 19%. After the elections, Degrelle, who previously ran on a populist platform, became openly fascist. This alienated most of his supporters. In the 1939 elections the anti-system parties obtained 17% of seats (including 4% for Rexists) and the immediate threat to the Belgian democracy was overcome.139 The actions of the democratically-elected Belgian politicians in 1937 sharply contrasted with the measures taken by the elites of other democracies during the similar contemporaneous crises (Italy in 1922, Austria in 1933, Latvia and Estonia in 1934) who faced with moderately popular anti-system movements were not willing to defend the democratic institutions or abolished them personally.

In the Netherlands, the popularity of anti-system parties was smaller than in Belgium, and its minor fascist movement was directly inspired by the Nazi Germany. The Dutch Nazi party,
National Socialist Movement in the Netherlands (NSB), was founded in 1931 by A. A. Mussert. It scored its largest electoral success in the 1935 provincial elections when it obtained 8% of the vote, but one should note that at this stage the party still appeared politically moderate. In the 1935 election NSB won 4.2% of the vote and remained politically rather irrelevant. This happened in spite of the fact that the Netherlands was painfully hit by the depression. Unemployment reached 20% because the confessional cabinet failed to implement effective measures which would stimulate the economy. Similarly as in Belgium, Dutch fascists faced a legitimacy problem: while they tried to appeal to traditional institutions, such as the monarchy and the churches, in order to obtain support, those institutions openly supported the democratic system. The fascist remained as well politically isolated by the mainstream parties and the civil society. In reaction to the growth of fascism, an explicitly pro-democratic movement was established in June 1935 under the name Unity through Democracy. It operated outside of the established parties and had up to 25,000 members. At the same time, the Dutch Catholic party remained firmly committed to the principles of parliamentary democracy. In February 1934 Dutch bishops issued a declaration warning the faithful against joining fascist movements or parties so that not to weaken the Catholic unity. In December 1936 an unambiguous condemnation of the right-wing totalitarianism was issued by Dutch bishops. An authoritarian movement among Dutch Roman Catholics remained marginal. Also the Protestant hierarchy prohibited the faithful from joining NSB.

---
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Final Remarks and Alternative Explanations

The purpose of this chapter was to illustrate the causal process which led to the development of self-sustaining democracies from PA monarchies on the examples of Belgium and the Netherlands. PA monarchies established in those countries were characterized by the self-sustaining practice of open-outcome elections and the respect for constitutional legality. As the next step in the political development, Belgium and the Netherlands transitioned to competitive oligarchies through gradual emergence of the principle of parliamentary responsibility. Subsequently, democracy was achieved through gradual extension of suffrage until all adults were granted the right to vote on equal rules. The positive legacy of open-outcome elections and constitutionalism, developed during PA monarchy, persisted into the subsequent periods and resulted in low probability of breakdown of the Dutch and Belgian democracies, which survived the otherwise turbulent interwar period. Throughout the process the monarchical institutions were preserved, which additionally increased the legitimacy of the newly-established democracies. Otherwise, the political histories of Belgium and the Netherlands were comparable to the history of France, whose political development alongside the same path was interrupted by the February Revolution of 1848. The discontinuity of 1848 entailed sudden introduction of universal male suffrage and the institutional transformation to the republic. Hence, the first French democracy functioned under a high probability of breakdown because the new institutional framework opened political opportunities for anti-system actors, and because the republic was not considered as a legitimate system of government by large segments of the society. The deficit of legitimacy pertained also to the short-lived second period of democracy in France, the so-called Liberal Empire. The democratic Third Republic, established in 1871, also initially functioned under a high probability of breakdown but it ultimately survived until the WWII.
In this chapter I provided an explanation of democratic stability in Belgium and the Netherlands and the failure of the first two democratic experiments in France. This explanation is nested within a wider theory supported by quantitative findings. Unfortunately, there are few alternative theories explaining regime outcomes in France, the Netherlands and Belgium. This situation contrasts sharply with the amount of research devoted to the United Kingdom and Germany in the nineteenth century. Still, a few theories pertaining to the regime outcomes in the analyzed countries have been presented. According to Lijphart stability of the Belgian and Dutch democracies could be largely explained by their consensual character. These polities developed power-sharing institutions which allowed for all social groups, divided by the religious cleavages, to take part in governing. However, one should note that power-sharing was fully developed in Belgium and the Netherlands only after WWII. The Catholic Party ruled in Belgium without interruption between 1884 and 1918. In the Netherlands before 1918, power was exchanged between Liberals and the confessional coalition. During the interwar period, the government was controlled by the confessional coalition to the exclusion of Liberals and Socialists (apart from the period 1933-37, when a small liberal party participated in government). Hence, the Lijphart’s theory cannot explain the reasons of stability of the Belgian and Dutch democracies and competitive oligarchies before development of consociationalism. On the other hand, Luebbert explained democratic stability in Belgium and the Netherlands in the interwar

---

143 Other theories have also been developed, but they did not treat regime outcomes as the dependent variable. For example, Hanson 2010 researched party strength in post-imperial democracies (which were, according to the author, the French Third Republic, Weimar Germany and Post-Soviet Russia) and argued that ideological parties were more successful than pragmatic parties. But the ideological parties in question could present either pro- or antidemocratic attitudes. Kalyvas 1999 proposed a theory on the origins of Christina Democratic parties in Western Europe, while Gould 1999 linked the scope of success of liberal parties in Belgium, Germany, Switzerland and France to the nature of church-state relations. All these theories did not directly address causes of democratic breakdown, nevertheless.
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period by the fact that in these countries already before WWI liberal parties had established stable parliamentary regimes, which successfully integrated the workers’ movement into the political system. But then one should ask the crucial question of why the parliamentary regimes (i.e. competitive oligarchies) were so stable in the Netherlands and Belgium once they were established? Given that similar regimes collapsed unless they were preceded by PA monarchies (the pattern I try to show in Chapter 6), one could argue that the latter historical legacy had greater explanatory power. Finally, Capoccia\textsuperscript{146} argued that survival of democracy in the interwar Belgium (and Finland and Czechoslovakia) was due to successful strategies in defense of democracy adopted by the elected elites. Leaving aside this account’s methodological limitation (lack of analysis of cases of democratic breakdown, which would allow for determination if pro-democratic strategies played a causal role) Capoccia’s analysis largely supports the arguments advanced in this dissertation. In countries characterized by legacies of PA monarchies (Belgium and Czechoslovakia) the elites, having developed commitment to constitutionalism and open-outcome elections, forcefully defended democracy, while in Finland their pro-democratic behavior could be explained by a tragic legacy of the democratic breakdown during the 1918 civil war. The ultimate cause of democratic survival were regime legacies, however.

Moore\textsuperscript{147} in his theory on the origins of democracy considered only the larger countries arguing that smaller polities follow political trajectories once trodden by the former. As this dissertation tries to show this is not necessarily the case. Moreover, the findings of this chapter do not support one of the main theses of the Moore’s work. According to Moore, the

\textsuperscript{146} Capoccia 2005.

\textsuperscript{147} Moore 1966, xix.
bourgeoisie’s position was strong in France and hence it could organize a revolution in order to topple the power of the feudal aristocracy. However, the power of the French landed interests was largely restored during the Napoleonic and restoration periods. It was again undermined after the July Revolution. But the latter uprising, the same way as the 1848 revolution, was not launched by the bourgeoisie but by the urban lower classes, which had been radicalized during the 1789 revolution. Again, the French history is too complicated to be neatly explained by one paradigm. Moore’s other thesis argues that in countries where the position of landlords was strong the prospects for democracy were undermined (or even more generally, that landholding inequality was negatively related to democratization). While this hypothesis has a large explanatory power regarding certain polities, it performs less satisfactorily regarding explanation of regime outcomes in France, Belgium and the Netherlands. Let me then ponder upon the agrarian structure in these countries. In the middle of the nineteenth century, the latter was the most unequal in France and the most equal in Belgium, with the intermediate position of the Netherlands. In France in the 1840s, only half of the land belonged to the peasantry, and only 37% of the agricultural population owned land (while 19% were tenants or sharecroppers, and 45% landless agricultural proletariat). The share of peasant proprietors was gradually increasing in subsequent decades, but the French agricultural structure did not change dramatically. In 1862, 52% of French peasant proprietors owned some land. This included 25% who worked exclusively on their land and 27% who had an additional agricultural job e.g. as an occasional day laborer or artisan. At the same time, 8% of the French agricultural population were tenants and sharecroppers, and 40% formed the agricultural proletariat. In 1884, 25% of the agricultural land in France belonged to the estates larger than 100 hectares, which usually were

owned by the aristocracy, 26% belonged to the estates of the size between 20 and 100 hectares, while the rest belonged to the smaller peasant-owned holdings.\textsuperscript{149} No statistical data regarding the agrarian structure in the period were available for Belgium and the Netherlands, unfortunately. According to qualitative sources, Belgium was characterized as entirely dominated by small peasant landholding in Flanders with some large estates remaining in Wallonia. Overall, the landlord class in Belgium was small, which was a legacy of the confiscation of most of the church and noble land during the French annexation.\textsuperscript{150} Finally, the agrarian structure in the Netherlands was divided geographically. The coastal regions were dominated by large estates which engaged in commercial production for the market along the British model, and whose owners were mostly of the bourgeois background. In the hinterland smallholding agriculture predominated, which nevertheless also produced for the market.\textsuperscript{151} Of the three countries, the agriculture’s economic importance was the largest in France. At about 1845, 55% of the French and Belgian populations worked in agriculture, while in the Netherlands it was 45%. As of 1900 the corresponding numbers were 43%, 21% and 36%; this shows the progress of industrialization in Belgium.\textsuperscript{152} However, in spite of the most unequal agrarian structure, predominance of labor-repressive agriculture in large areas of the country, and its continuous economic importance, France was the first to democratize among the three analyzed countries. Undoubtedly, the presence of a strong landlord class affected regime outcomes in France, and landlords certainly were not a pro-democratic force, but the influence of

\textsuperscript{149} Fortescue 2005, 32; Gildea 2008, 92-93; Magraw 1986, 56-57; Plessis 1985, 108.
\textsuperscript{150} Boulger 1904, 128-31.
\textsuperscript{151} Devienne 2007.
\textsuperscript{152} Allen 2000, 6-7; Andeweg and Irwin 2002, 178; Lademacher 2003, 274; Plessis 1985, 105; Swinnen, Banerjee, and Gorter 2001.
other factors was apparently more decisive in shaping regime type. As in Britain, the political ideology of the French landlord class was influenced by the experience of PA monarchy (in the French case, Restoration and July Monarchy). The Party of Order during the Second Republic, as well as Legitimists which took power during the first years of the Third Republic, were in favor of a parliamentary monarchy along the British model, which would be ruled by a legitimist king and have, preferably, restricted suffrage. They, however, were against a system of PA monarchy (i.e. the king as a chief executive), which was the main reason why the legitimist pretender was denied the throne in the 1870s. They opposed a democratic republic as well as Napoleonic authoritarianism; the latter because they valued the tradition, rule of law and protection of civil liberties, the values which they came to cherish during the 1815-48 period and which were denied by Louis-Napoleon. Hence, as in most countries, social structure affected regime outcomes in France, but it was an additional factor with a larger role played by politico-historical legacies.
Much has been written on the collapse of democracy in the interwar Germany (the so-called Weimar Republic from the name of the city where the first German democratic constitution was adopted). This is because of its historical importance. The breakdown of the Weimar democracy ended in the catastrophe of Nazism. The most common arguments explaining the collapse of Weimar point to the authoritarian and militaristic elements in its pre-WWI political system, the flawed institutional choice which increased the risk of democratic breakdown, the pernicious effect of Great Depression, or the persistence of elements of feudalism in the form of the anti-democratic Junker (landlord) class. What these explanations have in common is the insufficiently careful analysis of how these factors contributed to the most important cause of the breakdown of the Weimar republic – the strikingly high percentage vote for anti-system parties during its existence, which oscillated at about 35-40% even before the Great Depression and reached almost 60% in the last free election. Arguably, in comparison to other Western European societies in the period, German society was characterized by widespread and explicitly negative attitudes towards the country's democratic political system. Hence, if the collapse of Weimar democracy is to be accounted for, what needs to be directly explained are the causes of these anti-democratic attitudes. Or, to put it differently, the research process should begin with the analysis of factors which directly contributed to the anti-democratic attitudes prevalent during the Weimar period.

In this chapter I will argue that the pattern of establishment of the first German democracy was directly responsible for its deficit of legitimacy. Germany was the only Western European country, apart from Austria and France, which democratized through the overthrow of
the preceding political system, or to put it differently, through a regime discontinuity.\textsuperscript{1} As described in the introduction, in other Western European countries democratization was more gradual. Traditional rulers agreed to introduction of democratic institutions (extension of franchise and/or introduction of parliamentary responsibility of governments) as a result of popular pressure, but the traditional institutions were preserved and remained influential even after democracy was formally achieved. In contrast, German Empire was abolished during a revolution of 1918, and the institutional structure of the country was significantly transformed. The transformation included introduction of a republican democratic parliamentary system, women's suffrage, proportional representation instead of a two-round majoritarian electoral system, and democratically, although indirectly elected upper house.\textsuperscript{2}

However, from the comparative perspective, political development of German Empire before 1918 was not unique; it was in fact quite similar to the historical trajectory experienced by Denmark and Sweden. In contrast to the countries described in Chapter 4, which experienced a long period of competitive oligarchy as a transitional stage between PA monarchy and democracy, these countries transitioned nearly directly from PA monarchy to democracy. Sweden experienced a period of PA monarchy under restricted suffrage in 1866-1905. In 1905 the principle of parliamentary responsibility of the government was tentatively established, and nearly universal male suffrage was introduced shortly afterwards, in 1911. The monarch retained direct influence over politics until 1917. Several German states began political development toward modern representative government even earlier than in Sweden, as they established PA

\textsuperscript{1} As described in chapter 4, France experienced its initial democratization already in 1848, but its first democracy – which is in itself indicative – also collapsed quickly at the time, in 1851. Austrian democracy was established in 1919, but also collapsed, in 1933.

\textsuperscript{2} The federal system and the existing federal units were preserved, but a democratic political system was introduced in each unit. Under the empire, members of the upper house, which could block all legislation, were nominated by the governments of the federal units, which were on the other hand controlled by their respective monarchs.
monarchies, with restricted or relatively wide male suffrage, already in 1819 (Bavaria, Baden and Wuerttemberg). Still, the largest German state, Prussia, established freely elected legislature with unequal franchise only after the Spring of Nations (in 1850). Universal male suffrage was introduced in Germany in 1867 first in the North German Federation, and it was maintained when the united Empire was established in 1871. Finally, Denmark’s political history was the most similar to Germany’s. The country established PA monarchy with nearly-universal male suffrage already in 1848, but met the minimal criteria of democracy by adopting the principle of parliamentary responsibility only in 1901. Moreover, the same way as in Sweden and in sharp contrast to Germany, traditional institutions were preserved in Denmark after democratization, and the king continued to influence politics until the early 1920s.

In this chapter, I will take advantage of the similarities between the German, Danish and Swedish political histories to show how the mode of transition from PA monarchy to democracy might influence the scope of democratic legitimacy. As a result of differing modes of transition, the pro-monarchical Danish and Swedish right turned into pro-system, moderate conservative party after democratization, while the German pro-monarchical right turned into an anti-system force after World War I, mostly because the monarchy had been abolished and the political system lost its symbolic legitimacy. This anti-system sentiment was present also in larger segments of the society, which positively compared the imperial with the republican periods, the latter characterized by poor economic performance and political instability. Hence, a large potential for anti-system vote emerged. This vote initially went to a conservative German National People’s Party (DNVP), but during the Great Depression it was taken over by the Nazis as the main antidemocratic party. On the other hand, the Danish and Swedish democracies, because they had preserved the traditional institutions and symbols, were perceived as legitimate
by almost the entire society and the potential for anti-system vote in Denmark and Sweden was very limited. To put this comparison in counterfactual terms, if German Empire democratized similarly to Denmark or Sweden, without a regime discontinuity resulting in a rupture from the traditional institutions, the probability of survival of German democracy would have been significantly greater.

This chapter is divided into two main parts. In the first part I pursue a focused comparison of the Danish, Swedish and German political developments, arguing that the moment of democratic transition was a critical juncture in the histories of the three countries, which critically affected the probability of survival of democracy. The non-violent and gradual transition to democracy in Denmark and Sweden resulted in democratic stability, while a discontinuity transition to democracy in Germany resulted in creation of a system which was characterized by a deficit of legitimacy and resulting high probability of breakdown. Hence, in a similar way as the discontinuity transition to democracy in France in 1848, the discontinuity transition to democracy in Germany in 1918 nullified the pro-democratic legacy of open-outcome elections from the period of PA monarchy, although the causal mechanism leading to democratic breakdown was in both cases slightly different. In the second part of the chapter I consider alternative explanations of the collapse of Weimar democracy and diverging regime outcomes in Denmark, Sweden and Germany, with particular attention paid to the effect of the agrarian structure, and argue that their explanatory power is smaller in comparison to the effect of the character of democratic transition.

**Period of PA Monarchy in Denmark, Sweden and Germany**

The political history of Denmark and Sweden in the nineteenth century was in many aspects similar to the history of Germany and its largest state, Prussia, with the main difference being that Denmark and Sweden had not, in contrast to Germany, disintegrated into several
smaller states. All of these countries experienced the political stage of PA monarchy, when the lower house of the legislature was freely elected while the government was responsible to the monarch. The stage occurred in Denmark (1848-1901), Sweden (1809/1866-1905) and Prussia (1848-71). The institutional framework of PA monarchy was also adopted after the unification of Germany in 1871. This system permitted the society to articulate its political demands relatively freely and influence political outcomes (as the elections, with few localized exceptions, were free of direct fraud),\(^3\) but preserved the conservative elite's ultimate control over the political process. As well, the composition of the elite was similar in Germany, Denmark and Sweden, as the monarchy based its political power on the support of the nobility, including landlords, high officials and industrialists. At the same time, the Danish and Swedish elites consciously followed the German political solutions.

Denmark before 1848, like Prussia and some other German states, was an absolute monarchy. Still, the country established in 1834 representative institutions in the form of regional assemblies whose members were elected under relatively broad suffrage. In contrast to Prussia, however, the Danish agriculture was characterized by importance of the middle peasantry, which along with the rural underclass (the majority of the rural population) and large landlords was one of the three main social classes in the countryside. The middle peasantry was mobilized by political entrepreneurs (mainly teachers and pastors) and managed to elect effective representatives to the regional assemblies. Hence, the news of the Spring of Nations arrived at Copenhagen in 1848 in a situation when both the liberal bourgeoisie and middle peasantry had

---

\(^3\) See Anderson 2000 and Ziblatt 2009 for overview of the quality of Imperial elections. The nature of abuses was similar to other open-outcome elections held at the time in the United States, France or Great Britain (with Anderson arguing that elections in Germany were in fact fairer).
been politically mobilized. Moreover, there had been a growing realization in the society that the political system of absolutist monarchy was severely outdated.

In contrast to other European nations, the Spring of Nations in Denmark was a relatively peaceful affair. In March 1848, liberal bourgeoisie organized a march in Copenhagen to demand resignation of the government and introduction of constitutionalism, only to hear that their demands had already been met.\textsuperscript{4} Lack of violence during the regime transition could also be explained by the fact that the country was fighting the Prussian-supported secession of Schleswig-Holstein, so national unity was necessary in order to combat the insurrection, and both sides had to moderate their demands. As middle peasants had been already mobilized, they managed to elect numerous representatives to the 1848 Constituent Assembly, which secured the preservation of universal male suffrage (for men 30 years or older), which was had been already in place for regional elections. The assembly enacted a relatively liberal constitution which provided for numerous freedoms, direct elections to the lower house, and indirect election of the upper house under the same franchise.\textsuperscript{5} However, it failed to specify the principle of parliamentary responsibility of the government in the new constitution. Hence, although the 1849 constitution was not revoked, the king took advantage of this legal ambiguity in order to nominate more conservative prime ministers after the liberal wave of the Spring of Nations receded in the beginning of the 1850s.

Until 1864 Danish government was dominated by the bourgeois interests, which were organized in the National Liberal Party, while peasant deputies remained in opposition. Yet, the party lost power in 1864 after defeat in the war with Prussia and Austria over Schleswig-

\textsuperscript{4} Jespersen 2004, 58-59.

\textsuperscript{5} Jespersen 2004, 61; Lauring 1960, 213-14.
Holstein. As the liberals were compromised, the king decided to base his rule on the support of big landlords, who were organized into Højre (Right) party. The landlords tried to limit the influence of middle peasantry through a constitutional reform. The reform, enacted in 1866, introduced unequal suffrage to the elections to the upper house, which resulted in its conservative composition. Hence, the upper house could block legislation enacted by the lower house. Peasant representatives accepted the reform on the condition that they would have larger influence in the government, but that influence never came. Never again would middle peasants believe landlords' political promises. Still, Højre was unable to turn the influence in the government into electoral victories. The party's electoral base (it won up to 40% of seats in its best result) were mostly farm workers employed by large landlords, whose vote was tightly controlled by the latter.

As a reaction to landlord domination, in 1870 middle peasant representatives united into a single party called Venstre (the Left, or Liberals) and won every single parliamentary election until 1913. The Venstre's strength was based on an extensive system of rural high schools and cooperatives, but also on the fact that middle peasants controlled the vote of farm laborers and family members whom they employed. Still, the king refused to appoint a Venstre prime minister. Instead, Denmark was ruled between 1875 and 1894 by a conservative landlord, Jacob Estrup, who consciously followed Bismarck's political style. He based his rule on the support of the military and bureaucracy, institutions dominated by pro-monarchical and conservative landlord groups. On the initiative of Estrup's government, a system of social insurance was enacted along the German model.⁶

---

After 1875, Denmark was characterized by increasing levels of political conflict between Venstre and Højre. The Liberals’ main and constant demand was introduction of the principle of parliamentary responsibility. When it was not met, the party resorted to the strategy of obstructionism against Estrup. Because the parliament did not agree on a budget, the country was governed in the period between 1885 and 1894 through provisional laws. In the last decade of the nineteenth century, the political atmosphere in Denmark became especially tense. Never in its history was the country so close to open revolution and widespread civil disobedience. Still, in 1894, a tentative compromise was reached between Venstre and the government, under which Estrup was recalled, but Venstre had to agree to a budget which contained large military expenses. Subsequently, a new leader of the party moderated its goals. At the same time, growing strength of the emerging Socialists convinced many conservatives that a compromise with Venstre might soon be necessary. Such a compromise, as it was hoped, would strengthen Venstre as the main party of the opposition and prevent possible revolutionary takeover by the Socialists.\(^7\)

In contrast to Denmark, Sweden has had a long history of representative institutions. Its parliament, Riksdag, was officially established in 1527 as an assembly of four traditional estates: nobility, clergy, burgers and the peasantry. In this regard, the political incorporation of peasantry was unique in the European context. However, the Riksdag’s political importance varied across time. During periods of absolutism the assembly was not even convened for prolonged periods, but during the so-called Age of Liberty (1718-1772) it became the most powerful institution in the country. Its ascendancy culminated in the period between 1738 and 1772, when virtual parliamentary government (with the Privy Council responsible to the Riksdag) was established in

\(^7\) Jespersen 2004, 65-66, 70.
Sweden and two parties, the Hats and the Caps, competed for power. Still, the nobility became a
dominant estate at the time and the peasant estate was marginalized. The Age of Liberty came to
an end in 1772, when King Gustav III reintroduced absolutism after a successful coup.\(^8\) Still, the
last absolutist king, Gustav IV Adolph, was removed in 1809 in another coup after a disastrous
war with Russia. Because his successor, Charles XIII, was old and childless, a question of
successor came to the fore. After a long process, the reconvened Riksdag elected to the throne
French marshal Jean Bernadotte, who established a new dynasty. A new constitution was also
adopted in 1809, whose purpose was to avert absolutism but also prevent the return to the
excesses of the Age of Liberty.\(^9\)

The constitution reestablished the Riksdag of the Estates in spite of calls to introduce a
modern type of parliament. Each of the four estates formed a separate assembly and the consent
of at least three was necessary to adopt legislation. The noble and clerical estates formed jointly
less than 1% of the population. Otherwise, about 24% of male adult commoners could vote in
indirect elections within the burgher and peasant estates. This included only large and middle
peasants; smallholders and landless peasantry were disenfranchised (Scott 1977 334-338, Verney
1957 14-20, Goldstein 1983 13). The Riksdag was to meet every five years at least. In practice, it
met every three years on average before 1845 and every two years after. However, the
government remained responsible to the king. He also had the right to veto legislation, with the
exception of tax-related bills. An independent judiciary and civil service were retained, though,
and government actions were scrutinized by a constitutional committee.\(^10\)

\(^8\) Carlsson 1975; Hadenius 1997, 81-105; Weibull 1993, 63-69.


The period after the adoption of the new constitution was characterized by Bernadotte’s personal rule, subservient position of the estates, and persecution of the radical press. It came to an end when opposition candidates won majorities in the 1840-41 Riksdag. A governmental reform enacted in 1840 created separate government departments with ministers being legally responsible to the Riksdag. The reform increased the government’s accountability and decreased the king’s powers. In 1845, censorship was ultimately abolished in Sweden.\footnote{Bukdahl et al. 1959, 718; Goldstein 1983; Hadenius 1997, 129-32, 137-38; Scott 1977, 383; Weibull 1993, 93; 162.} A more liberal atmosphere in the 1840s was also characterized by increasing calls to reform the obsolete estate parliament. As of 1840, the lower two estate were in favor of a reform, but plans were blocked by the higher two estates. In reaction to reform proposals, “true conservatives and friends of the king” formed a so-called Junker party which was composed of landed aristocracy and high civil officials.\footnote{Scott 1977, 387-88; Verney 1957, 35-37.}

The Spring of Nations in Sweden resulted in a few demonstrations which were suppressed by the police. The king nominated a more liberal cabinet and proposed a reform of the parliament, which was considered too conservative, however.\footnote{Hadenius 1997, 139-40; Scott 1977, 388, Verney 1957, 38.} Subsequently, after a period of moderate reaction, a new wave of pro-reform agitation erupted in the 1860s. The need for reform came to be understood also by a group of officials in the conservative circles. Conservative landlord Louis De Geer, who was prime minister in 1858-70, proposed a parliamentary reform arguing that if nothing is done, a more radical change would soon be forced upon the elites. Initially the plan was not accepted by the king, but after De Geer threatened his resignation, Charles XV backed down as he was unwilling to dismiss the popular
prime minister.\textsuperscript{14} The reform proposals were being prepared under strong popular pressure. A “Central Committee of the Friends of Reform” collected 60,000 signatures in support of the reform bill in 1865. Pro-reform meetings were held throughout the country and a popular deputation was elected, which met with De Geer and the king. The depth of popular support ultimately convinced Charles XV to support the proposal. On the day of the vote large crowds assembled in front of the Parliament. Although the clergy and most of the noble estate were against the proposal, it was ultimately accepted given widespread fears that even a more radical reform would have to be adopted under popular pressure at a later stage, and that a rejection could lead to serious disturbances. The margin of victory in the noble estate was small, however.\textsuperscript{15}

De Geer’s plan created a modern legislature composed of two equal chambers. The upper chamber was elected indirectly by provincial councils for the term of nine years with membership renewed annually. The right to be elected was restricted to the wealthiest 0.6\% male adults. Technically, about 40\% of male adults could vote in the provincial elections, but the suffrage was very unequal. In practice, 4\% of male adult voters controlled the composition of the upper chamber before the 1907 reform. The new upper chamber came to be nominated by landed aristocracy, big industrialists and highest civil servants, who blocked or delayed progressive reforms.\textsuperscript{16} In the lower chamber elections, held every three years, about 20\% of male adults could vote. The suffrage was restricted by income and property qualifications, but the vote was secret.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{15} Scott 1977, 391; Verney 1957, 70-71.
\textsuperscript{17} Hadenius 1997, 142-44; Scott 1977, 390; Verney 1957, 52-53, 91.
The reform did not significantly affect the power structure in Sweden. There was a large degree of continuity between the reformed and unreformed Riksdag. More than 50% of members of the first-elected upper chamber had served in the noble estate and about 56% of members of the first-elected lower chamber had served in the peasant and burger estates.\textsuperscript{18} Although opportunities for moneyed interest of commoner background increased, the highest levels of civil service and the military still were dominated by pro-monarchical aristocracy and nobility.\textsuperscript{19} The lower chamber, on the other hand, was dominated by a lose group of wealthy farmers’ representatives called the Farmers’ Party. It pressed for narrow issues of interest to rich farmers, such as tax reform and reduction in military spending. This party lacked territorial organization and did not engage in efforts to mobilize voters. Hence the turnout in the lower chamber elections was initially low. It increased from 18\% in the 1867 election to 45\% in 1896 and only 60\% in 1908.\textsuperscript{20}

The 1866 reform in Sweden did not affect the structure of the government as it remained responsible to the monarch. However, in comparison to Denmark, the demands for parliamentary government were not as vocal. This was caused by several factors. First of all, equal bicameralism resulted in a situation when it was unclear to which chamber the government should be responsible. In addition, to have a good working relationship with the parliament, the king nominated ministers which generally enjoyed the former’s confidence. Finally, the Farmers’ Party leaders were reluctant to join the government. They were given an opportunity to do so during the premiership of one of its leaders, Arvid Posse (1880-83), but they refused being determined to preserve their independence. If the Farmers’ Party had demanded reforms,

\textsuperscript{18} Scott 1977, 394.
\textsuperscript{19} Lewin 1988, 56-57; Scott 1977, 380-81, 392-92; Verney 1957, 10, 123.
\textsuperscript{20} Scott 1977, 386, 394, 422; Verney 1957, 91-93, 100-01, 123.
parliamentary government would have been possible to attain in Sweden as early as 1883. However, the party “had not challenged the alliance of conservative bureaucrats and the Monarchy.”\textsuperscript{21} During the subsequent decades, King Oscar II (1872-1907), although he was rather passive in everyday politics, carefully guarded the prerogative to nominate ministers. After the 1887 election, when the majority in the lower chamber turned from free-trader to protectionist, he refused immediate nomination of a protectionist cabinet arguing that parliamentary responsibility was not envisioned in the constitution.\textsuperscript{22}

Swedish political and economic development during the late nineteenth century was in many aspects similar to Germany’s. A comparable alliance of agrarian and industrial groups, dominated by the nobility, emerged in Sweden and pressed for introduction of protectionism.\textsuperscript{23} The middle classes remained weak and rapid industrialization started late, only in the 1880s. A conservative landlord Erik Boström (prime minister in 1891-1900 and 1902-05) consciously followed Bismarck’s ideas as a model for domestic policy, while Swedish industry, the military and the labor movement imitated German organizational patterns.\textsuperscript{24} Similarly to Germany, the period was also characterized by rapid development of civic society, notably fraternal, religious and temperance associations; cooperatives, and the labor movement. Most of these associations had a democratic internal framework.\textsuperscript{25}

The late nineteenth century was also characterized by increasing pressures for extension of suffrage and introduction of the parliamentary government. The first issue drew support of

\textsuperscript{21} Scott 1977, 423-24; Verney 1957, 10, 103-04, 124, 132-33.
\textsuperscript{22} Hadenius 1997, 155; Lewin 1988, 87; Verney 1957, 113-14, 117-18.
\textsuperscript{23} Sejersted and Adams 2011, 20; Verney 1957, 79.
\textsuperscript{24} Berman 1998, ix-x; Verney 1957, 121-22; Weibull 1993, 102.
\textsuperscript{25} Lundkvist 1975; Scott 1977, 410; Sejersted and Adams 2011, 52.
Liberals both inside and outside of Riksdag, and was pursued by the emerging Social Democratic Party (founded in 1889). A Universal Suffrage Association was formed in 1890. In 1898 petitions for extension of suffrage drew 364,000 signatures. In 1893 and 1896 “folk Riksdags” (people’s parliaments) were elected by universal suffrage as a means for political discussion and popular pressure. They were dominated by liberals and social democrats, and supported by the Temperance Movement.\textsuperscript{26} Introduction of conscription in 1901 provided additional argumentation for broader enfranchisement, and a three-day general strike demanding extension of suffrage was held in 1902. As a result of the popular pressure, in the parliament elected in 1901 all factions and the government agreed on a need to reform the suffrage, but the main difficulty lay in agreeing on a concrete reform proposal.\textsuperscript{27}

The issue of suffrage extension led also to formation of modern political parties in Sweden, the development which came late in comparison to Denmark or Norway. A loose Liberal Coalition was formed in the lower chamber in 1900. Its political program was hardly coherent but it included the demands of parliamentary government and universal suffrage with a taxpaying requirement. The coalition, which was supported by the smallholding peasantry and urban lower middle classes, formed an electoral committee and a territorial organization in 1902.\textsuperscript{28} The Social Democratic Party, even though the best organized, remained mostly extra-parliamentary. Still, in spite of restricted suffrage, it managed to elect one member to the lower house in 1896. In 1902, four Social Democrats were elected.\textsuperscript{29} At last, in spite of government’s reluctance to the idea, conservative factions united into General Electoral League in 1904. In the

\textsuperscript{26} Scott 1977, 405; Verney 1957, 110-11; Lewin 1988, 63-64.


\textsuperscript{28} Hadenius 1997, 159; Scott 1977, 424; Verney 1957, 136-137.

\textsuperscript{29} Scott 1977, 400, 429-30; Verney 1957, 196-97.
early twentieth century, it was clear that political changes towards democratization were imminent in Sweden, although it was still uncertain what would be their particular pace and direction.

Although Prussian/German history was slightly different in comparison to Denmark and Sweden, in Germany there ultimately emerged a political system which was very similar as in the former countries. As mentioned, most German states adopted a political system of PA monarchy already in the 1820s and 1830s. The biggest exception was Prussia, where nearly half of Germans lived, which remained an absolute monarchy. However, the Prussian middle class’ fight against the regime was complicated by the fact that it was a struggle both for political liberalization and the unification of Germany. Generally, the struggle ended in the apparent defeat during the Spring of Nations, when a constitution adopted by the all-German Frankfurt Parliament was ignored by the Prussian king and other German monarchs, and rebellions in favor of it were suppressed. Yet, demands for liberalization could not be longer totally ignored by the German ruling circles if they hoped to limit the scope of social unrest. Hence, after a short period of repression, the pre-1848 constitutions were reintroduced in most of the smaller German states. A constitution which provided for a political system of a PA monarchy was also granted in 1850 in Prussia. Similarly to other German constitutions, it guaranteed basic freedoms, equality before the law, and provided for an elected lower house of parliament, with the upper house composed of hereditary aristocrats and royal appointees. The lower house, however, was elected under unequal suffrage (which effectively enfranchised about 40% of male adults), and the government remained responsible to the king, not to the parliament. Such an outcome should be considered a political compromise which benefited the monarch and his aristocracy to a larger extent than the
middle classes which had fought for constitutionalism. The latter called for introduction of parliamentary government along the British model, a demand which was not fulfilled.

In the 1850s and 1860s, the Prussian lower house was dominated by liberals who actively opposed policies of the conservative leadership and consistently demanded the introduction of the parliamentary government. A conflict over increasing military expenses led to a situation in which the country operated without a budget in 1862-66. Liberal intransigence was one of the factors which convinced the conservative chancellor Otto von Bismarck (in office since 1862) that Prussia should actively seek unification of Germany, which had been another main liberal policy goal. Generally, Bismarck hoped that when unification was achieved, the middle classes would reconcile with the government. Unification was indeed achieved after victorious wars with Denmark (1864), Austria (1866) and France (1870). In the end, Bismarck's hopes were fulfilled, as the majority of liberals became supporters of the government after unification. They organized into the National Liberal Party. A smaller group, which remained committed to parliamentarism, formed German Progress Party (I will call this group “democratic liberals” afterward).

Unified Germany was a federal state under Prussian leadership. For all practical purposes, it was created already in 1866 (after the war with Austria) as structures of the North German Confederation were extended to the southern German states in 1871. The head of state was German Emperor, who was also the King of Prussia. The previously independent German states became federal units, and they retained their monarchical institutions. Prussia was the largest state, where about 60% of Germans lived. The lower house, Reichstag, was elected under universal male suffrage, while the upper house, Bundesrat, consisted of representatives of the monarchical governments of federal units. As the consent of both chambers was necessary to
adopt legislation, it meant in practice than the unelected Bundesrat could block all bills. The imperial government was responsible to the Emperor and not to the Reichstag.

Bismarck decided to introduce universal male suffrage in the North German Confederation in the hope that lower classes would vote in accordance with the government's wishes out of loyalty to the Emperor and other monarchs, and with the intent to weaken other German monarchs through creation of a strong central representative authority. The intransigence of liberals in the Prussian parliament might have also played a role in his calculation, as it showed that unequal suffrage does not in fact guarantee a complacent parliament. However, at this time Bismarck's hopes were not fulfilled; pro-government factions (National Liberals and two conservative parties) lost the majority of seats during the 1874 elections and never recovered it, although they also never obtained less than 25% of the vote under the Empire. Hence, in order to pass legislation the government had to bargain with some opposition parties. Initially, the largest of those was the Center Party, which quite effectively mobilized German Catholics of all classes. Later on, the Social Democrats became the largest party in opposition. On the other hand, pro-democratic middle classes voted for democratic liberals.

Similarly to Denmark and Sweden, during the period of PA monarchy German government maintained its rule through the support of large landowners (Prussian Junkers) and upper bourgeoisie. These groups were represented in Reichstag by two conservative parties and the National Liberal Party. They also applied patronage and intimidation in order to influence the electoral choice of economically-dependent lower class voters (farm workers and small peasantry in case of landowners and industrial workers in case of the bourgeoisie). During the imperial period these tactics became less and less effective, however, because of economic changes and
more consistent application of the secret ballot. As mentioned, in the last imperial elections the pro-government parties obtained only 26% of the vote. Industrial workers gradually moved to support Social Democrats, while most Catholic Germans had voted for Zentrum since the introduction of universal male suffrage.\textsuperscript{30} Because of geographical diversity in terms of agrarian structure and the confessional division, the vote of German peasants was divided. Still, a large number of smallholding Protestant peasants supported democratic liberals, which was indicated by their victory in the 1912 election in many rural regions, including Schleswig-Holstein,\textsuperscript{31} the northern part of East Prussia, and Mecklenburg. This showed an increasing possibility of consolidation of peasant liberalism along Danish lines. Unfortunately, this and other political developments (including gradual increase of the opposition vote in Germany) were suddenly interrupted by the outbreak of WWI.

**The Form of Democratic Transition as a Critical Juncture, and its Consequences for Democratic Stability in Denmark, Sweden and Germany**

Like most other Western European countries, Denmark transitioned to democracy (in the nineteenth-century understanding of the term) through peaceful change. Because the principles of free elections and universal male enfranchisement had been already established in the country, the final step in the process was introduction of the principle of parliamentary responsibility of the government. It was accomplished in 1901. In the elections held that year, Højre received only 7% of the seats, and the ruling party was in total disarray. Even king’s closest advisers from Højre were convinced that in order to avoid widespread social disturbances, it was necessary to agree to a Venstre government. The monarch accepted the new reality only reluctantly. As the story goes, he called Venstre to send him a list of three candidates for prime minister, of whom
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he was to choose the most proper person. Consequently, a little known professor whom the king trusted personally became prime minister instead of the party’s leader, Jens Christensen. The latter became head of government only in 1905.\textsuperscript{32}

Even though the principle of parliamentary responsibility became a part of Danish reality after 1901, the monarch and his conservative entourage continued to influence politics until the early 1920s. In particular, King Christian X undermined democratic principles when he tried to nominate a government lacking a parliamentary majority in 1920. Yet, widespread protests forced him to give up the idea as the preservation of monarchy itself was at stake.\textsuperscript{33} Still, the continuing influence of the monarch might have been, paradoxically, beneficial for the survival of democracy. It probably made it easier for the conservative elite to swallow the bitter pill of popular government. Preservation of monarchy also increased legitimacy of the democratic political system as perceived by the right-wing political groups. Indeed, Højre, the authoritarian pro-government party before 1901, gradually transformed into a mainstream, pro-democratic right-wing party under the name of Conservative People's Party (since 1915). Danish democracy did not develop a legitimacy deficit. In this context, one should note that Great Depression hit Denmark particularly hard, because its economy still depended to a large extent on the export of foodstuffs. Unemployment in urban areas reached 40\% in 1932 and thousands of farms had to be sold. Yet, no large anti-system movement emerged in Denmark. Before WWII, the largest electoral success of anti-system parties (both Communists and Nazis) was 4\% of the vote. Rather than blaming each other for economic problems, the two most popular parties, Venstre and Social Democrats, cooperated in order to solve the crisis.\textsuperscript{34}
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In contrast to Denmark, the struggle for democratization in Sweden was more protracted as it considered, in addition to the issue of parliamentary responsibility, the question of universal suffrage. For the first time the principle of parliamentarism was recognized in Sweden during the Norwegian crisis of 1905, when the royal government could not find a political solution. Consequently, the king had no other choice but to let the parties in the parliament form a cabinet. Accordingly, a coalition of Liberals and moderate Conservatives came to power in August 1905. The September 1905 election was won by the Liberal Coalition, which obtained 49% of the seats. Accordingly, Karl Staaff, the leader of the party, became prime minister in November 1905 with Social Democratic support. However, Staaff’s cabinet scored a major setback when his suffrage reform project was defeated in the upper chamber.

Subsequently, the prime minister made a challenging statement, asking whether the will of the monarch and the aristocracy, or rather the popular will, should prevail in Sweden. He also requested the king to dissolve the lower chamber, hoping that Liberals would emerge victorious in a snap election and this would force the upper chamber to accept the reform. However, the king refused arguing that the dissolution would be unconstitutional. Given the refusal, Staaff resigned. Subsequently, in May 1906 the king turned to Conservatives under the leadership of Arvid Lindman to form the cabinet. Lindman’s parliamentary support was based on the Conservatives and right-wing Liberals. In spite of his conservative convictions, Lindman argued that the extension of suffrage was in a long term unavoidable. Hence it was beneficial for the Conservatives to enact the reform on their own terms while still in power. Hence, paradoxically, the 1907 suffrage reform was adopted by Conservatives with left Liberals and Social Democrats voting against it. In order to safeguard Conservative interests, the suffrage bill provided for proportional representation, but it also decreased suffrage inequality in the upper chamber.
elections, and extended the suffrage in the lower chamber elections from 35% to about 75% of male adults. The first lower chamber election under the extended suffrage, in 1911, brought about Liberal and Social Democratic victory. Those parties obtained 44% and 28% of the seats, respectively, while the conservative General Electoral League obtained 28%. Liberals had campaigned on the issue of parliamentary government and reduction in defense spending. As a result, King Gustav V again called the Liberal leader Staaff to form the government, although he did so very reluctantly and only after several Conservative leaders refused. Subsequently, Liberals entered into a political conflict with the Conservatives and the king over the defense issue. In the light of increasing international tensions, Gustav V and his entourage came to the opinion that Liberal plans to reduce defense spending ran against the Swedish national interest.

The conflict came to a head in February 1914, when a 40-thousand strong demonstration dominated by conservative farmers was held in Stockholm in support of the monarchy and rearmament. In the speech which greeted the marchers, the king defied the Staaff’s defense policies, which caused a parliamentary crisis. A few days later, a 50-thousand counter-march was organized by Social Democrats in support of the government. Nevertheless, after the king refused to retract his statements, Staaff resigned and an extra-parliamentary government dominated by the Conservatives was formed in February 1914 pending general elections. The 1914 elections sent a mixed message as both Conservatives and Social Democrats increased their seat share, while Liberals lost. Hammarskjöld interpreted the outcome as a mandate for office. But he in fact did not have the parliamentary majority necessary to enforce his pro-defense policies. The prime minister would have been probably recalled, and the king would have faced
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serious consequences for the speech (there were calls for his abdication) save for the war outbreak. In this situation a truce was announced between the parties and Hammarskjöld continued in office.\textsuperscript{37}

It should be noted that during the crisis the parliamentary Conservatives headed by Arvid Lindman did not openly side with the monarch. Before the Farmers’ March, they had advised the king not to dismiss Staafl, arguing that he should first present his defense proposal. They hoped that the proposed defense cuts would lead to a breakup within the Liberal Party and formation of a coalition between right-wing Liberals and Conservatives. Lindman also tried to moderate the king’s response to the Farmers’ March, but without success. Clearly, by 1911 parliamentary Conservatives were already in a large part committed to the principle of parliamentarism. The Hammarskjöld’s government continued in office until March 1917, when it resigned having lost an important vote. Apparently, Hammarskjöld conformed to the principle of parliamentary responsibility in spite of the king’s opposite position on the issue.\textsuperscript{38} Full recognition of the parliamentary government came after the September 1917 election, which the Conservatives lost having obtained only 25\% of the seats. Given that no leading Conservative was willing to form a cabinet, a coalition of Liberals and Social Democrats was formed, led by a Liberal Nils Eden. Eden assumed the post under the condition that the king and his associates would neither interfere in politics nor conspire with the Conservatives against the government.\textsuperscript{39}

The end of WWI brought about further democratization, which was mostly caused by fear of a revolutionary outbreak. The economic crisis in 1918 led to massive workers’ demonstrations and food riots. Radical demands of republicanism, end of capitalism and military
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service were raised. Still, the Social Democratic leader Hjalmar Branting, who was at the time in a government coalition with Liberals, was able to placate radical demands, convincing most of the party and trade union representatives at a meeting in November 1918 that democratization was better than a revolution, and that the proposed suffrage reform enjoyed the support of the king. Most members of the party and its elite preferred a vision of a democratic Sweden, but a radical faction split at the time to form a separate Social Democratic Left Party. The suffrage reform was indeed rapidly adopted in December 1918. It introduced universal suffrage both to the lower and upper house elections. The reform needed the approval of the Conservative majority in the upper chamber, which was obtained after Lindman threatened resignation arguing that the party had to reconcile itself with the new democratic realities.\textsuperscript{40} Hence, after a transitory period (1905-17), marked by the fight for parliamentary responsibility and universal suffrage, Sweden reached the standards of full democracy.

Similarly to Denmark, the consolidation of democracy in Sweden during the interwar period proceeded quite smoothly. The 1920s were characterized by parliamentary instability and frequent minority governments, but this did not result in dissatisfaction with the democratic system in general. Similarly to Denmark, there was a high degree of elite continuity between the pre- and post-democratization periods. The leaders of the Liberal and Social Democratic parties, Staaff and Branting, began their parliamentary careers already in 1896, while most of the Conservative Party (General Electoral League) was a direct continuation of the Farmers’ Party active before 1900. The Social Democratic Party, led since its inception by its parliamentary representatives, had been committed to democratic politics and reformist socialism already since the 1890s, and after coming to power it dropped the nominal demand of republicanism. Similarly
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to Danish Højre, “with remarkable speed, the Conservatives and the monarchy also embraced the
new set of shared values that parliamentary democracy began to generate,” in spite of their
commitment to “defense, monarchy and business.” For example, the party broke off with its
youth organization after the latter adopted a pro-Fascists stance in 1934, and established another
youth league. A network of leading industrialists supported financially bourgeois parties and
would be happy to see the parliamentary government suspended, but its goals were not shared by
the Swedish Conservatives, which sharply contrasted with the position of the German DNVP. Otherwise, the electoral support for anti-democratic parties was limited even after the outbreak
of the Great Depression. Fascist parties reached the maximum support of 1.6% of the vote in the
1936 election, while the Communists reached the maximum of 8.3% in 1932.

In contrast to Denmark and Sweden, Germany did not transition even to partial
democracy before the outbreak of the war in 1914, but according to many authors it was
arguably moving in this direction. However, already before 1914 a peaceful transition to
democracy through the introduction of parliamentarism could have been possible in Germany,
but did not occur because of certain unfortunate events. In particular, democratic change would
have been more likely if Emperor Frederick III, who ruled just for four months in 1888, did not
suffer a premature death. According to historians, Frederick III had liberal-democratic
convictions and politically sympathized with Progressive Liberals to the point that Otto von
Bismarck was afraid that the new emperor would want to significantly liberalize the political
system (Craig 1980:119, 165-166). Yet, it did not happen. Instead, a much more conservative
and politically erratic William II became emperor after Frederick's death. Still, democratization
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was also possible under William II. It could have occurred, for example, if after the 1912 election the three main opposition parties (Social Democrats, Progressive Liberals and Zentrum), which commanded 61% of the seats, had formed a united front and engaged in policy of obstructionism against the government, the same way as Venstre did in Denmark before 1901. According to historians, the ruling elite would be unwilling to undertake any extra-constitutional actions in such a situation, even if it would be the emperor's preference. On the other hand, if the war had not broken out in 1914, or if Germany had won the war, peaceful democratization would have probably occurred in the subsequent decades. The secular trend of decreasing popularity of pro-government parties would probably have continued, and at some point the opposition would have become strong enough to demand transfer of power to an elected prime minister, similarly as Danish Venstre did in 1901 or Swedish Liberals achieved in 1905.

This argument does not imply, however, that peaceful democratization of Germany, Denmark and Sweden before WWI was equally likely. A turn to parliamentarism in Germany was undermined by several factors. First of all, economic position of the imperial elite was comparatively stronger than the position of the pro-monarchical elements in Denmark and, to a smaller extent, in Sweden. Moreover, democratization was hardly imaginable under the chancellorship of Bismarck (until 1890), who engaged in repressive campaigns against the Catholic Church (so-called Kulturkampf, in 1871-78) and Social Democratic Party (which remained banned in 1878-1890, but its candidates still participated in elections). In addition, the political system of the empire enjoyed more support than the Danish PA monarchy, as the conservative German elite based its legitimacy on the successful unification of the country in 1871, while popularity of the Danish monarchy decreased significantly after the defeat in the
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Schleswig war of 1864. Probably for that reason, opposition parties under the empire were less popular than the Danish Venstre (in Sweden, the division between pro-monarchical and anti-monarchical deputies was less distinct before the emergence of the Liberal Coalition in 1901, but the Farmer’s March in 1914 indicated that the idea of a monarchical government still enjoyed wide support). In Germany, in addition to the elites, the institution of the empire enjoyed legitimacy also among lower classes and opponents of the imperial government. This was evident by the fact that while pro-democratic parties demanded introduction of parliamentarism, they did not demand abolition of the empire in favor of a republic. In fact, when a parliamentary system was finally conceded by the elites in October 1918, the opposition parties gladly accepted power. But it was too little, too late. In conditions of economic disaster and military defeat, revolution broke out in Germany in the beginning of November. Even then the leaders of Social Democratic Party, including future president Friedrich Ebert, tried to preserve the institution of the monarchy under a different sovereign from the Hohenzollern dynasty, but were unable to do so after on November 7 Philip Scheidemann, one of SPD leaders, proclaimed a republic without consultation with the party leadership. He was motivated by the Communist plans to declare a Soviet-style council republic.

Indeed, the first German democracy was established in highly unfavorable circumstances. The newly created political system of the Weimar republic was characterized by a significant break with the past institutions in comparison to the political systems of Danish and Swedish democracies. First of all, the institution of the empire, which before 1918 was the regime's center of power, was abolished. Yet, the monarchy had also performed various positive functions. It had been a symbol of the unity and historical continuity of the German nation. In the minds of

45 Craig 1980, 401.
Germans of all classes, the Hohenzollern dynasty could also be credited with unification of the
nation and provision of several decades of peace and relative prosperity after 1871. Moreover, if
monarchy had been preserved at the moment of democratization, it could have provided the
conservative elites, through its continuing influence behind the scenes, a kind of ultimate
insurance against possible excesses of democratic governments (performing a similar function as
the Danish and Swedish monarchies in the first decades after the parliamentary breakthroughs of
1901 and 1905). In the event of peaceful democratization, the emperor, who might have counted
on continued loyalty of the army and the bureaucracy, could be expected to block the most
radical ideas of the elected leadership, such as dramatic cuts in military spending or
nationalization of large estates. Needless to say, a republic lacked this type of protection. Hence,
a democracy stripped of the symbolic and “protective” components of the monarchical
institutions could not be expected to enjoy the same degree of legitimacy and popularity. One
should also note that the republican government took over and the emperor was forced to
abdicate at the moment of a military defeat and national humiliation in 1918. Many Germans
believed, which was not true in the light of available historical evidence (in fact, the imperial
government admitted that the war was lost in October 1918) that the empire was abolished and
the war was lost because of the revolution. It was the so-called “stab in the back” legend, which
further diminished the legitimacy of the newly-created republican institutions.

The first visible symptom of the Weimar's legitimacy deficit was anti-system character of
the German rightist parties after 1918. Their anti-democratic ideology severely contrasted with
increasingly pro-system character of the main Danish and Swedish right-wing parties after the
democratization. Most supporters of the pro-government parties under the empire did not
consider the republican institutions as legitimate and remained monarchists. The conservative
parties reemerged as German National People's Party (DNVP), whose electoral supported oscillated between 15% and 21% before 1930. National Liberals continued their political existence as German People's Party (DVP), which scored between 9% and 14% of the vote before 1930. Although DVP took a relatively moderate course under Weimar and it participated in several governments, DNVP remained vehemently anti-system and pro-authoritarian (even if it joined two governments for short periods so that coalitions involving Social Democrats would not be formed). DNVP was a conglomerate of various far-right ideological strands; these included traditional conservatives, völkisch groups, and anti-semites.

Apart from the growth of anti-system monarchical right, the Weimar's legitimacy deficit also resulted in creation of an “ideological opening” for new types of right-wing anti-system movements and parties. These groups took advantage of the perceived illegitimacy of the republic in order to propagate the creation of alternative, “modern” forms of right-wing dictatorships. Among them NSDAP was the most popular, but even this party was quite marginal before the outbreak of Great Depression, obtaining the most of 6.5% of the vote in the May 1924 elections and only 2.6% in 1928. In addition to the presence of anti-system right-wing parties, Weimar Republic was also characterized by increasing importance of anti-system left in the form of the Communist Party. The German left split already during the war over the issue of its continuing financing, but the division became irreconcilable after the Communist uprising in Berlin was put down by the Social Democratic government in January 1919. Subsequently, the Communists took a hardcore anti-system course and refused to cooperate with the Social Democrats. The party obtained between 9% and 13% of the vote before 1930. Altogether, anti-system vote in Weimar (excluding DVP) even before Great Depression oscillated at about 35-
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40%, of which 20-25% went to the right-wing parties. In this regard, the percentage obtained by the Communists was not unprecedented (French Communists also obtained about 10% of the vote in the period). Germany was also not the only country where the Left split into Communists and democratic socialists; similar developments occurred in other European democracies as a reaction to the emergence of USSR. In comparative perspective, what was surprising about the Weimar republic was the unparalleled popularity of the anti-system right. This phenomenon may be the most convincingly explained by the republic's legitimacy deficit.

Because of the large following of the anti-system parties, the future of Weimar was quite uncertain, as I would argue, already before 1930. Yet, its survival became doomed after the outbreak of Great Depression in 1929. The percentage vote of anti-system parties reached 50% in the 1930 election and nearly 60% in the elections held in 1932. This increase was associated primarily with the rise of the Nazi party, but increased support for the Communists also played its role (they obtained 17% of the vote in the November 1932 election). NSDP received support from three main sources. First of all, it mobilized marginal, apathetic voters who had not previously participated in elections (turnout increased from 76% in 1928 to 84% in July 1932, and most of the new voters came to support the Nazis). These voters associated democracy with the republic, and the republic with low performance, especially after the Great Depression. As they linked the empire with good times and at the same time with an authoritarian, strong government, they came to believe that only a strong-handed politician like Hitler would improve the situation. Otherwise, a significant number of the previous supporters of DNVP, DVP and small peasant parties also switched their electoral support to NSDAP. Very few voters switched to NSDAP from Zentrum or SPD. In the end, it is difficult to claim that Germans abandoned Weimar after the outbreak of the depression. It had not been very popular in the first place.
Yet, the fact that the Nazi Party, instead of DNVP, became the main anti-democratic force after the depression was not a historical necessity, but rather a coincidence. It could be explained to a large extent by the personal charisma and popularity of Hitler. Still, another right-wing populist party could have capitalized on the rising anti-system attitudes after the Great Depression. This could have been DNVP, if the party had a more skillful leadership and espoused a more populist ideology. Instead, DNVP was perceived as dominated by Junker and upper bourgeoisie interests, and it could not make a viable electoral connection with the unemployed masses. Moreover, in spite of its anti-system stance, it had become associated with the Weimar system as it had already participated in two governments. Yet, even if DNVP remained the main anti-system party during the depression, the survival of democracy in Germany would still be very doubtful. For sure, however, a less vicious right-wing dictatorship would have been established, probably accompanied with restoration of the monarchy. The latter solution was considered by all relevant political actors, including chancellor Brüning, at the beginning of 1932. Brüning perceived the restoration as a way to preserve the parliamentary system (through subsequent boost in its legitimacy), while President Hindenburg and some DNVP members treated it as a way to introduce a right-wing dictatorship. Because of various reasons (opposition of the Nazis, lack of cooperation of pro-democratic parties, and erratic behavior of William II and other Hohenzollerns) neither plan succeeded.\footnote{Holborn 1969, 688; Mommsen, Forster, and Jones 1996, 397-98.} In any case, the German elite clearly considered the restoration as a way to address the political system's legitimacy deficit.

Some have argued that Weimar democracy would have survived if the depression had not broken out. In this situation the anti-system vote would not have risen above 50% and the pro-
democratic parties would have remained in majority. Yet, in conditions of anti-system vote reaching 40% even before the depression, the Weimar democracy functioned under a constant risk of breakdown regardless. Hence, although democracy could have survived in Germany but for the Great Depression, it could have as well collapsed at a later stage. In no other Western European democracy during the interwar period did anti-system vote reach 40%, and in no other there was such a dramatic rise in anti-system attitudes during the depression. Clearly, a certain idiosyncratic factor pertaining to the German democracy must have resulted in widespread anti-system attitudes.

This idiosyncratic factor was arguably the mode of the establishment of the Weimar democracy. If Germany had become a parliamentary monarchy through a peaceful transition (like Denmark and Sweden), the right-wing parties of the imperial period (Conservatives and National Liberals) would have likely transformed into pro-system conservative parties (similar to Conservative People's Party in Denmark and Moderates in Sweden) and Germany would probably have avoided democratic breakdown. One has to admit, however, that the chances of survival of a German democracy, if it had been established in such a manner, still would have been probably slightly lower than the chances of survival of Danish and Swedish democracies. German democracy, even if established under a constitutional monarchy, would still be weakened by anti-democratic attitudes of the upper and middle classes, and their continuing economic importance. A part of the German middle classes was more committed to the authoritarian monarchy than their Danish and Swedish counterparts because Hohenzollerns had fulfilled the middle class dream of German unification. Still, without the legitimacy deficit associated with the overthrow of the monarchy, survival of German democracy as a
constitutional monarchy would have been arguably much more likely than the survival of Weimar republic.

**Alternative Explanations of the Collapse of Weimar Democracy**

**The Continuing Power of the Landlord Class**

The most renowned alternative explanation of the establishment of fascism in Germany was developed by Barrington Moore.\(^{48}\) It pays close attention to the effect of agrarian structure on regime outcomes. In Moore’s account, fascism emerged in countries where landlords, having defeated politically the emerging bourgeoisie, became a dominant social class during the first stage of modernization, but pockets of smallholding peasantry were also preserved. In these countries, the state apparatus dominated by landlords engaged in “modernization from above” in which the urban bourgeoisie had a subservient position because it depended on the landlord-controlled state to control the emerging working class. In Germany, this process occurred during the period of the Empire. According to Moore, a coalition between landlords and the bourgeoisie created preconditions of fascism, although he does not describe in detail the causal link between these preconditions and the actual establishment of the Nazi regime. The Moore's theory has been recently extended by Michael Bernhard,\(^{49}\) who showed that the continuing influence of landlords in Eastern Germany was associated with higher popularity of right-wing authoritarian parties, including NSDAP.

As I have tried to show, the emergence of landlord-dominated autocratic state which engages in modernization from above does not automatically lead to fascism. In fact, in Denmark

\(^{48}\) Moore 1966. Moore built on the previous work by Gerschenkron 1966 [1943]. Also Rueschemeyer, Huber, and Stephens 1992 extend the Moore’s theory, but they largely agree with the Moore’s conclusions regarding the German case, and their analysis of the other countries is not directly relevant to the argument presented in this chapter.
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the social position of landlords was similarly strong as in Germany, and this social group formed
the backbone of the coalition which supported the monarchical rule in the period of PA
monarchy (1848-1901). In Sweden, the position of landlords was weaker in comparison to
Denmark, but this group, along with high civil officials and industrialists of noble background,
formed the ruling elite during the periods of Estate monarchy (1809-66) and PA monarchy
(1866-1905). Moreover, the Danish and Swedish elites explicitly adopted the political
institutions of German Empire as their role model during the period. On the other hand, contrary
to Moore's theoretical expectations, the middle peasantry was the main pro-democratic force in
Denmark before 1901, while in Sweden its political affiliations were divided. Subsequently, after
democratization, the political and economic significance of landlords, and nobility in general,
disappeared as a result of land reforms and increasingly urban character of Denmark and
Sweden.

Ultimately, Moore's analysis of development of fascism is unable to explain how exactly
the alliance of landlord and bourgeoisie interests under the Empire was causally connected to the
emergence of fascism at the later stage. After all, fascism was established in Italy even though
the bourgeoisie, and not the landlords, were the dominant partner in the upper class alliance in
this country before 1914. Establishment of Nazism in Germany occurred as a result of a series of
quite idiosyncratic historical events which were not directly caused by Germany’s social
structure: German defeat in WWI, emergence of the völkisch ideology, Hitler's personality and
charisma, etc. Some of these factors increased the probability of breakdown of democracy once it
was established in Germany, but Nazism was just one possible result of a breakdown, and
establishment of a more traditional right-wing dictatorship was another. One could also note that
landlords did not play a large role during the establishment of Nazism because the economic
importance of this class in the early 1930s was already limited. Otherwise, landlords gave their support not to the Nazis, but to the traditional right (DNVP), and also pressured farm workers who were employed on their estates to vote for the latter party.  

There were few Junkers in the Nazi party leadership. In fact, support for Hitler came from multiple classes, which included petty bourgeoisie, non-Catholic smallholding peasantry which fared particularly badly during the Great Depression, and various lower class urban elements which had not participated in elections before 1930 and were electorally mobilized only by the Nazis. 

Truly, the support for Nazis was higher in Eastern Germany, which was generally poorer, more agrarian, and where landlords still wielded considerable influence. Yet, it is difficult to determine whether the Junker influence was to blame for this outcome (as most Junkers continued to vote for DNVP and were very skeptical of the Nazis). Alternatively, one could claim that the popularity of NSDAP in Eastern Germany resulted from the fact that it was very strongly affected during the depression. In any case, there is scarce evidence that there was a landlord-peasant coalition hidden behind the Nazi movement. Hence, the rise of Nazism is hardly explainable by the continuing clout of the landlord class, although it might have had some influence in this regard as it had promoted the anti-democratic values in general. But in order to explain the breakdown of Weimar, one needs to account first of all for the widespread popularity of anti-system parties. The legitimacy deficit of the Weimar democracy again emerges as the original culprit.

Still, in order to illustrate the insufficient explanatory power of the structural theories in comparison to the “deficit of legitimacy” account of the Weimar’s breakdown, one needs to
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discuss the agrarian structure in Germany in more detail. It also needs to be compared to the agrarian structure in Denmark and Sweden, the countries which had been identified as the closest cases of similar political development. If it turned out that agrarian structure in Denmark and Sweden was radically different than in Germany and favored survival of democracy to a much larger extent, than Denmark and Sweden could hardly serve as viable counterfactuals.

Although Germany, Denmark and Sweden developed in the nineteenth century in a similar pace and achieved a similar level of wealth, agriculture performed a more important role in the Danish economy, and the level of industrialization and urbanization of Denmark was lower in comparison to Germany. About 55% of German workforce was employed in agriculture in the beginning of 1860s. This percentage declined to about 50% in 1882 and 30% at the beginning of 1920s. In Denmark, still about 37% of workforce was employed in agriculture at the beginning of 1920s. In Sweden, the percentage of population employed in agriculture was even larger (72% in 1870, 55% in 1900, 44% in 1920, and 39% in 1930). Yet, as I will try to show, in Germany and Denmark the level of landholding inequality was relatively similar in spite of different agrarian structures, while it was slightly smaller in Sweden.

In terms of patterns of agriculture, Germany in the middle of the nineteenth century was divided between the eastern part (east of the river Elbe) and the rest of the country; the difference resulted from centuries of divergent historical development. In the west serfdom became obsolete already in the Renaissance and peasants gradually gained ownership of the land they used; family farms dominated and large estates were rare. The east in its entirety belonged to the Kingdom of Prussia, where serfdom was abolished only in 1807. During the agricultural reform,
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peasants took over some of the land they used, but huge areas (former demesnes) were transformed into large estates whose owners remained the Prussian nobility (so-called Junkers). At the end of the nineteenth century, large estates occupied about 1/3 of the arable land in the east, and the rest belonged to family farms.\footnote{Hagen 2002, 595; Wunderlich 1961, 3-20.} Altogether, about 20\% of the German arable land belonged to large estates. In terms of class relationships, farm workers formed about 26\% of the agrarian population at the end of the imperial period. A great majority of farm workers lived in the east and worked on Junker estates. Only 17\% of family farmers hired some workers; the rest did not hire anyone and/or depended on support of family members.\footnote{Wunderlich 1945.} The Junkers controlled votes of their workers, which explains to a large extent the electoral successes of the conservative parties in Eastern provinces.\footnote{Vascik 1991.} On the other hand, the vote of family farmers was divided. In the Catholic regions they voted for Zentrum, in non-Catholic regions usually for the liberal parties (Progressive or National Liberals). There were also efforts to organize separate peasant parties before WWI. Such parties managed to elect a few representatives in heavily rural districts; otherwise they supported liberal candidates.\footnote{Ultimately, the agrarian structure of the German Empire was \textit{more equal} than in France in the same period. In France, for example, farm workers formed about 40\% of the agricultural population in 1862, while estates larger than 100 ha encompassed 25\% of the arable land in 1884. The agricultural structure of the areas east of Elbe was probably only \textit{slightly more unequal} than in France as a whole (see chapter 4 for more discussion). What was accomplished in France during the revolution was also largely accomplished in Prussia after its 1807 land reform. Same political patterns were clearly visible e.g. landlords controlling the rural vote in elections under universal male suffrage in 1848, 1849 and 1871. Then again, it makes little sense to analyze the effect of agrarian structure on regime type in abstract alongside Moore’s. It mattered only in the context of a particular regime which was currently in power. For example, in France landlords were the backbone of the regime during restoration, lost influence under July Monarchy, regained under democratic Second Republic, lost under the empire, etc. They were not, otherwise, always an openly anti-democratic group: after they realized in 1848 that they could effectively control the rural vote, they were in favor of a relatively wide suffrage.}
The agrarian structure of Denmark in the nineteenth century was qualitatively different. Agrarian reforms which freed peasants from a form of bondage and corvees were implemented in the end of the eighteenth century. At the time, the countryside was divided into about 60,000 tenant farms of about 20 ha each; previously, peasants had farmed collectively. The number of farms was subsequently frozen (they could not be divided into smaller units). In the subsequent decades, the tenants gradually bought property rights to their farms and became a type of “peasant aristocracy”. On the other hand, about 60%-70% of the rural population turned into rural underclass with no property. They had lost the right to use common land in a process similar to English enclosures. The majority of the rural underclass worked for middle farmers (who did not usually employ more than 10 people), a minority at large estates. The latter encompassed in the nineteenth century about 10-15% of arable land. Hence, in the first half of the nineteenth century the Danish agriculture became dominated by a relatively wealthy and independent class of middle-sized farmers, whose economic position shared the characteristics of a family farmer and a landlord. This group was generally loyal to the monarchy as it was grateful for the possibility of obtaining ownership of the tenant farms in the beginning of the nineteenth century. For this reason, Danish countryside remained relatively peaceful during the Napoleonic period, and the scope of demands made during the Spring of Nations by peasants was also relatively limited.

As the middle peasants were economically independent and relatively wealthy, they managed to overcome the collective action problem in order to elect effective representatives to the regional assemblies created in 1834, to the constitutional assembly elected in 1848, and to
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subsequent parliaments. Later they formed the backbone of Venstre party, which was in parliamentary majority after 1870. Given that the middle farmers formed a minority of the rural population and the franchise was universal among males, my hypothesis is that they controlled votes of their employees, similarly as landlords were forcing their employees to vote for the conservative Højre party. As a consequence, farm workers, who formed the majority of the rural population, remained for all practical purposes politically subjugated until the beginning of the twentieth century. Their position even worsened in comparison to the middle farmers, who increased their economic power through creation of the cooperative movement in the last decades of the nineteenth century. Yet, the royal government did not base its power on the support of middle peasantry. Instead, as in Germany, landlords remained the politically-dominant class until the democratization in 1901. This happened even though their economic importance was smaller in comparison to the middle peasants. The position of landlords was effectively terminated with the land reform of 1919, which provided for confiscation of large estates (about 10% of arable land) and their redistribution among farm workers. Yet, large farms were untouched by the reform and the rural underclass (farm workers who worked for middle peasants) still formed about 43% of the agricultural population in the 1920s.

In Sweden the agrarian structure was still different in comparison to Denmark and Germany. Swedish peasantry never experienced serfdom. In the late eighteenth century, nobles (only 0.5% of the population) owned about 1/3 of the arable land while the rest belonged to smallholder peasantry and to the crown; the crown land was rented to the peasants, however.
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Similarly to Denmark, as a result of the process of farm consolidation in the first half of the nineteenth century, the number of farms remained constant and a large landless rural underclass emerged in Sweden, which reached 50% of the agricultural population in 1870. At the same time, the percentage of land belonging to large estates decreased to about 15% in the late nineteenth century. Such estates, which employed a large number of farm workers, were still present in Southern Sweden in the 1920s, but were gradually purchased by farmers with state financial assistance.64

The Swedish land-owning peasantry was socially more differentiated in comparison to the equivalent class in Denmark. Before the 1907 suffrage reform, only the wealthy farmers (about 20% of the agricultural population), who usually employed some farm workers, enjoyed political rights. This group came to be politically allied with landlords of noble background. It gave its political support mostly to the Conservatives and the Farmers’ League (after it was established before the 1917 election). Small farmers formed about 50% of the agricultural population and they became enfranchised only after the 1907 reform. Most of them supported Liberals before the WWI, while many switched their allegiance to the Farmers’ League in the 1920s. Finally, most of the rural proletariat (26% of the agricultural population in the 1920s) was enfranchised only after the 1918 reform. They voted for the bourgeois parties in the 1920s in solidarity with their employers. The majority of this group was convinced that Social Democrats opposed rural interests in general because the party was concentrated on defense of industrial workers’ interest. Still, after the 1928 election Social Democrats engaged in efforts to mobilize
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farm workers and small farmers and this bore some fruit during the 1932 election, when the party obtained significant support among farm workers.65

What was the effect of agrarian structure in Germany, Denmark and Sweden on regime outcomes? As already mentioned, in all those countries the landlords (along with the upper bourgeoisie in Germany and Sweden, and wealthy peasants in Sweden as the junior partners) were the dominant class during the period of PA monarchy, yet their political dominance was not accompanied by the same extent of economic dominance. In the end, one should not assume that in non-democratic regimes the groups which have the most of economic influence or wealth are the same as those who hold the political power (for the clearest example of a discrepancy in this regard, see Malaysia after 1969). In the late nineteenth century, landlords in Denmark, Germany and Sweden derived their influence first of all from their high position in the ranks of military and bureaucracy. Or rather, one could talk about the nobility as the ruling class, whose majority was not engaged in the agriculture anymore, but rather preferred careers in the industry or the civil service. As their political clout was larger in Germany than in Denmark or Sweden, the nobility was able to block democratization more effectively in the former country (although this was only one of the reasons why Germany did not democratize before 1914). However, the main argument of this chapter is not concerned with the probability of democratization, but rather with the factors which influenced survival of democracy in Germany, Denmark, and Sweden once it was established. From this point of view, it is hard to identify a direct effect of agrarian structure in the story of democratic breakdown in Germany and democratic survival in Denmark and Sweden. This factor, although it still affected the structure of the party systems and agricultural
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politics, did not directly shape regime outcomes after WWI for two basic reasons: decreasing economic importance of the agriculture and overall medium levels of landholding inequality.

Most of the existing theories of the effect of inequality on democratic breakdown point out that democracy is threatened when inequality is severe. This happens because the elites may decide to introduce dictatorship if their economic interests are threatened through redistribution. From the point of view of this theory, one should notice that after WWI in Germany, Denmark and Sweden most GDP was no longer derived from agriculture and the majority of people worked in other sectors. This should cast doubt over whether agrarian structure could have significantly affected regime outcomes, although it still affected the patterns of politics and quality of elections at the local level. Moreover, economic interests of the dominant agricultural class were threatened to a larger extent in Denmark than in Germany or Sweden. In the former country the scope of inequality in agriculture was also higher (as indicated by the percentage of farm workers in agricultural population, which was 43% in Denmark, 26% in Sweden and 23% in Germany). The political mobilization of rural proletariat was also more clearly visible in Denmark than in Germany or Sweden. In 1905, Social Liberal Party was established in Denmark. The party appealed directly to farm laborers, demanding welfare provisions and land reform through division of large estates. Social Liberals came to power for the first time in 1913 in coalition with social democrats, and subsequently carried out most of their electoral program. Still, even in Denmark landholding inequality achieved only average levels from the comparative perspective.
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In Sweden, on the other hand, Social Democrats made serious efforts to mobilize farm workers after the 1928 election. Yet, the political mobilization of the rural underclass did not result in the rise of anti-democratic attitudes among middle peasants in Denmark and Sweden. Middle peasants in Sweden stopped supporting the Conservatives and mobilized into their own parties already before the 1917 election, when farm workers were not even enfranchised and could not be electorally mobilized. The main peasant party, the Farmers’ League, obtained between 10% and 15% of the vote in the interwar period. It was initially anti-socialist, anti-big business, pro-German, ambiguous on democracy, and far right. In this regard it resembled small German peasant parties operating in the same period. Yet, in contrast to the latter, it gradually came to embrace democratic values and entered a coalition with Social Democrats after the 1932 election.

In Germany, farm workers formed a much smaller group of voters than in Denmark; they were also concentrated in the east. They did not organize into a separate political party, but SPD made a series of largely unsuccessful efforts to mobilize them instead. Weimar governments encompassed farm workers with social benefits according to the same rules which pertained to industrial workers. This apparently contributed to the frustration among family farmers (as they had to pay taxes in order to finance those benefits), but discontent over this issue did not play a large role among the reasons of relative lack of support for democracy among family peasants. SPD also supported maintaining large estate in the east in order not to undermine agricultural productivity. It has been argued that this decision and other policy mistakes cost it the support
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of family farmers, but I remain skeptical. If large estates of the east had been divided as a result of a land reform, farm workers would probably have received the land, and not family farmers of the east who already owned land. The issue was hardly relevant to the farmers living in the west in any case. In the end, during Weimar, the Protestant German farmers were divided into supporters of liberal parties (DDP and DVP), DNVP, and small agrarian parties. The latter espoused hardly democratic ideologies and obtained up to 5% of the vote, which was a good result given the size of the potential constituency (Protestant family farmers formed about 12% of the electorate). When the Great Depression broke out, this class turned overwhelmingly to the Nazis. In this regard, their electoral behavior resembled the Protestant middle classes. The Junkers remained ambivalent towards the Nazis and continued to support DNVP throughout the period. In the end, in the story of the Weimar's breakdown it is difficult to identify a large causal role of factors related to agrarian structure or income inequality. The role of the Junkers as a class was also relatively limited. Given the evidence presented in the previous part of the chapter, I would argue that the theory which points to the Weimar's deficit of legitimacy has much more explanatory power.

**The Effect of Class Coalitions**

Gregory M. Luebbert offered another structural explanation of origins of political systems in interwar Europe.\(^{72}\) He identified four main regime outcomes in the period – social democracy, pluralist democracy, fascism and traditional dictatorship (the latter outcome appeared only in Eastern Europe so it is not directly relevant here). Pluralist democracy, according to Luebbert, emerged in those countries where liberal parties had been strong before WWI (primarily in Switzerland, France and Britain). There, liberals had formed an alliance with
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labor interests already before WWI and this way prevented the rise of social democracy. If such an alliance had not materialized, labor entered politics suddenly during the WWI with its interests being represented by social democratic parties. These parties could not form alliances with liberals because of conflicting policy goals. In such cases of “late labor entry”, social stability could be achieved only through social democracy or fascism. The former was possible if social democrats could form a coalition with smallholding peasantry. If social democrats were unable to do so because of too radical policy stances and/or because of efforts to mobilize farm workers politically, the result was fascism. For example, in Germany workers radicalized very quickly at the end of the war, which led to the alienation of peasants from the leftist parties. Peasants then formed the backbone of the Nazi movement, which could be described as a peasant-middle class coalition.

Luebbert’s account is problematic from several points of view. First of all, his definitions of regime types are poorly operationalized. There are no clear scope conditions specified which one could use to distinguish between, for example, fascist vs. traditional dictatorships and pluralist vs. social democracies (which leads to disputable coding decisions, for example, Austria under Dolfuss is classified as traditional dictatorship, while Spain under Franco as a fascist polity). In addition, Luebbert’s data give inconsistent support to his theory. In particular, Lueb bert’s theory does not account well for the regime outcomes in the countries of interest in this chapter (Denmark, Germany and Sweden). Generally, the German case partially supports the Lueb bert’s theory, but the Danish and Swedish cases largely do not. According to Lueb bert, fascism was possible in Germany because smallholding peasantry became alienated by the policies of Social Democrats, who tried to obtain farm worker vote after the war. As position of
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farm workers improved because they were encompassed by welfare provisions, smallholding peasants’ economic position worsened, especially after the outbreak of Great Depression. This led large numbers of smallholding peasants to support NSDAP along with most of middle classes; the latter had abandoned the liberal parties being terrified by the prospect of a Communist takeover. This account is problematic, however, because the outrage against improving position of farm workers does not figure high on the list of reasons which induced middle peasants to vote for the Nazis. After all, farm workers formed about 26% of the rural population in Germany and a great majority of them were employed by large estates in the East, not by family farmers. Middle peasants voted for Nazis out of desperation, because of their worsening economic conditions and increasing taxation, but social democratic mobilization of farm workers was not the main cause of family peasant support for the Nazis.

Denmark, on the other hand, is identified as a case close to social democracy by Luebbert, but one could not observe an alliance between social democrats and smallholding peasantry there. Instead, farm workers were mobilized by Radical Liberals, which formed governing coalitions with Social Democrats in the interwar period. At the same time, smallholding peasants continued to support Liberals (Venstre), which formed ruling coalitions with a middle class Conservative People's Party. Hence, the political dynamics was similar as in Germany, but the “coalition” of peasants and middle classes espoused liberal democratic, and not anti-democratic fascist values. This crucial difference is not explained by Luebbert. Why in Germany the smallholding (Protestant) peasantry, in reaction to mobilization of farm laborers, started to support the anti-system Nazis instead of liberal parties or even traditional conservatives (DNVP)? Finally, why did the (mostly Protestant) middle classes prefer anti-system, instead of
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pro-democratic alternatives? Again, I would argue that the explanation lays in the form of Germany’s transition to democracy, which resulted both in radicalization of the left and legitimacy deficit of the republic as perceived by the Protestant smallholding peasantry and the middle classes.

In case of Sweden, a perfunctory study would confirm the Luebbert’s account, but a deeper analysis would reveal serious deficiencies of his theory in terms of the causal process. It is true that Swedish Social Democrats (SAP) formed an electoral coalition with middle-peasant dominated Farmer’s League after the 1936 election, and that a minority Social Democratic government had been supported by the latter party already since 1932. However, this coalition was formed at the time when Social Democrats had engaged in serious efforts to mobilize rural proletariat after the party’s unsatisfactory performance in the 1928 election. These efforts resulted in moderate success during the 1932 election, when Social Democrats, as mentioned, obtained significant support among farm workers.75 According to Luebbert’s predictions, such endeavors should entice middle peasant Farmers’ League to ally firmly with middle class parties, but it did not happen. Instead, the coalition between Social Democrats and Farmers’ League / Center Party persisted for several decades. This happened even though Farmers’ League’s was dominated by anti-socialist and anti-democratic attitudes in the 1920s, similarly to the already-listed small German peasant parties in the period.76 At a more general level, Luebbert fails to explain why, in the first place, there were no fascist parties in Denmark and Sweden which could embrace middle peasants. The main parties on the right in Sweden and Denmark (General Electoral League and Conservative People’s Party), which were a political continuation of the
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pro-monarchical Conservatives, firmly supported liberal democratic values during the interwar period, while the scope of popularity of truly Fascists parties was miniscule.  

**The Role of Anti-Democratic Civil Society**

Sheri Berman offered an alternative explanation of the collapse of Weimar republic, which emphasized the role of civil society in the process. According to the author, during the long period of Imperial Germany, relatively liberal policies led to the rapid growth of civil society, which was not, however, accompanied by development of well-institutionalized middle-class political parties. Subsequently, the middle class became estranged of their weak political parties and resorted to associational life, abandoning pro-democratic, liberal values and contributing to the weakness of Weimar political institutions at the later stage. Subsequently this well-developed, but anti-democratic civil society provided crucial resources in the form of monetary contributions and political activists for the growing Nazi party, which caused the eventual collapse of democracy. If civil society had been less developed in Germany, the Nazis would have never come to power, according to Berman.  

First of all, it is difficult to substantiate the Berman’s claim that German political parties during the Empire were weakly institutionalized. In fact, such parties as SPD or Zentrum had one of the most developed organizational structures from the comparative perspective (Anderson 2000). Berman agrees on this point and concentrates on organizational weakness of the liberal middle-class parties. The account that middle classes “abandoned” these parties is problematic,
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however. First of all, much of the Catholic middle classes supported Zentrum, and the strength of this party remained constant during the imperial period. It is true, on the other hand, that that the strength of the National Liberal Party gradually decreased from about 30% of the vote at the beginning of the Empire to about 15% in its last years. But this party was not liberal in the first place as it supported the regime in its existing, authoritarian form. Moreover, much of the decrease in the National Liberal electoral strength was caused by the fact that employers’ pressure on workers, who were forced to support this party, came to be less and less effective over the years. Instead, an increasing number of urban lower classes started to vote for Social Democrats.\footnote{Anderson 2000, chap.7.} Regarding the truly liberal, anti-regime parties,\footnote{These were German Progress Party (1861-84), Liberal Union (1880-84), German Free-Minded Party (1884-1910), Free-minded People's Party (1893-1910), German People's Party (1868-1910), and united Progressive People's Party (after 1910).} the level of their support lacked a distinguishable trend. These parties received about 8% of the vote at the beginning of the Empire. The percentage rose to about 18% in the early 1880s, and fell to about 12% in the period just before the war. Consequently, there is some evidence that the German middle classes, because of limited responsiveness of the imperial political system, abandoned direct engagement with politics in favor of associational life, as Berman claims. But there is scarce evidence that this alleged disengagement from politics resulted in increasing anti-democratic character of the middle classes. Rather, middle classes remained divided between supporters and opponents of the imperial political system.

If a part of the German middle classes abandoned liberal values, one could more readily substantiate the claim that it occurred not before, but after WWI and it was, as I would argue, the result of the previously-identified legitimacy deficit. Although liberal democrats obtained about 12% of the vote in the last imperial elections of 1912, their support dropped to 6-8% of the vote
in the 1920s, and almost entirely disappeared after 1930. The support for conservative liberals (who had supported the imperial political system before the war and were ambivalent towards the Weimar democracy) did not decrease in comparison to the pre-war period (it was about 10-13% of the vote in 1920s), but nearly vanished in the 1930s.\textsuperscript{84} Finally, although conservative parties obtained about 12% of the vote in 1912, their continuation (DNVP) scored between 15-20% of the vote in the 1920s.\textsuperscript{85} After the onset of Great Depression, supporters of these three middle and upper class ideological groupings flowed to NSDAP in large numbers, but apart from those who had voted for liberal democrats, this movement hardly indicated abandonment of democratic values, as conservative liberals and conservatives were not democrats in the first place. Clearly, liberal attitudes became significantly less popular among (Protestant) middle class after WWI and nearly entirely lost popularity in the 1930s.

Yet, one should not forget that Protestant middle classes formed only one pillar of the NSDAP electoral base, the others being Protestant smallholder peasantry and previously immobilized voters who came to polls only in the 1930s. From this point of view, Berman's claims that NSDAP rose to power “not by attracting alienated, apolitical Germans, but by recruiting highly activist individuals” and then using them to expand its electoral base (p. 408) is not very revealing.\textsuperscript{86} NSDAP, like any other political organization, tried to recruit highly-skilled individuals as its activists, because alienated and apolitical Germans could not be expected to

\textsuperscript{84} It is true that liberal democrats obtained about 18% of the vote in the first postwar elections, but it was a temporary bump in support which was associated with the fact that pro-imperial parties were blamed for the war defeat.

\textsuperscript{85} Liberal democratic parties were Progressive People's Party (before 1918) and German Democratic Party/ German State Party (under Weimar). Conservative liberal parties were National Liberal Party (before 1918), German People's Party and Reich Party of the German Middle Class (under Weimar). Conservative parties were German Conservative Party, German Reich Party (before 1918) and German National People's Party, DNVP (under Weimar). DNVP was led by upper class interests, but obtained mostly middle class vote.
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carry out well the task of political mobilization. Finally, it is probably true that an active civil society helped to increase the electoral strength of NSDAP, but values of those associations simply reflected the political attitudes of the German society in general. If anti-democratic attitudes are prevalent in the wider society, then they will be prevalent also in the civil society. Hence, it is hard to attribute to civil society the causal role in the rise of NSDAP. Rather, one should ask why anti-system attitudes were so popular among Germans in the first place.

The Flawed Institutional Design of the Weimar Republic

Michael Bernhard, building on the work of Renier Lepsius, offered an alternative explanation of the collapse of Weimar, arguing that it was largely facilitated by unfortunate institutional choices made by the founders of the republic. In this case, the main unfavorable institutional factor was “the specific form of semipresidentialism” which enabled the directly elected president Hindenburg to undermine democracy through the use of emergency powers after 1930. After elections held this year, the parliament became deadlocked, as pro-democratic parties lost majority and no governing coalition could be formed. In this situation, Hindenburg decided to nominate chancellors who lacked the support of Reichstag, and one of such-appointed chancellors, Adolf Hitler, abolished democracy soon after his nomination. The government instability during Weimar was also caused by the adoption proportional representation (PR) electoral system, which led to political fragmentation. Obviously, in this story the rise of anti-system parties (NSDAP and the Communists) after the Great Depression was a crucial factor which increased the probability of democratic breakdown in the first place. Adolf Hitler would not have been nominated chancellor if NSDAP and another anti-system rightist party, DNVP, had not commanded 43% of Reichstag seats after the 1932 elections. Hence, Bernhard's
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argument explains the collapse of Weimar as the effect of institutions interacting with circumstances largely unfavorable to the survival of democracy.

The problem with the institutional argument is that it is hard to imagine, through a counterfactual analysis, a different institutional framework under which German democracy would have survived. Let us assume that political preferences of the German society and economic conditions stayed the same as in reality during the interwar period, and consider the hypothetical effect of different institutions. First of all, if Germany had a purely parliamentary system or a semi-presidential system under which the president did not have emergency powers, than the collapse of democracy would be arguably even more likely. In this situation, when the pro-democratic Weimar coalition lost its majority in the 1930 election and the parliament became deadlocked, no actor would have been legally entitled to “do something about that” and form a viable legitimate government. Hence, some kind of extra-constitutional outcome would have likely occurred and German democracy would have collapsed already in 1930, but it is hard to determine what outcome in particular it would have been. Given the inability of Reichstag to form a government, the last elected prime minister, Hermann Müller, could have clung to power extra-constitutionally (via an executive coup, similarly to Dolfuss in Austria). Yet, such an SPD-led dictatorship would have probably sparked a rightist outrage. Otherwise, one could imagine a coup by the traditional right and reintroduction of the monarchy, Nazis trying to take over the power unconstitutionally via a move resembling the march on Rome, or Nazis taking power and abolishing democracy after forming a coalition with DNVP and Zentrum (the last alternative being probably the least likely). In any case, one could reasonably argue that the emergency provisions of the Weimar constitution, which allowed the president to form a legal government
lacking a parliamentary majority, actually *prolonged* the life of the German democracy after 1930.

Otherwise, if Germany had adopted a purely presidential system in 1919, this would have allowed Hindenburg to rule directly without consideration of the current composition of Reichstag. Under this situation survival of democracy was still unlikely given that Hindenburg was not a democrat in the first place. I would argue that in conditions of the increasing popularity of Nazis and Communists, Hindenburg would have decided to abolish democracy, reintroduce monarchy and/or establish some kind of a right-wing dictatorship. Historical evidence shows that such a solution was considered by many elite actors in 1932 and given the large scope of pro-monarchical attitudes it might have been implemented without much resistance. Still, the probability of survival of democracy would have been slightly higher under a purely presidential system. Yet, the likelihood of adoption of such a system was not high given that no other European democracy practiced pure presidentialism, although it was suggested by certain pro-monarchical elements during the constitutional convention. In the end, a compromise solution of semi-presidentialism was adopted.

The adoption of system of proportional representation (PR) was often blamed for the collapse of Weimar democracy as it led to the political fragmentation of the Reichstag. However, the main cause of the democratic collapse was the loss of majority by pro-democratic parties after the 1930 election. Before 1930, when they still could do so, pro-democratic parties were agreeing on ruling coalitions in spite of fragmentation. Otherwise, the strength of anti-system parties under a different electoral system would probably have been similar or only slightly
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smaller than in reality. Consequently, it is difficult to blame adoption of PR for the collapse of Weimar. If Weimar Germany had retained the two-round majoritarian electoral system (which was used during the Empire), two scenarios are possible. Arguably, NSDAP, because of its small popularity in the 1920s, might not have gained any parliamentary representation in the period and because of resulting organizational weakness would have been unable to challenge DNVP as the main anti-system party on the right after 1930.

In any case, assuming the rise of anti-system sentiments after the Great Depression, a rightist anti-system party (DNVP or NSDAP) would probably still have obtained about 30-35% of the seats. This would have been caused by the fact that in many regions of Germany (such as Pomerania, East Prussia, Hannover, Schleswig or Hessen) anti-system right could claim support of more than 50% of voters in a hypothetical second round. Under a plurality system the success of the main anti-system rightist party could have been even greater than under PR, as it would be the single most popular party in most regions of the country. In this situation, the Weimar coalition parties would be able to prevent election of some rightist anti-system candidates only if they behaved strategically and nominated just one candidate against anti-system candidates in each district. This behavior, however, would have been quite unlikely given the coordination problems associated with the task. Moreover, the Communists might still have performed a role of the spoiler of the anti-fascist vote. Consequently, in any case, a rightist anti-system party would have obtained at least 30% of the seats under plurality (and possibly even more), and so the breakdown of democracy would still be very likely; only the likelihood of establishment of a traditional right-wing dictatorship instead of the Nazi regime would be higher than in the reality.

To sum up, adoption of pure presidentialism or a majoritarian electoral system might have slightly increased the chances of Weimar democracy, but the choice of these institutions
was very unlikely in any case (hence, it is not a viable counterfactual). In consequence, one can reasonably argue that the probability of collapse of Weimar was very high under all democratic institutional frameworks. One could obviously imagine a different, less vicious type of dictatorship emerging in Germany (e.g. Hindenburg supporting a traditional right-wing dictatorship in 1932 or later), but this could have happened also under the framework which was actually adopted. Hitler's nomination as chancellor by Hindenburg, although a likely outcome given NSDAP electoral successes, was not a historical necessity. Regardless, the crucial puzzle to be explained is why democracy was so unpopular in the interwar Germany. Or, to put it differently, why anti-system parties became so popular in Germany after the onset of the Great Depression so that the likelihood of democratic breakdown increased enormously. From this point of view, Germany was very different from other Western European democracies, where the increase in popularity of anti-system parties in similar economic conditions was minimal.

**Development toward Democracy Interrupted by the War**

Sheri Berman offered a perspective according to which the seeds of Nazism were planted already during the period of Empire, when illiberal attitudes became popular among German middle classes.\(^90\) Yet, the negative assessment of the imperial period from the point of view of future democratization is not the only one present in the literature. Margaret L. Anderson offered an alternative perspective on this period of German history.\(^91\) She noticed that the institutional structure of the Empire created in fact conditions which were relatively favorable to future democratization. The imperial political system provided for universal male suffrage, elections free of direct fraud, and conditions in which civil liberties were largely respected. Although the

\(^90\) Berman 2001.

\(^91\) Anderson 2000.
government was not responsible to the elected legislature, the results of parliamentary elections were still very important, because the consent of Reichstag was necessary to adopt the budget and all legislation. The importance of elections was visible through actions of the government, which campaigned hard in favor of its preferred parties and candidates. For all practical purposes, German citizens were “practicing democracy” during the imperial period, according to Anderson.\footnote{Although one should not forget that the power of the elected parliament was quite limited in the period compared to the imperial bureaucracy, as noticed by Max Weber and others (see Weber 1994 [1918]).} The learning and practice of democracy manifested itself through increasing voter turnout, as well as citizens' engagement in electoral campaigns, party organizations, and politically active associations. The growth in democratic maturity of the citizenry was also evident through gradual increase in voting motivated by economic interests or ideological convictions, and decrease in the number of lower class votes obtained through patronage or coercion by pro-regime parties (Conservatives, Free Conservatives and National Liberals). On the basis of this evidence, Anderson concluded that during the imperial period the German political culture was becoming increasingly democratic, and that the German political system was developing towards establishment of a self-sustaining democracy, which would have happened if the principle of parliamentary responsibility of the government had been established before 1914 (or later if the war had not broken out). Indeed, if the three pro-democratic parties (SPD, Zentrum and democratic liberals) had organized a coherent legislative coalition and pressed the government on the issue after the 1912 election, the ruling elite, already unwilling and unable to resort to mass repression, would have likely backed down and parliamentarism could have been established.\footnote{Berman 2001, 458-60.} Unfortunately, the entire dynamics of democratic development of Germany was destroyed by WWI and the revolutionary establishment of the republic. These
events led to radicalization of politics and growth in anti-democratic attitudes among the German public.\(^{94}\)

In this chapter, I tried to give additional support to the Anderson's account of political development of Germany. My interpretation of German history emphasized that the relative success of the Empire in terms of provision of economic development and stability created a wide belief that the imperial political system was legitimate. This belief in imperial legitimacy took two basic forms. Wide segments of the society, which formed, however, a minority at the end of the imperial period, considered the imperial political system as preferable to democracy. Yet a majority believed that a democracy would be preferable, but did not associate future democratization with a demand to establish a republic, but rather with introduction of parliamentary responsibility of the chancellor; this would entail preservation of the “symbolic” imperial institutions. The latter preference was espoused by all major anti-regime parties, including Social Democrats. The sudden breakdown of the Empire and establishment of the Weimar republic created a situation of legitimacy deficit of the newly established democratic institutions, as they lost the legitimate “symbolic” component. This legitimacy deficit formed a fertile ground for the rise of anti-system parties during Weimar and was the single most important factor which contributed to the breakdown of the first German democracy. I tried to enhance the plausibility of this account through comparison of German, Danish and Swedish political histories. Generally, Denmark, Sweden and Germany had very similar political histories until the moment of democratization, and what differentiated these two cases was the mode of democratic transition. Denmark and Sweden, the cases where democracy survived, served as a “real-life counterfactuals”, which enhanced the counterfactual arguments developed otherwise.

---

**Concluding Discussion**

All social outcomes have numerous causes, and the breakdown of Weimar is no exception. Certainly, the first German democracy would have slightly bigger chances of survival if its institutional framework was designed in a different way (with a majoritarian electoral system, for example), if the Junkers did not play such a big role during the imperial period, or if the Brüning's government pursued sounder economic policies during the Great Depression. Yet, according to the available historical evidence, the aforementioned factors did not play the largest causal role. If Germany had democratized peacefully as a constitutional monarchy, either before or after 1914 (in the latter case, assuming that the war would not have broken out), then its democracy would have had much bigger chances of survival than in reality. In this situation the political development of Germany would have likely proceeded similarly to Denmark and Sweden, the countries characterized by the most similar political histories prior to democratization. Hence, the mode of transition played arguably the largest causal role in the story of the Weimar’s breakdown. If the German democracy had preserved the institution of monarchy, it would not have been plagued by a large legitimacy deficit, whose main symptom, since the establishment of the republic, was very high anti-system vote. The Nazis took advantage of this legitimacy deficit in order to take power.

Among European cases, a similar dynamic as in Germany occurred also in Austria, where the monarchy was established through discontinuity in 1918 and democracy subsequently collapsed in 1933. The transition to democracy with discontinuity was also responsible for the breakdown of the democracy in French First Republic (1848-1851), the case described in Chapter 4. In France, in contrast to Germany, transition to the second republic involved abolition of a monarchical competitive oligarchy and a dramatic extension of suffrage. In contrast to Germany, the popularity of the July Monarchy had been limited among the lower classes, both
peasants and workers; hence the Second Republic did not suffer from the same type of legitimacy deficit as the Weimar. Instead, the main contributing factor to democratic breakdown was the character of the French peasantry, which had not been mobilized politically before 1848 but remained otherwise committed to a vision of the Imperial France. Hence, this electorate was captured by the populist Louis Napoleon, who, as he enjoyed charismatic legitimacy, managed to establish an authoritarian regime with relative ease.

The wider purpose of this chapter was also to illustrate, through the comparison of political histories of Germany, Denmark and Sweden, the causal process through which a regime discontinuity nullified a positive, pro-democratic legacy of pre-democratization open-outcome elections (the finding detected through quantitative methods in Chapter 3). During the period of PA monarchy, the political cultures of Germany, Sweden and Denmark developed common pro-democratic characteristics: the commitment, shared both by the ruling elite and the wider society, to the principles of open-outcome elections, civil liberties and the rule of law. Another element of the pro-democratic legacy was vibrant civil society, which had developed in favorable environment when political freedoms were generally respected. The final step in the process of democratization from a PA monarchy consisted of introduction of the principle of parliamentary responsibility and (in the case of Sweden) extension of suffrage. It was successfully achieved in Denmark and Sweden, but regarding Germany the political development toward sustainable democracy was unfortunately broken through the military defeat and the revolutionary overthrow of the monarchy.
CHAPTER 6
THE BREAKDOWN OF EUROPEAN COMPETITIVE OLIGARCHIES NOT PRECEDED BY
PA MONARCHY: ANALYSIS OF PIEDMONT, HUNGARY AND ROMANIA

Preliminary Considerations on the Emergence of PA Monarchy in Europe

The goal of Chapters 4 and 5 was to illustrate how self-sustaining democracy was likely
to emerge in Europe before WWII only in the countries whose democratization had been
preceded by a sufficiently long period of a PA monarchy (or competitive oligarchy preceded by a
sufficiently long period of PA monarchy). This happened, as discussed, unless democratization
was accompanied by regime discontinuity. As a corollary, self-sustainable democracy was very
unlikely to emerge in those Western countries in which PA monarchy was never established.

This chapter presents introductory hypothesis on the reasons which prevented development of
PA monarchies in some European countries. It subsequently discusses how lack of legacy of PA
monarchy prevented establishment of self-sustaining competitive oligarchies (which could have
later made a transition to self-sustaining democracies) in some of the cases interesting from the
theoretical point of view: Piedmont, Hungary and Romania.

First of all, PA monarchy could not be established as a matter of fact in republics, several
of which emerged after WWI in Europe and in the nineteenth-century Latin America. In the
European republican democracies, as discussed in the introduction, the probability of democratic
survival was nevertheless related to the pre-independence political legacies. It depended on the
duration of free electoral politics before the secession leading to independence. None of the Latin
American nineteenth-century republican democracies or competitive oligarchies enjoyed such a
legacy; hence these regimes were generally not self-sustainable. Nevertheless, some of them
survived surprisingly long which was probably the result of strongly liberal ideology of some of
the Latin American elites. To give some examples, Bolivia and Peru established competitive
oligarchy for two short periods (Peru in 1833-35, Bolivia in 1872-76 and 1880-88; with suffrage
restricted to about 10% of male adults). Colombia had a democratic form of rule, with the suffrage restricted to about 60% of male adults, in 1821-28 and 1831-59 (with a short interruption in 1854). These examples indicate that the scope of suffrage was not a decisive factor influencing durability of republics practicing open-outcome elections. One should also note Brazil as the exceptional case in Latin America. It experienced a short period of PA monarchy under a legitimate dynasty, as explained in the introduction, but it was terminated by a regime discontinuity.

Otherwise PA monarchies did not emerge, obviously, in those European monarchies which were annexed by stronger states before they established constitutionalism. This pertained to several states which disappeared at the moment of Italian and German unification. Those were either entirely abolished or turned into federal subjects of Imperial Germany. Some European monarchies made a transition to PA monarchy of a very short duration, on the other hand. If such a PA monarchy subsequently made a transition to competitive oligarchy or democracy, the legacy of open-outcome elections was too weak to guarantee self-sustainability. In Portugal, PA monarchy existed for only three years, in Piedmont and Hungary, for only two, and in Spain it was never established. Among the newly-independent monarchies which emerged when the Ottoman Empire was weakening in the nineteenth century, PA monarchy was established only in Romania, but it lasted for only five years. It never emerged in Greece, Serbia, and Bulgaria. Otherwise, some PA monarchies were abolished before they made a transition to a competitive oligarchy or democracy. This pertained to several German states and Russia (which became a PA monarchy in 1905). Hence, in the light of the findings of this dissertation, the path to self-
sustainable democracy in Russia was still open as of 1916, but it was interrupted by the revolution.¹

It is beyond the scope of this dissertation to research the reasons of why some European absolute monarchies experienced transitions to PA monarchies but not others, although this certainly is a very important question. Some hypotheses in this regard can nevertheless be presented also at this stage. First of all, long-established monarchical institutions seemed to be a precondition of emergence of a PA monarchy given that such a regime did not arise in any of the newly independent monarchies in the Balkans. As the example of Romania shows, rulers of newly-established monarchies did not enjoy sufficient legitimacy to become unelected chief executives, both under absolute and PA monarchies. This happened regardless whether such rulers came from an imported foreign dynasty or a local noble family which assumed the throne. Otherwise, presence of a dynasty with a long-established tradition probably facilitated emergence of PA monarchy, but it was not a necessary condition. After all, PA monarchies emerged in Britain after 1688 and in Sweden after 1809 under newly-imported dynasties (Houses of Orange and Bernadotte, respectively). Hence, the strength of monarchy as a long-standing institution was in this case more important that dynastic continuity.²

Within the group of long-established European monarchies PA monarchies emerged, it seems, when the powers of the pro-monarchical coalition, led by the monarch and his aristocracy, and the opposing middle classes were more or less balanced (in addition, international pressure for establishment of a PA monarchy could also have helped in some

¹ For Russia to evolve into self-sustaining democracy, its PA monarchy would need to endure for another ten years at least, and then it would have to make a democratic transition, preserving the monarchical institutions, through establishment of parliamentary responsibility and extension of suffrage. Obviously, the necessary condition was that the tsar agrees to political concessions before he is abolished in a possible revolution.

² I am grateful to Michael Bernhard for this observation.
situations, notably in France in 1814). In other words, the pro-monarchical coalition was strong enough to prevent the middle classes from taking power altogether, but it was not strong enough to continue ruling in the absolute manner; doing so entailed a risk of (another) middle class uprising. Hence, PA monarchy emerged as a compromise institutional solution, which protected the interests of both parties: the middle classes came to be represented in a freely-elected legislature whose consent was necessary to adopt legislation, while the monarchical coalition retained the ultimate control over the executive power. But whether such a compromise was achieved depended also, as it appears, on personal factors, not only on the balance of social forces which could be somehow measured objectively. In other words, both sides needed to realize the necessity of a compromise and must not have aimed for too much which was, respectively, preservation of the absolute monarchy or establishment of an elected middle class government. But such a compromise was sometimes impossible. First of all, some rulers opposed constitutionalism as a matter of principle, e.g. Neapolitan Bourbons, and no force on Earth could make them grant a constitution. In other cases also the middle classes pressed for too much. To give an example, the initial inability to establish a PA monarchy in France in the years 1789-91 stemmed from the failure to reach a compromise between the middle classes and the monarchy. The monarchy could not agree to anything less than preservation of absolutism. The majority of the middle classes wanted to deprive the monarch of the executive power or abolish the monarchy altogether.

If the monarchical coalition pressed for preservation of absolutism, two options were available for the middle classes: it could either attempt to abolish the monarch’s executive power altogether, or abolish only the recalcitrant ruler and find a monarch who would be willing to govern under the conditions of PA monarchy. The first was the story of the English and French
revolutions, the second the story of the English Glorious Revolution (in 1688) and the Swedish coup of 1809. Those upheavals were directed against rulers who had never agreed to establish PA monarchies. One pattern however seems quite clear: once the monarch agreed to the institutional solution of PA monarchy but subsequently abolished the same PA monarchy through an executive coup, the middle classes tried only the first option against the same monarch and/or dynasty, and did not try to find a new ruler who would establish PA monarchy. Given the breakdown of trust between the ruler and his subjects, and the fact that the system of PA monarchy had been discredited in the eyes of the middle classes, such a development was to a large extent understandable. This pattern was evident in the history of Spain (after the king abolished the Cadiz constitution in 1814), Portugal (after PA monarchy was introduced in 1821 and abolished by the king two years later) and Romania (with abolition of PA monarchy by the prince Cuza five years after it was established in 1859). It seems that after this type of development the possibility of a PA monarchy, and hence of a self-sustaining democracy, remained closed. This conclusion is true also regarding France after the July Revolution: Charles X tried an executive coup against PA monarchy and was abolished. Instead, a competitive oligarchy emerged under Louis-Philippe, which was however to a large extent unstable having been established after a regime discontinuity (on the other hand, the legacy of open-outcome elections from the fifteen-year-long Restoration period prevented its degeneration into a non-competitive oligarchy, nevertheless).

From the point of view of the theory advanced in this dissertation, the most interesting cases of European monarchies which did not experience the stage of PA monarchy might be Piedmont and Hungary, which will be analyzed in this chapter. In contrast to such countries as Denmark or Prussia, which experienced non-discontinuity transitions from absolute monarchy to
PA monarchy in the same historical period, Piedmont and Hungary made an almost direct transition from absolute monarchy to competitive oligarchy, “skipping” the stage of PA monarchy (in 1850 and 1867, respectively). In those cases the monarchical coalition was not only too weak to oppose introduction of PA monarchy, but it was also unable to retain the effective executive power in the hands of the monarch. This development happened for very different reasons in Piedmont and Hungary, but the effects were quite similar. Both competitive oligarchies lacked a legacy of open-outcome elections and the respect for constitutionalism dating from PA monarchy; hence the elites were not committed to the aforementioned values. In this situation they did not hesitate to close the electoral process to political opponents in order to perpetuate themselves in power. Hence, in contrast to the contemporaneous competitive oligarchies which were established after a period of PA monarchy (such as the Netherlands or Belgium), elections in Piedmont and Hungary quickly lost open-outcome character: in 1857 in the former case and in 1872 in the latter. Piedmont, whose political system was subsequently extended to the unified Italy, and Hungary, turned into pluralist, but non-competitive oligarchies, in which the electoral process was largely controlled by the government and hence the opposition was effectively excluded from power. The chapter will end with by a short analysis of the political development of Romania, which will illustrate the difficulties of establishment of self-sustaining PA monarchy in the newly independent European monarchies. Romanian competitive oligarchy, preceded by a very short period of PA monarchy and a regime discontinuity, lasted even shorter than competitive oligarchies in Piedmont and Hungary, and quickly made a transition into a non-competitive oligarchy functioning along the line of the latter cases.

The Transition from Competitive to Non-Competitive Oligarchy in Piedmont

The Kingdom of Sardinia was one of the countries located on the territory of contemporary Italy before its unification. It encompassed the regions of Piedmont, Savoy,
Liguria and the island of Sardinia. Because Piedmont was the largest part of the kingdom, it was commonly referred to by this region’s name. In the period between 1815 and the Spring of Nations Piedmont was an absolute monarchy along with other Italian states. But in contrast to the latter, it was ruled by a native dynasty. Otherwise, the territory of Italy was divided into Lombardy-Venetia (annexed by Austria), Northern Italian principalities ruled by the branches of the Habsburg dynasty (Parma, Modena, Lucca and Tuscany), the Papal States, and the Kingdom the Two Sicilies ruled by a reactionary branch of the Bourbon dynasty. The purpose of this section is to illustrate how the political system of competitive oligarchy was prone to breakdown unless it had been preceded by a period of PA monarchy. Such a system was established in Piedmont after 1848, but it collapsed after elections lost their open-outcome character in 1857. In addition, it is important to analyze the political developments in Piedmont in order to understand the character of the political system of Italy before WWI. This is because Italy unified through annexation of other Italian states to Piedmont, and the political system which emerged in Piedmont before 1861 became the political system of the unified Italy.

**The Spring of Nations in Piedmont**

Certain liberal reforms, for example, creation of a local elected government, were already enacted in Piedmont in the fall of 1847, but as in many other European countries, the establishment of a constitutional government came only with the upheaval of 1848. In February 1848, King Charles Albert came to be faced with strong pressure to reform the political system. Constitutions had been already granted in other Italian states, including the reactionary Two Sicilies, and Piedmont did not have a chance to achieve leadership in Italy, which was a political ambition of the Savoy dynasty, if it remained an absolute monarchy. Moreover, popular pressure
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for a constitution was growing anyway, so the king faced a choice of conceding under favorable terms or being forced to concessions later under worse conditions.\(^4\) Hence, he granted a constitution in March 1848, which was otherwise a typical constitutional document for the period. It established a political system of a PA monarchy with limited suffrage. Ministers were politically responsible to the monarch and only legally to the parliament, while the lower legislative chamber was elected by app. 8\% of male adults, and the upper chamber was nominated by the king. The suffrage was restricted by education and property requirements. The constitution provided for a French system of centralized government with huge powers reserved for prefects.\(^5\)

The first election under the constitution was held in April 1848. This and subsequent elections were won by radical Liberals, who demanded further reforms and the kingdom’s engagement in the fight for liberation and unification of Italy. These hopes were partially embraced by Charles Albert, who aimed to create a unified kingdom of Northern Italy under his own rule. However, shortly after provoking a war with Austria, the Piedmontese forces were defeated at Custoza in July 1848, the pro-Piedmontese uprising in Lombardy was crushed, and Piedmont was forced to sign an armistice. But the radical public opinion in Northern Italy pressed for resumption of the war. This ended up fatally for Piedmont, whose forces were again defeated at Novara in March 1849. Charles Albert abdicated after the battle and his son, Victor Emanuel II, assumed the throne. From the point of view of constitutional development, Piedmont remained a PA monarchy at this stage. Charles Albert nominated moderately Conservative governments which did not enjoy majorities in the radical parliaments. The situation came to a

\(^4\) Mack Smith 1985, 34; Marshall 1966, 115-16.

\(^5\) Mack Smith 1971, 42; Mack Smith 1985, 45.
head when the parliament refused to ratify the peace treaty with Austria. The chamber was dissolved at the request of Prime Minister d’Azeglio, who hoped to obtain a right-wing majority, but the new elections in July 1849 again resulted in victory of the left-wing opposition, and the first act of the new parliament was to nominate a radical speaker. Still, moderate Liberals elected to this chamber were in fact willing to support the treaty in return for policy concessions, hence the agreement could have been ratified, but d’Azeglio refused to enter into the negotiations with the opposition. The chamber was again resolved on 20 November, for the third time in 1849.\footnote{Mack Smith 1985, 36-37, 41-43; Marshall 1966, 133-42, 148-49, 157-61, 164-65.}

Failure to ratify the treaty might have resulted in another war with Austria and forced reintroduction of absolutism in Piedmont. Hence, the king issued a memorandum to the electorate in which he called voters to support the government and warned about dangers of another radical victory. The legality of this appeal was put under question. The government, in the meanwhile, engaged in vigorous efforts to mobilize its supporters, especially in rural areas. The turnout in previous elections did not exceed 35% and the majority of those who turned to the polls were intellectuals of radical sympathies. It was hoped that an increase in turnout would bring about a more moderate chamber. The campaigning was not entirely fair; in particular, public officials were pressured to vote for the government. But the nature and scope of electoral abuses was similar to those occurring in other countries which held open-outcome elections in the period, for example Britain. In the end, a generally pro-government moderate parliament was elected in December 1849, which ratified the treaty. The next election was held, as constitutionally prescribed, only in December 1853.\footnote{Clark 2009, 66; Hearder 1994, 58-59; Mack Smith 1971, 21, 43; Mack Smith 1985, 46; Marshall 1966, 168, 202-03.}
The Establishment of Responsible Government and Cavour’s Rise to Power

In contrast to the other Italian states and the Austrian Empire, the constitutional government was not revoked, but persisted in Piedmont after 1849. Even more than that, the political system made a transition from PA monarchy to competitive oligarchy in the early 1850s. This development did not result from constitutional changes, but from the exigencies of practical politics, and was caused by several interrelated factors. First of all, the constitution was preserved because the king’s personal power was dramatically weakened after the defeat at Novara. The army was on the brink of disintegration, Genoa was in rebellion, and the parliament was controlled by the leftist opposition. In this situation an absolutist executive coup was impossible. Otherwise, the liberal regime was preserved in the longer term because Victor Emmanuel did not abandon his dream of unifying Northern Italy. But in order to carry out this plan he needed middle class support both at home and in the territories he planned to annex, and this would arrive only if Piedmont remained attractive due to its liberalism. In other words, the bourgeoisie in Lombardy and the Habsburg duchies would support Italian unification only under a liberal political order. The political dream of Italian unification brought about preservation of the Piedmontese liberalism even though privately the king was no friend of constitutionalism. He even consulted in secret with the Austrians asking if their military help would be available to reintroduce absolutism. In practice, Victor Emmanuel not only had to reconcile himself with the constitution, but also gradually lost control over the executive power after the 1849 election. This happened due to the loss of monarchy’s prestige after the defeat in the war with Austria, the king’s ambiguous stand on foreign policy and his irresponsible desire to engage in another war. The two latter factors undermined the monarch’s standing among the elites, who preferred a responsible prime minister to be in charge of both foreign and domestic matters. In the end, the
king stopped opposing parliamentarism once he learned that under this system he could conveniently blame ministers for policy failures.  

In the early 1850s, the position of Piedmontese Prime Minister d’Azeglio was challenged by an ambitious minister of finance, the Count of Cavour, who achieved substantial influence due to his economic competence. This was facilitated by the fact that d’Azeglio did not enjoy parliamentary politics and had to spend much time at home because of a war wound. Cavour realized that the government did not have reliable parliamentary majority, especially in the light of the plans to adopt a package of anti-clerical legislation, which was opposed by Conservatives. Hence he started negotiations with the moderate Liberals in order to move the government to the left. In February 1852 he challenged the prime minister publicly by announcing in the chamber the new coalition without prior consultation with d’Azeglio. The government’s new basis of support was formed by moderate conservatives and centrist Liberals led by Urbano Rattazzi, the future prime minister of Italy.  

Because of the conflict with d’Azeglio, in May 1852 Cavour was forced to resign from the ministry, but his departure was temporary. In October 1852 the government attempted to force through the parliament a new piece of secular legislation which would introduce civil marriage. The king, pressured by the pope, threatened to veto the law, which would be an unprecedented decision running contrary to the emerging practice of parliamentarism. In this situation D’Azeglio resigned in November 1852 and Victor Emmanuel had no choice but to nominate Cavour to the post of prime minister under the promise that he would abandon the bill. Once in office Cavour continued the alliance with the center-left. His political practice of forming lose centrist coalitions which were not based on clearly defined
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government and opposition parties, and adjusting their composition in reaction to the political mood of the country, persisted well into the independent Italy and became known as transformismo.¹⁰

Cavour handily won the 1853 election, winning approximately 120 out of 204 parliamentary seats. Again, the electoral process was not entirely fair because of government pressure on civil servants. In addition, the electoral system favored the government as the large proportions of districts were small rural constituencies subject to influence. Otherwise, Cavour gradually asserted his power over the king and hence entrenched the principle of parliamentarism, which became respected already under the administration of d’Azeglio. According to foreign observers, the government of Piedmont became at this stage entirely parliamentary along the British model. In 1855, Victor Emmanuel tried to dismiss Cavour and form an extra-parliamentary cabinet, but the attempt was unsuccessful because no politician with a viable basis of support was willing to undertake the task. The personal power of the prime minister was gradually increasing while the regime was evolving in an illiberal direction. Cavour often authorized government expenses without asking the legislature for approval, which was a breach of the constitution. Press freedom was gradually undermined: opposition titles were occasionally bought with secret funds, and limited repression applied if necessary. Democratic activists were kept out of the country or persecuted. In February 1855 Cavour felt powerful enough to enforce anti-clerical legislation which was much more radical than the bill blocked by the king in 1852. The statute disestablished monastic orders which were not devoted to charity or education. The pope excommunicated the supporters of the bill, and its enactment marked the final split between the church and state in Piedmont. Within the parliament, the prime minister

was secure of his majority because up to half of deputies were dependent on government as they received or hoped for state jobs or pensions.\footnote{Mack Smith 1971, 48-51, 56-59, 70; Mack Smith 1985, 74, 79-80, 121-22.}

**The 1857 Election and Breakdown of Open Electoral Politics**

The adoption of a series of anti-clerical measures brought about electoral mobilization of the Catholics, sustained with organizational resources of the church. It was clear that the government’s anticlerical policy was not supported by the majority of the population, even within the narrow enfranchised strata. Before the November 1857 election Catholics nominated a single slate of opposition candidates. On the other hand, the government lacked a consistent electoral strategy. Numerous pro-government candidates competed against each other at the district level, and only in the runoffs they agreed to support one another. To make matter worse, the government camp hardly campaigned as it took the victory for granted. When the returns came it was apparent that Cavour lost. Outright Catholic opposition obtained 40\% of the seats and leftist opposition got 10\%, while the loyalty of numerous other deputies could not be assured. Cavour admitted that the government lost majority and remarked that “in normal circumstances he would have to resign.” But the circumstances, according to him, were not normal because of the government’s far-reaching plans of Italian unification, which would be likely abandoned by a Catholic government. As in any emerging authoritarian polity, ends justified the means – in this case, the end was the holy objective of Italian unity.\footnote{Mack Smith 1985, 124-26.}

Hence, the election did not result in a change of the government, as could be expected under a liberal parliamentary regime. Instead, Cavour used various legal tricks, mostly retrospective legislation, to annul 10\% of the seats won by the Catholic opposition and this way
preserve the government’s majority. The Catholic deputies were excluded on arbitrary grounds: this included nine priests who were not admitted solely on the basis of their occupation; otherwise, “spiritual pressure” by the clergy was cited as a reason to annul election results. The government was criticized on the grounds of vote-buying and the fact that it had applied even worse pressure against civil servants to make them vote appropriately.\(^{13}\) After the election Cavour made sure that the opposition would never achieve a similar success again. First of all, he created a special government department whose task was to ensure that official candidates get elected. He dismissed the minister of interior Ratazzi, on the grounds of his insufficient provision of patronage to pro-government candidates, and assumed the portfolio himself. “Cavour made himself minister of the interior in January 1858 expressly to organize the elections, and his first action was a stiff electoral circular to the provincial intendants;” subsequently, Cavour took the same office shortly before the 1860 elections in order to “direct them.” Since the 1858 by-elections (organized to fill the annulled seats of the Catholic deputies), local government officials were expected to behave like party agents in terms of organizing and aiding the campaign of pro-government candidates through such means as patronage, vote-buying, and if necessary outright threats and intimidation. “It became the usual practice that elections brought either promotion or removal for prefects, according to their diligence or negligence in backing the official nominees."\(^ {14}\) Conditional on favorable electoral returns, the government made generous promises of patronage, and occasionally resorted to falsification of voter lists as well.\(^ {15}\) These mechanisms of electoral control were simply extended from Piedmont to the rest of Italy after the unification, and first applied in the 1861 election. Cavour’s behavior after the 1857 election


\(^{14}\) Mack Smith 1971, 71.

\(^{15}\) Mack Smith 1971, 71; Mack Smith 1985, 128-30, 199.
contrasted sharply with the conduct of Belgian Liberals, who resigned from power after they lost the 1870 election to Catholics.

Needless to say, due to the aforementioned tactics the 1858 by-elections were won by the government, similarly as the last Piedmontese election in March 1860. But the clerical opposition was neutralized also due to parliamentary maneuvering. Following the established practice of changing the government’s composition in reaction to the swings of public opinion, Cavour nominated a cabinet with a slightly conservative slant. Nevertheless, the Catholic conservatives lost hopes that they could ever influence policy through electoral means, and they effectively boycotted the Piedmontese and subsequently Italian representative institutions after the 1857 election. This decision obviously helped the government achieve the desired electoral results.\(^{16}\) After the 1857 election Cavour consolidated his personal power and the institutions of a non-competitive oligarchy. The monarchy’s prerogatives were further limited, but this was of course meaningless in a situation when the prime minister became more powerful than most constitutional monarchs. Cavour’s government was parliamentary only in a purely legalistic sense, as the parliament was in fact unable to express lack of confidence in the prime minister having become largely a rubber-stamp institution submissive to his will. Further centralization of the civil administration, curtailment of civil liberties, press freedoms and judicial independence was justified by the need of Italian unification. An additional pretext in this regard was provided by the assassination attempt on Louis-Napoleon in January 1858, committed by a group of radical Italians. The electoral fraud undermined the government’s legitimacy and made it vulnerable to the French pressure. Truly, Cavour resigned from the post of prime minister in July 1859 over the terms of the peace treaty at Villafranca (signed between the French and the
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\(^{16}\) Mack Smith 1971, 27, 59-60, 64; Mack Smith 1985, 130-33.
Austrians), but he turned out indispensable to direct the system he had created and was called back to the office in January 1860. He died in office in June 1861 having become the first prime minister of Italy.  

**Political System of the Independent Italy as the Extension of the Piedmontese System**

In March 1860, the unified Kingdom of Italy was created, which in addition to Piedmont encompassed Lombardy, the Central Italian Duchies, the Two Sicilies, and most of the Papal States (Venice was subsequently added in 1866, and Lazio with Rome in 1871). From the political and legal points of view, the unification of Italy consisted of conquest and annexation of these territories by Piedmont. Lombardy was annexed as a result of Austrian defeat in the war with France and Piedmont, Central Italian duchies as a result of local uprisings supported by the Piedmontese army, and Two Sicilies and the Papal States as a result of military campaign led by Giuseppe Garibaldi. These territories were annexed by Piedmont after a series of rigged plebiscites held under universal male suffrage. The vote was public and took place under a watchful guard of Piedmontese troops, ballots with “yes’ already printed on them were distributed to mostly illiterate voters, and other incentives, such as wine, were provided, while the recalcitrant were pressured to vote by their landlords. The results were similar to those achieved by the totalitarian states of the twentieth century. For example, in Tuscany only 3.7% of “no” votes were recorded, and in Sicily just 0.2%.  

The first election in the independent Italy was held in January 1861 and was managed by Cavour with the methods which had already been developed in Piedmont. The government was also helped by the Catholic boycott, which was proclaimed at the instigation of the pope, who
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prohibited the faithful from taking part in Italian politics after Piedmont attacked and annexed most of the Papal States in 1860.\footnote{Clark 2009, 97; Mack Smith 1971, 35; Mack Smith 1985, 252.} No government lost an Italian election before the rise of Fascism, and the country did not hold open-outcome elections until January 1919. To be precise, the electoral competition was not entirely farcical. The actual voting took place and the voters had to be convinced to support the government through the mixture of patronage, bribery and intimidation (to give a comparison, in the contemporaneous Spain election was more of an administrative procedure consisting of provision of fake electoral returns). The government avoided such brutal methods as ballot stuffing or protocol falsification; instead, opposition supporters were prevented from voting and government supporters voted multiple times, and this only if necessary. The regime’s electoral philosophy under long-lasting Prime Minister Giolitti (1892-93, 1903-05, 1906-09, 1911-14) was to obtain a minimal parliamentary majority with as little intimidation and fraud as possible, so that the regime continues to be perceived as legitimate and parliamentary by foreign public opinion. Elections also served, to a large extent, as a mechanism through which local elites were represented. The quality of elections varied regionally. In the South the electoral process was controlled by the government-allied landlords, but in several Northern regions it was relatively fair hence the opposition parties had a chance to elect a number of deputies. Those included Radicals, and since the beginning of the twentieth century, Catholics and Socialists. The government’s popularity was decreasing up to the point when it obtained only 53% of the vote in the 1913 election, the first held under universal male suffrage. Moreover, the ruling coalition remained fractious and changes in public opinion were reflected in changes in the government.\footnote{Elazar 2001, 34-38; Mack Smith 1997, 95-96, 101-03, 150-51, 162-63, 180, 199, 250-51; Samuels 2003, 119-20.} Last but not least, the monarchy retained the influence
over the political process and thus establishment of a personal dictatorship was avoided. Instead, Italy remained a non-competitive oligarchy (along with contemporaneous Hungary and Romania, the cases discussed in this chapter), in which various elite interests were widely represented, but this representation was not based on the mechanism of open-outcome elections.

Nevertheless, the unified Italy retained a number of illiberal features. After unification, the Piedmontese laws and the centralized system of government were imposed on the rest of Italy, and the local elites’ demands of federalization were simply ignored. The fate of the peasantry worsened, especially in the South: peasants were more heavily taxed than under the Bourbon monarchy, they lost the customary rights to common lands as well as the traditional sources of support after charitable orders were dissolved by the government and their property confiscated to the benefit of local notables. This resulted in widespread localized rebellion, which was brutally suppressed by the government. The Piedmontese constitution and suffrage regulations were retained without amendments; hence the suffrage was limited to only about 10% of male adults until the 1882 election. There were no elections at the local level in Italy, and all municipal officials were nominated by the government-appointed prefects. One of the reasons why centralization was adopted after unification was the need to fix elections. If local government was elected and the power of prefects limited, the government would find it harder to control the electoral process. However, the power of local notables was retained within this system because only local elites could ensure the desired electoral outcome through patronage or pressure. Hence they were routinely appointed to the local government and their interests had to be respected.  
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21 Clark 2009, 87-92, 98; Furlong 1994, 34-36; Mack Smith 1971, 249, 272-73; Mack Smith 1985, 250-51, 265;
In contrast to several other European states of the period, Piedmont experienced a direct transition from an absolute monarchy to competitive oligarchy. Hence, the principle of free electoral competition was introduced in the country without a previous gestation period under a PA monarchy. Unlike governments holding power under PA monarchies, the Cavour’s government in Piedmont was responsible to the legislature and needed to win elections in order to remain in power. In consequence, it faced much stronger incentives to taint the electoral process in comparison to the governments responsible to the monarch. Hence, using a convenient pretext of Italian unification, Cavour stole the 1857 election and subsequently developed administrative mechanisms in order to ensure that the opposition would never win elections again; afterward, the Cavour’s system was extended to the unified Italy. Obviously, the governments of the contemporaneous competitive oligarchies in Britain or Belgium faced the same kind of incentives regarding the control of the electoral process as the government of Piedmont, but they had achieved power in a situation when the principles of free electoral competition and the respect for constitutionalism had become firmly entrenched among the elites after a period of PA monarchy. Certainly, a different history of Piedmont, and in consequence of Italy, is imaginable and was definitely possible. If Victor Emmanuel had been a more competent and stronger ruler, he could have preserved the control over the executive power, and Piedmont could have experienced a long period of PA monarchy similarly to contemporaneous Prussia or Denmark. Then it could have transitioned to a self-sustaining democracy along the lines of the countries described in Chapters 4 and 5. In reality the Italian democracy was established in 1919 after a long period of non-competitive oligarchy and was extremely prone to breakdown. In the minds of ordinary people there was a clear continuity between the pre-1914 period, characterized by widespread electoral manipulation and unbridled corruption among the ruling elite, and the
postwar democracy. Italian democracy was established without a clear break from the past, and hence it inherited the veneer of illegitimacy dating from the oligarchical period. Moreover, the legacy of transformismo induced the ruling politicians to co-opt Fascist into the political system (instead of isolating them), and brought about limited support for constitutionalism and the principle of free electoral competition, which was the crucial precondition of democratic breakdown.

Emergence and Fall of the Competitive Oligarchy In Hungary

As described in the previous section, competitive oligarchy broke down in Piedmont because its establishment had not been preceded by a period of PA monarchy. In spite of different historical legacy and international circumstances, similar fate met the Hungarian competitive oligarchy established in 1867. Hungary, as a separate kingdom ruled by the Habsburg dynasty, enjoyed before 1848 a limited autonomy and a feudal parliament. However, the pro-democratic legacy of these traditional institutions, if it existed at all, was largely lost when they were abolished after an unsuccessful uprising against the Habsburg rule in 1849. Nevertheless, failures of foreign policy and the continuing opposition in Hungary forced the Austrian Emperor into a compromise with Hungarians in 1867. Elections under restricted suffrage were held in 1865 and the responsible government was formed in 1867. At this stage, similarly as in Piedmont, a government which was responsible to the elected legislature, and not to an unelected monarch, became in charge of organization of elections. Because the elite had not become committed to the principle of free electoral competition during the period of PA monarchy, the voting quickly lost its open-outcome character. Already the 1872 election was controlled by the government similarly as the later elections in Piedmont and Italy. Like Italy,
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Hungary evolved into a non-competitive oligarchy where civil liberties were protected to a smaller extent than in the contemporaneous Austria, which remained a PA monarchy. The subsequent narrative will illustrate this process. It will be supported by additional details regarding the historical background which are needed to fully understand the historical development of Hungary.

The medieval kingdom of Hungary encompassed the territories which nowadays form Hungary, Slovakia, the Romanian region of Transylvania, most of Croatia and Northern Serbia. In 1526, after the Hungarian army was defeated by the Ottomans, the throne of Hungary was inherited by the Habsburg dynasty. The social structure of the country was characterized by pervasive inequality. Serfs (app. 80% of the population) were exploited by the aristocracy and the nobility (app. 6% of the population and 12% among ethnic Hungarians) which possessed most of the land and political power. Hungary was not an absolute monarchy. Before the Turkish invasion, parliamentary institutions developed in which the aristocracy, nobility and free cities enjoyed representation. Since 1301, kings were in principle elected by the parliament, which usually preferred dynastic continuity. The parliament was preserved by the Habsburgs, but its power was severely limited in practice. In 1608, the institution was divided into two chambers. In the upper chamber the most powerful aristocratic families and bishops were seated, while the lower chamber represented the gentry and free cities. Yet, the Parliament met very irregularly every few years only, for example, it was not convened at all between 1811 and 1825, and only about 5% of male adults were enfranchised in parliamentary elections. Delegates to the lower chamber were elected indirectly by county assemblies, in which all nobles residing a

23 Janos 1982, 4-5.


25 Janos 1982, 23-34, 60, 74.
county could take part. They were bound by instructions. Transylvania and Croatia had traditionally enjoyed an autonomous status within the kingdom.²⁶

**The 1848-49 Revolution and Its Suppression**

In the 1830s and 1840s, given the country’s economic and social backwardness, a significant portion of the Hungarian gentry embraced liberal ideas. Their goal was the transformation of Hungary into a modern liberal state on the pattern of Britain or Belgium, but the efforts at reform were blocked by the conservative part of the nobility and the Habsburg court. The Hungarian Parliament abolished serfdom in 1833, but the reform bill was vetoed by the king.²⁷ The chance to implement reforms came during the revolution of 1848. The parliament elected in 1847 met to deliberate in 1848 during a period of intense upheaval both in the country and abroad. An urban uprising was shaking the capital, minor peasant rebellions had broken in the countryside among the fears of a general peasant revolt, and popular revolutions destabilized other European countries, including Austria. As a result of significant popular pressure, the assembly enacted major reforms, which included the end of serfdom and the tithe, equality before the law (end of feudalism), and transfer of about half of arable land to peasants (i.e. peasants became owners of the fiefs which they had previously used). Still, the other half of the peasantry remained landless and continued to work on large estates owned by the aristocracy and nobility.²⁸

The end of serfdom was accompanied by political transformation. The 1848 reform created a modern bicameral parliament. The House of Lords was the continuation of the previous upper chamber, but its powers were significantly reduced. The lower chamber, or the House of

²⁶ Király 1975, 39.
Representatives, was elected under restricted franchise based on property, tax or education qualifications (10 years of education was required to become an elector). The scope of franchise was limited to 6.5% of the population (which was app. 26% of male adults). The government, headed by prime minister, was responsible to the House. The 1848 constitutional changes were not implemented, however. After suppression of the uprising in Vienna, the Austrian Emperor and king of Hungary, Franz Josef, withdrew his consent to the political reforms. In response, the newly elected Hungarian parliament dethroned the Habsburgs and declared independence. The resulting war ended with Hungarian defeat after Russian intervention. The Austrian government abolished the Hungary’s separate legal status, its parliament and local government. The country, ruled directly from Vienna, was divided into several new provinces. The changes were officially justified by the fact that Hungary had supposedly forfeited its constitutional rights through rebellion against a legitimate king. Serious efforts at germanization and a period of heavy repression followed, but the land reform of 1848 was not revoked.29

The outbreak of the Second Italian War of Independence in April 1859 renewed the hopes of Hungarian patriots. During the war Louis-Napoleon promised to help the cause of Hungarian independence, but in July 1859 he was forced to sign armistice by the other great powers. Hence the planned uprising in Hungary did not even begin.30 After the armistice Hungary was on the brink of a revolution, but an uprising was prevented by a promise of concessions made by the emperor.31 Even more importantly, Franz Joseph was hard-pressed to grant constitutionalism by foreign and domestic lenders, who refused to finance the state budget without introduction of some degree of public accountability. The press campaign for
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30 Szabad 1977, 71-72.
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constitution was in fact led by Viennese bankers. Because of the lenders’ refusal to finance the government, the empire was on the verge of bankruptcy. Hence, the Bach government associated with neo-absolutism was dismissed and a more liberal cabinet was formed.32

Hoping to appease both the Hungarians and the financial bourgeoisie, the emperor announced in October 1860 a constitutional charter. The document was prepared in cooperation with conservative aristocrats, who argued that the alternative to constitutionalism was another popular uprising or the monarchy’s dissolution. It created elected assemblies in each of the empire’s crown lands – this included Hungary and Transylvania – and an indirectly elected lower chamber. The suffrage overwhelmingly privileged the landed interests.33 In Hungary, a moderate governor was appointed and the pre-1848 administrative division was reinstated. The government also promised reinstitution of the local government and a wide degree of autonomy for the country.34 But the new charter was unacceptable both for the Austrian Liberals and Hungarians of all social classes. In Hungary, it was greeted by student demonstrations and riots in the countryside.35 Hungarians took advantage of a more liberal atmosphere to spontaneously organize local elections in fall 1860 with a franchise wider than provided by the 1848 constitution. The newly-elected municipalities refused to pay most of the taxes to the imperial government.36

In February 1861 a new constitutional charter was announced, which partially met demands of the Austrian Liberals. It provided for an institutional framework of a PA monarchy.

33 Szabad 1977, 80-83.
34 Szabad 1977, 80-81.
35 Szabad 1977, 83-86.
The system of government was centralized with the lower legislative chamber indirectly elected by the provincial assemblies. The emperor called for elections in Hungary hoping that the newly-elected parliament would accept the charter and send a delegation to the imperial legislature. The elections were held in April 1861 according to the electoral law of 1848. They remained free of government interference. But the parliament elected in April 1861 was united in its rejection of the charter. Doing so would legalize the transformation of Hungary into just another crown land (of the same legal status as Galicia or Dalmatia), subordination to the Viennese parliament, and deprivation of the longstanding constitutional rights as a separate country ruled by the House of Habsburg. In the end, the assembly sent an address to the emperor demanding restoration of the 1848 constitution, which would change the character of the union between Hungary and Austria to de facto personal. Apparently, a compromise was impossible at this stage because the emperor’s goal was to create a viable unitary state which would be able to defend itself on the international stage.\textsuperscript{37} Hence, after a few months of deliberations, the parliament was dissolved by the imperial government and direct rule was reintroduced in Hungary.\textsuperscript{38}

The dissolution caused protests in other parts of empire, but it was supported by the pro-centralist German Liberals. With the exception of Transylvania, municipal councils were dissolved after their repeated refusal to pay taxes, and a system of military courts was introduced. Compared to the post-1848 situation, the wave of repression which followed was not as severe. Some elements of the Hungarian administrative and judicial systems were in fact preserved, and many Hungarian patriots kept their posts at lower levels of the administration under the elite consent. However, while the other Habsburg lands enjoyed a constitution which


\textsuperscript{38} Ormos and Király 2001, 49; Szabad 1977, 116.
introduced basic civil liberties and an indirectly elected lower house, these liberties were still denied to Hungary. The semi-absolutist system of government remained in force for five years. During the period the goal of the imperial government was to force Hungarians into acceptance of the February Constitutional Patent and send representation to the Austrian lower house.39

After 1861 the political atmosphere in Hungary was marked by the deadlock and tension. It was clear that the lack of legal government in the country could not be a permanent state, especially given that the imperial decree dissolving the 1861 parliament promised new elections. In 1862 the Hungarian Conservatives prepared a memorandum in which they proposed creation of a dual monarchy. Under the arrangement Hungary and Austria would become separate countries ruled by the common monarch with joint army and foreign affairs. The memorandum was rejected by the emperor in spring 1863, but it formed the basis of the future compromise with the Habsburgs. In the meanwhile, the imperial government tried to undermine the Hungarian unity from within. The Transylvanian Diet was elected in 1863 under an electoral law guaranteeing majority to the German and Romanian representatives (which reflected the region’s demographics in any case), and it subsequently sent representatives to the Austrian legislature. Domestic radicals engaged in conspiracy, but a planned uprising inspired by the Polish 1863 insurrection was thwarted by the police.40 Nevertheless, the Hungarian middle classes had become tired of the continued resistance and were worried about the lower class radicalization. At the same time, the international prospects for Hungarian independence remained bleak. Hence the idea of a compromise with Habsburgs gained increasing popularity.41

41 Szabad 1977, 140-41.
The Compromise of 1867 and Establishment of Competitive Oligarchy in Hungary

A compromise came also to be preferred by the imperial government due to the Austria’s increasingly precarious international position. In the end of 1864 the emperor realized that Bismarck had to be stopped by force so that his policies of German unification under the Prussian leadership would not be realized. But because of the Hungarian tax boycott the government did not have enough funds to engage in a war with Prussia, while Czech and Polish delegates since 1863 had boycotted the parliament over local grievances.\(^4^2\) In early 1865, Ferenc Deák, the leader of the Hungarian Liberals, published a study which defended the traditional rights of Hungary as a constitutionally separate kingdom within the Habsburg realm. The study was in fact an offer of reconciliation with the imperial government; it was well received by the emperor. In April 1865, direct negotiations started between Deák and the government in Vienna.\(^4^3\) The preparations for the compromise were preceded by changes within the Austrian government: the February Constitutional Patent was suspended, Anton von Schmerling, de facto prime minister since 1860, was forced to resign in June 1865 and a more liberal cabinet took over. In September 1865 the emperor scheduled elections for the Hungarian and Transylvanian parliaments. Deák’s conciliatory stance was largely supported by Hungarian public opinion, which desired normalization of the political life. On the other hand, Deák was criticized by the opposition because elections were held in a legal void. No Hungarian constitution was in force at the time, and local government was not reestablished before the vote. Local councils only met to choose electoral commissions as prescribed in the 1848 constitution so that the parliament could be elected legally.\(^4^4\)

\(^{4^2}\) Király 1975, 167; Ormos and Király 2001, 51; Peter and Lojkó 2012, 240.

\(^{4^3}\) Szabad 1977, 144-47.

The 1865 election was not without problems, but it otherwise resembled other open-outcome elections held at the time in such countries as France or Prussia. Conservatives used bribery and promises of patronage to support their candidates. In a few districts far left candidates were defeated through bribery and intimidation, while the army had to intervene to stop occasional violent clashes during the campaign. The moderate Deák Party was tacitly backed both by the imperial government and the Hungarian conservatives. The voting was close in several districts, but ultimately the Deák Party won a convincing victory. The Center Left led by Kálmán Tisza also mostly supported the Deák’s platform. But it was treated with suspicion by the authorities as it was associated with the previous pro-independence conspiracies. The far left won in a few constituencies, primarily where the secret ballot was used. Overall, nearly half of deputies elected in 1861 were reelected in 1865. The 1865 parliament was divided into several factions. The Deák Party was a continuation of the Liberal Right (the so-called Address Party) from the 1861 Parliament. It enjoyed a majority with 180 deputies and was supported by a small Conservative faction of twenty parliamentarians composed mostly of deputies elected in aristocratic strongholds. The opposition was divided into Center-Left, which was a continuation of the Liberal Left (so-called Resolution Party) from the 1861 parliament (ninety-four deputies), and far left, which was inspired by the Kossuth-led exiled Democrats, counting twenty deputies. Only 10% of politically-independent deputies represented minorities, in spite of the fact that the latter formed nearly 50% of the country’s population.

In contrast to the situation in 1861, both sides had a sincere desire to achieve a compromise; hence the negotiations proceeded relatively smoothly. The main terms of

disagreement pertained to the extent of the monarch’s prerogatives and the scope of affairs which would remain common with Vienna. While the Hungarians preferred full restoration of the 1848 constitution, the emperor found this demand unacceptable as this would weaken the central government and undermine the empire’s international position. The Habsburg defeat in the war with Prussia in July 1866 made the compromise even more desirable to Vienna, as the war revealed the country’s military weakness. The main parts of the agreement were ready in January 1867, and on 17 February Gyula Andrásy, one of the leaders of the 1848 Revolution, formed the first responsible Hungarian government (Deák refused the honor). The compromise of 1867 transformed the Habsburg realm into a de facto confederacy. Existence of separate parliaments in Austria and Hungary was confirmed, and no federal assembly was created. Austria continued to be ruled by modified Constitutional Patent of 1861, while in Hungary the 1848 Constitution was largely restored. The common institutions included the Emperor-King, the army and the Foreign Service. Delegations from the two parliaments legislated over these matters, although in practice they were largely controlled by the emperor.\(^\text{47}\) The compromise probably represented the views of the majority of enfranchised Hungarians at the time, although a large majority found it unacceptable and continued to demand full independence under a strictly personal union with Austria. The question of the compromise thus became one of the main sources of cleavage in Hungarian politics.\(^\text{48}\)

The restored 1848 constitution was a typical liberal constitutional document for the period. It provided the king with wide powers, including the right to dismiss and appoint ministers, declare war and control the military, dissolve the legislature, give preliminary assent to


the legislation submitted by the government to the parliament, and veto bills. But the regime which emerged after the compromise resembled more closely a competitive oligarchy rather than a PA monarchy. The emperor left most of domestic matters to Hungarians and concentrated on foreign and military affairs. Among his wide prerogatives, he occasionally used only the right to decline preliminary assent to the legislation. Otherwise, since February 1867 the government was responsible to the majority of the legislature, although it also needed a degree of the monarch’s confidence to remain on office (in this regard, the political practice resembled July Monarchy in the period 1836-1848). The suffrage law from 1848 was retained, and in 1874 the voting rights further restricted from 26% to 23% of male adults. Although this degree of enfranchisement was progressive as of 1848, it became very conservative when retained in the beginning of the twentieth century. As of 1910, among the enfranchised social strata, 62% belonged to the landowning peasantry and 16% to the petty bourgeoisie.49

Initially, the Hungarian competitive oligarchy remained a liberal regime similar to the contemporary Belgium or the Netherlands. It was led by politicians who, like the Belgian or Dutch Liberals, truly believed in the liberal values and principles of civil liberties, religious toleration, and constitutional government. For example, Ferenc Deák, who was responsible for the negotiations leading to the compromise, despaired of electoral fraud and manipulation and favored further suffrage extensions even against the wishes of his own party. After he was elected a deputy to the Hungarian Parliament in 1843, he refused the mandate because of bribery and intimidation which his supporters used to win the vote. The Andrássy-Deák government, which came to power in 1867, pursued policies which corresponded to its liberal ideology. In 1868 a progressive law on nationalities was enacted, which guaranteed that in areas inhabited by

minorities the local languages would be used in the administration, education and the civil society. An equally progressive law on public education was adopted in the same year. However, the generation of politicians which assumed power in 1867 quickly receded into the background. Ferenc Deák was ill and he lost effective influence over the policy after 1869. Gyula Andrássy resigned from the post of prime minister in November 1871 to assume the office of foreign minister. József Eötvös, one of the leaders of the 1848 revolution, died in February 1871. The generation which took over after 1872 did not have parliamentary experience dating from the pre-1848 representative institutions. Thus it lacked the unambiguous commitment to free electoral competition. In this situation, it did not hesitate to permanently exclude the opposition from power through electoral manipulation, and the convenient excuse in this regard was provided by the necessity to defend the 1867 compromise (in the same way as the necessity of Italian unification was used to justify the electoral manipulation in Piedmont/Italy in 1857 and after). Lacking a legacy of open-outcome from the period of PA monarchy, the personal commitment to free electoral competition on the part of the elite was not sufficient to retain this principle in practice after Hungary became a semi-independent competitive oligarchy in 1867.

**Hungary’s Transition to a Non-Competitive Oligarchy**

The first election in post-compromise Hungary, organized by the Andrássy government, took place in 1869. It had a relatively free character with electoral abuses typical of open-outcome elections of the period. The clergy, aristocracy and other landowners controlled the vote of their clients through pressure or patronage. Because they supported the government at the time, they delivered their clients’ vote to the latter. Similar mechanisms were in place in
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elections held at the time in Germany or Britain. The clientelistic electioneering was facilitated by open voting, hence the opposition fought to introduce secret ballot and it managed to do so in certain areas thus increasing its electoral success. Vote-buying was common but not as widespread as during the Hungarian elections in the 1890s and 1900s. Voter lists were prepared by county authorities. Hence in the opposition-controlled counties the 1848 suffrage law was interpreted liberally in order to increase the number of voters, whereas it was interpreted in a restrictive way in the government-controlled counties. In the end, the ruling Deák Party won 235 seats with 53% of the vote, the center-left opposition 120 seats, and the far left forty seats. The government actually narrowly lost in the ethnically Hungarian areas, which indicated unpopularity of the compromise. It also was less successful in the districts where the opportunities for clientelism were restricted. It won in minority-dominated districts: in some because such districts were controlled by large landowners, in others because its policies were genuinely popular (especially among the German minority which favored the compromise). Additionally, the government was helped by the Romanian minority’s boycott.\(^52\)

However, the 1869 vote was the last relatively free election in Hungary before 1945. In November 1871 a new prime minister, Menyhért Lónyay, took over, in a situation when the popularity of the ruling party was decreasing. If Lónyay wanted to remain in power, he could not risk an open-outcome election. Hence, he applied a set of tactics including massive bribery and intimidation in order to secure the victory of the ruling party, or strictly speaking, a single slate of candidates which were personally loyal to the prime minister. For those tactics to be successful, the government needed to control the electoral process at the local level in a sufficient number of districts, and be in possession of large funds required for effective vote-

\(^{52}\) Gerő 1997, 8-23; Hoensch 1996, 22.
buying and patronage. Hence, before the vote large sums of were procured from the aristocracy, clergy and the financial circles. The election was also preceded by administrative reforms which increased the powers of prefects and diminished the powers of elected local government bodies regarding the organization of the electoral process. The prefects were also charged with coordination of the ruling party’s campaign through provision of government resources, corruption and intimidation.  

The mechanism of electoral manipulation introduced in 1872 by Lónyay was subsequently emulated and perfected by Kálmán Tisza, who first applied it before the July 1875 election in the capacity of the minister of interior (after the election he became the prime minister and kept the post until 1890). The government used a variety of means to fabricate the desired electoral result. The most important of the tactics was institutionalized vote-buying. Similarly as before the 1872 election, the government procured campaign funds from the business circles and the clergy. In return for campaign contributions, it offered business concessions, preferential loans, titles of nobility and other forms of patronage. Paradoxically, most of the money was spent in safe districts as financial support came to be expected from voters as a matter of fact. Initially relatively low, the cost of campaigning increased enormously during Tisza’s administration as voters expected the candidates to pay for transportation to a polling station. The voting took the whole day hence voters had to be provided with food and drink. They were also paid a daily allowance just for going to the polls. The election was public apart from a few localities. As the tally was known along the way it could be changed at the last moment if
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additional financial incentives were offered to the voters.\textsuperscript{56} The strategy of massive vote-buying was also willy-nilly emulated by the opposition, but on a much smaller scale given its obviously smaller opportunities to obtain campaign contributions.\textsuperscript{57} Moreover, the government applied brutal tactics in the electoral districts where the contest was close. Because the voting was public, the administration forced the electorate to vote for pro-government candidates through selective application of taxes and fees. If these means were insufficient, electoral registries were forged or opposition supporters were physically prevented from taking part in elections. Police or army units were deployed if voters protested.\textsuperscript{58}

In terms of the electoral geography, the core support for Tisza and his ruling Liberal Party came from deputies elected in the so-called rotten boroughs (notice the analogy to the pre-1832 Britain), usually located in areas inhabited by Romanian or Slovak peasants. Out of 413 constituencies, 160 were rotten boroughs. Because of administrative pressure, government candidates were elected from these seats usually without opposition. Most of these deputies belonged to a so-called group of “mamelukes”, who were officials unquestioningly loyal to the government out of fear of losing their posts. Another fifty seats or so were controlled by the largest landowners of aristocratic background who directly influenced electoral choice of their clients. This group was the most concerned with their economic interests and the government could not automatically count on their support. The rest of districts, located mostly in cities and areas inhabited by ethnic Hungarians, remained “open” in a sense that they could vote either for the government or the opposition. A large number of those routinely elected opposition deputies

\textsuperscript{56} Gerõ 1997, 64-65, 71-72.

\textsuperscript{57} Gerõ 1997, 68-69.

and could be manipulated only with the help of brutal intimidation. The government found it inconvenient to apply such pressure because of influence of international and domestic public opinion. Moreover, the ruling party wanted to prove that it was genuinely popular through election of its supporters from open districts in fair contests. Hence, opposition candidates frequently won in open districts, and prominent government members occasionally lost them. In the end, however, the government’s victory was assured in normal circumstances. According to a contemporary observer, the Hungarian government could not “be overthrown in an open election.”

After 1875, the politics of electoral abuse was also accompanied by gradual restriction of civil liberties and freedoms. The liberal law on national minorities was interpreted narrowly and the government pursued an active policy of ethnic assimilation. Most schools with minority instruction were turned into Hungarian-only institutions, and adoption of Hungarian identity became a prerequisite of admission to the civil service. As well, the state actively persecuted and imprisoned members of minority associations and political parties. Heavy intimidation, voter deregistration and other fraudulent methods were applied in non-Hungarian districts in order to prevent election of minority deputies. As a consequence, the percentage of minority deputies never exceeded 9% although minorities formed nearly 50% of the country’s population and 42% of voters. In addition to ethnic minority politicians, the government was also quite willing to intimidate opposition activists from the ethnic Hungarian parties. This applied in particular to the incipient labor movement which aimed to mobilize farm workers in the countryside and


industrial workers in the cities. The Agricultural Labor Act of 1898 explicitly prohibited strikes, made employees criminally liable for breaches in their contracts, and obliged the police to bring back escaped farm workers to their workplaces. The unrest and strikes among farm workers, which broke out in 1891, 1897 and 1898, were brutally suppressed by the police. Finally, several elements of a police state were introduced after 1895. The introduction of these repressive policies was possible due to the subordination of parliament to the executive power under the Tisza’s administration, and centralization of the local administration enacted during the 1870s.

As mentioned, elections in Hungary were in principle fixed. In practice, the government could be defeated only if it lost both the support of the aristocrats and the overwhelming majority of open seats. This happened only once, in the January 1905 elections. But whether this electoral outcome would have resulted in a change of government is hard to assess given the country’s semi-independent status. If Hungary was sovereign, the government might have annulled elections of certain opposition deputies to preserve its majority (as Cavour did in 1857 in Piedmont), or dissolved the parliament and conducted new elections in which fraud would be applied more effectively. But such an extra-legal behavior would not probably have been tolerated by the imperial government (parliamentary dissolution required the royal consent). It should be also added that Hungary did not have a standing army (it was a federal institution), hence the government’s opportunity for repression was also limited. In reality, Franz Joseph was willing to nominate the leader of the opposition Independence Party as the next prime minister after the 1905 election. But the party’s key campaign pledge was the introduction of a separate Hungarian army and foreign service, the demands considered unacceptable by the imperial
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government. Hence the emperor kept in office the leader of the Liberal Party, István Tisza, and in June 1905 nominated an extra-parliamentary government of Géza Fejérváry. In consultation with the emperor, Fejérváry made overtones to the Socialists and promised universal suffrage, a reform which could be unilaterally imposed by the imperial government. Free elections under universal suffrage would pose an existential threat to the Hungarian elites; hence the leaders of the Independence Party backed down and abandoned the demands to establish a separate Hungarian army. In April 1906, a new government was formed.65

However, the new administration used exactly the same tactics to perpetuate itself in power as the previously ruling Liberal Party, starting with the fraudulent April 1906 election. Hence, it is not possible to treat the 1905 election as a democratic or liberal opening in the Hungarian political history.66 Moreover, in 1910 the pro-compromise coalition came back to power when a deal between moderates from the Constitution Party and the former Liberal Party was achieved.67 The final years of the pre-war Hungary were marked by the growing struggle over political reforms between the elites and the extra-parliamentary opposition dominated by Socialists and national minorities. The elites vehemently resisted demands to introduce universal male suffrage voiced by the minorities and the incipient Social Democratic party for several interrelated reasons. Under universal suffrage, it would be more difficult to control the electoral process. This is because the mechanism of manipulation was based on the minority districts where voters were few and could be easily pressured to vote for the government. Under universal suffrage the percentage of minority voters would increase and the mass of farm workers and the urban proletariat would be enfranchised. It was nearly certain that the latter would vote for Social
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Democrats, which could also likely mobilize the former. Istvan Tisza, a long-term prime minister and leader of the Liberal Party, openly declared that universal suffrage would likely terminate the oligarchical rule over Hungary and could lead to national minorities taking over the power in coalition with Hungarian Socialists. Still, the tension over the issue was increasing. Especially after 1900, Socialist-led demonstrations and strikes demanding universal suffrage and other reforms (200,000 people demonstrated in Budapest in October 1907) were growing in number, but the government either ignored or brutally suppressed the protests. A token electoral reform was enacted only in 1913, but the increase in the number of voters was meager (by only 28%). In the end, the Hungarian non-competitive oligarchy fell in November 1918 with the country’s military defeat in the WWI, but it was reestablished two years later after a failed experiment with the Socialist rule and ultimately survived within the country’s diminished borders until 1944.68

Hungary started its semi-independent existence as a competitive oligarchy in the same historical period as Belgium or the Netherlands. Open-outcome elections under restricted suffrage were held in 1865, and a government responsible to the parliament came into office in 1867. Initially, the government was in hand of a generation of politicians who had fought for freedom with the Habsburg absolutism and pursued genuinely liberal policies in the period after the compromise. But shortly after this generation receded into background and more conservative politicians took over. Unfortunately, in contrast to Belgium and the Netherlands, establishment of competitive oligarchy in Hungary was not preceded by a period of PA monarchy; hence the principle of free electoral competition had not taken root before the elected government took over. While the 1867 election was still largely free, starting in 1872 the government actively controlled the electoral process through administrative methods, and the

opposition victory became extremely unlikely. Similarly as Piedmont, where establishment of competitive oligarchy had not been preceded by a period of PA monarchy, Hungary turned into a pluralist but non-competitive oligarchy. Hungarian elections, taunted by fraud, intimidation and corruption, contrasted sharply with the situation in the neighboring Austria, which retained the system of PA monarchy after 1865 (with the executive power controlled by the monarch), and where the electoral process remained largely free while civil liberties were respected to a larger extent than in Hungary.

Clearly, Hungarian political history could have been different if the country experienced a sufficiently long period of a PA monarchy (realistically, such a system could have been established in 1848 or at the compromise of 1867). In this situation the practice of free electoral competition could have taken root before the introduction of a responsible government, and the Hungarian competitive oligarchy would be self-sustainable once established. Such a self-sustainable competitive oligarchy would then probably make transition to a stable democracy along the path taken by Belgium or the Netherlands, through the extension of suffrage. As shown by the example of Belgium, Hungary’s ethnic diversity would not necessarily be a fatal impediment to this historical development. In the context of free electoral competition, civil liberties would be largely respected and the country’s ethnic minorities might have developed loyalty to the state within its existing borders. This development was prevented through historical accidents, and not necessarily by ill will on the part of the Hungarian elites.

**Romania: The Shortest Experiment with Competitive Oligarchy**

With the gradual decline of the Ottoman Empire in the nineteenth century, several new independent countries were established in the Balkan Peninsula and they adopted a monarchical form of the government. These included Greece, Serbia, Romania and Bulgaria. Yet, in none of these countries a PA monarchy was established, and hence they could not enter the path of
historical development to a self-sustainable democracy. Although more historical research is certainly needed on the subject, my hypothesis points to the problem that in none of those countries existed preconditions for a PA monarchy because they were not ruled by monarchical dynasties of long historical traditions. In other words, a monarch should come from a long-established dynasty to hold power legitimately and share it with a freely elected legislature in conditions of a PA monarchy. Yet, Bulgaria and Greece, after they gained independence, were ruled by imported foreign dynasties. In Serbia, two native families competed for the throne (the country lacked nobility hence they had both peasant roots); for that reason the dynastical loyalty of the country’s population was divided. Finally, in Romania a native noble family initially assumed the throne, but it was abolished and a foreign dynasty took over. In this section my goal will be to illustrate the difficulties in creation of a stable PA monarchy in the newly-independent countries on the example of Romania.

Romania did not exist as an independent country in the medieval period. There existed two Romanian-inhabited principalities (Wallachia and Moldavia), which became vassals of the Ottoman Empire in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. But there were no long-standing dynasties ruling over these autonomous entities, instead, the Ottoman Turks in the eighteenth century imposed on them the rule by imported Greek noble families or Phanoriotes. The social structure of the Romanian principalities was similar to Hungary’s. Even after a modest land reform of 1864 it was characterized by pervasive inequality: Half of the arable land belonged to large estates, and most of the peasants were either landless or owned too little land to become independent farmers. Hence, they made livelihood working on large estates owned by the nobility. The political status of the Romanian territories changed in the 1850s. After
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considerable international pressure, the Ottoman Empire agreed to unification of the principalities, which was accomplished in 1859 when a local nobleman, Alexandru Ion Cuza, was elected prince both in Wallachia and Moldova. The first constitution of Romania was a result of negotiations between the great powers and the Romanian notables. It established a system of PA monarchy with restricted suffrage. According to its provisions, the government was responsible both to the prince and the assembly (but became controlled by the monarch in practice), and the latter was elected by a highly restrictive franchise (only 2% of male adults could participate). Because the number of voters was very small, Cuza's government found it hard to manipulate elections, which in any case resulted in victories of Conservative landlords.

Cuza's aim was to establish an effective and enlightened dictatorship in order to modernize Romania. In this regard his role model was Napoleon III, who tried to base his rule on the peasant support. Yet, the prince's political position was precarious because his right to rule was tenuous: he could not claim descent from a long-standing royal family, but was a noble whose social position was equal to any other leading noble family of the country. Hence, Cuza’s attempts at land and electoral reforms were constantly blocked by the Conservative-dominated parliament. In order to resolve the deadlock, in 1864 Cuza conducted a coup, unilaterally changing the constitution through a plebiscite. This way he terminated the country’s PA monarchy only after five years of its existence. Universal male suffrage was introduced, but both the plebiscite and the subsequent election were government-organized sham votes (Michelson 1998, pp. 128-135). In the situation of constant landlord opposition, Cuza tried to increase his support among the lower classes, enacting in 1864 a land reform. The reform redistributed about
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one third of estate lands to peasants, while landlords were guaranteed property rights over the rest. The social position of peasants improved slightly, but the economic power of landlords was largely preserved.  

Hence, contrary to Cuza's expectations, the land reform did not lead to consolidation of his regime. The reform alienated the Conservatives, but as a result of its poor implementation it did not increase Cuza's support among the peasantry, either. At the same time, growing repressiveness of the regime alienated Liberal urban elites. At last, Cuza was overthrown in a bloodless Liberal-Conservative coup in 1866 and a new prince from the Hohenzollern dynasty was crowned after a sham referendum. Before the new elections were held, a committee was formed by the Liberal-Conservative government whose role was to ensure that each fraction would obtain its due share of representatives during the April 1866 vote. Subsequently, instructions were sent to prefects ordering them to ensure election of the agreed lists of candidates. The newly elected parliament adopted a new constitution, which introduced parliamentary government and revoked universal male suffrage. According to the new electoral law, app. 1.5% of male adults who met strict property requirements elected directly 80% of deputies, while the rest of male adults elected 20% of deputies in an indirect vote. In its basic form this electoral system remained in force until the outbreak of WWI, but the number of direct voters gradually increased to about 6% of male adults in 1914. The suffrage in Senate elections was even more restrictive. In 1911, it encompassed only about 1.5% of male adults.
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The election held in October 1866 was organized by the coalition government. It was the last non-manipulated vote held in Romania before 1914. It resulted in a fragmented parliament in which all elite fractions were represented. In February 1867, the new assembly ousted the coalition government, and a ministry led by a moderate Liberal was voted into office.\textsuperscript{76} The new government had to face a growing Conservative opposition, however. Hence, it dissolved the assembly and held a fraudulent vote in December 1867 in order to ensure election of a more complacent parliament. The election of 1867 “resulted in a permanent undermining of the electoral process, establishing a tradition that would last well after World War I.” The prince was at least partially responsible for this outcome, as he accepted and even encouraged the fraud during the 1867 vote.\textsuperscript{77} Hence, the experiment with competitive oligarchy in Romania very short lived: it lasted only one year. In this case, the competitive oligarchy was established after a period of PA monarchy, but the latter was obviously too short to result in emergence of the tradition of free electoral competition. The latter was additionally undermined by the monarch himself, who organized two rigged elections. Moreover, the coups of 1864 and 1866 undermined the respect for constitutionalism in Romania.

Hence, the country developed into a pluralist but non-competitive oligarchy similar to contemporary Hungary or Italy, but with elections which were meaningless to a much larger extent than in the latter countries. At the beginning of its political development, an equilibrium seemed to emerge under which the monarch effectively determined the choice of prime minister using his prerogative to dismiss the government, which later confirmed its rule through fraudulent elections. This scheme of events occurred in 1869, 1870 and 1871. Yet, the king, in
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order not to alienate any part of the elite, started to interchange the Liberal and Conservative parties in power. By 1895, the system of rotation, which was similar to the practice of *turno pacifico* existing at the time in Spain, became already well entrenched. The 1895 turnover in power stirred few political passions as the Conservative prime minister, whose government had been dismissed, knew well that his party would return to power after the next electoral cycle.\(^{78}\)

The newly-emerged political system ensured political representation and guaranteed civil liberties to landowners and urban middle classes, while disenfranchising almost the entire peasantry. Both parties opposed plans to extend the franchise, but the Conservatives were more intransigent in their opposition. The main fraction within the party opposed electoral reforms as it feared that elections under universal suffrage could not be effectively controlled by the government, and hence that a legislature thus formed would enact land reforms and introduce progressive taxation.\(^{79}\)

The lack of effective land reforms resulted in growing unrest among the peasantry, which culminated in a brutally-suppressed uprising in March 1907. More than 10,000 peasants were killed during the revolt.\(^{80}\)

Ultimately, although the peasant problem remained the subject of constant parliamentary discussion, a significant land reform and universal suffrage were adopted only after the end of the WWI, after the consequences of the Bolshevik revolution terrified the elite. However, the legacy of electoral fraud plagued Romania also during the interwar period, when only three relatively free elections were held.

The political history of Romania after it gained independence in 1859 gives confirmation to two hypotheses advanced in this dissertation: the difficulty to establish a PA monarchy in a country lacking a long-established legitimate royal dynasty, and the inherent instability of
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competitive oligarchies not preceded by sufficiently long periods of PA monarchy. Because of unfavorable historical legacy, the path from PA monarchy to sustainable democracy was largely closed to Romania and the other Balkan countries in the late nineteenth century, even though these countries adopted monarchical forms of government. Instead, the history of these countries was marked either by political instability or development of pluralist but non-competitive oligarchies which were accompanied by closed-outcome elections held under universal or restricted suffrage. In Romania, in particular, there emerged a system of predetermined rotation in power, in which election results were manufactured, and the king played the role of an arbiter between the main elite factions.

**Final Remarks**

The analysis of Piedmont, Hungary and Romania illustrated that self-sustaining competitive oligarchies could emerge and transform to self-sustaining democracies only if they had been preceded by PA monarchies. In this regard, competitive oligarchies were as unstable as European democracies established lacking a legacy of PA monarchy, in which the respect for the principles of constitutionalism and open-outcome elections had not had a chance to develop. This finding qualifies Dahl’s\(^{81}\) observation that the experience of competitive oligarchy facilitated the emergence of self-sustaining democracies. According to Dahl, the masses were more likely to embrace the principle of electoral contestation for power if the latter had been initially restricted to narrow elite. But the analysis presented in this chapter shows that restricted suffrage did not help in consolidation of open electoral politics. Regardless of the scope of suffrage, elected politicians faced the same incentive to rig elections and remain in power forever. This incentive was not embraced by the ruling elites of competitive oligarchies only if they had come to power.
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after a long period of PA monarchy, during which open-outcome elections was a self-sustainable practice, and hence it could be embraced by the elected representatives. Then, self-sustaining competitive oligarchies such as Britain or Belgium functioned in conditions of elites’ mutual expectation that electoral results will be respected.

The fate of competitive oligarchies in Piedmont and Hungary reveals one of the paradoxes of democratic development. In short, it indicates that granting too much democracy in the short term might be bad for democracy in the long term. However, “too much democracy” should be understood very narrowly in this case: it refers solely to the establishment of the elected executive, which is only one of democratic dimensions. There is never “too much democracy” if one considers the quality of elections or, most of the time, the scope of suffrage. Nevertheless, self-sustaining democracies in such countries as the Netherlands, Belgium, Denmark and Sweden were established mostly because these polities first experienced limited electoral competition under PA monarchy, which encompassed only the legislative power. If these countries had made in the nineteenth century a direct transition from absolute monarchy to a competitive oligarchy or democracy, such-established democracies or competitive oligarchies would likely have shared the fate of Italy and Hungry and degenerated into non-competitive oligarchies, with bleak perspectives for a transition to self-sustaining democracy. In case of Italy and Hungary such a transition was ultimately achieved (in 1946 and 1990, respectively) but only under a pro-democratic international environment, when those countries were already characterized by high levels of economic development (the conditions which were not present before 1945).
CHAPTER 7
THE EFFECT OF COLONIAL AUTONOMY ON DEMOCRATIC STABILITY:
COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ISRAEL, JAMAICA, AND SRI LANKA

While Chapters 4 to 6 of this dissertation were devoted to the analysis of the path from PA monarchy to self-sustaining democracy, the goal of Chapters 7 and 8 is to illustrate the path through which colonies characterized by long periods of internal autonomy made a transition to self-sustaining democracy, and, contrastingly, the failure of the colonies which did not experience long colonial autonomy to survive as democracies. The causal process which linked long periods of colonial autonomy with democratic survival and prevalence of colonial autonomy among the territories colonized by the Europeans were already discussed in Chapter 1. Here one needs to briefly reiterate the principal points. First of all, although the relationship between the length of colonial autonomy and democratic survival was robust, few colonies experienced long periods of colonial autonomy. Long periods of colonial autonomy were established, with the exceptions of Lebanon, the Philippines and Papua-New Guinea, only in the British colonies, but democracies established in those British ex-colonies which had not experienced long colonial autonomy died at similar rates as democracies established in other ex-colonies. Among the British colonies, only Guyana, India, Israel, Jamaica, Mauritius, Sri Lanka, Trinidad, and four settler colonies (the United States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand) experienced periods of colonial autonomy of ten years or longer. Within the group of ex-colonies with a legacy of long autonomy, post-colonial democracies collapsed in Burma, Guyana, the Philippines and Lebanon, and survived in the other countries. On the other hand, among thirty-nine countries which achieved independence having experienced a shorter period of colonial autonomy, democracy survived until the present day only in Botswana. The average duration of a post-colonial democracy within this group was just five years. Regarding the factors which conditioned granting of long colonial autonomy by the British, the timing of British colonization
played probably the greatest role. The British colonies which were established in the first half of the nineteenth century or earlier developed a viable Westernized middle class already before WWI. Already during the interwar period, the British were willing to give this middle class partial responsibility for governance through autonomous institutions. Contrasting, in the British colonies which were established in the late nineteenth century (i.e. primarily in Africa), viable Westernized middle class developed only in the 1950s or did not develop at all. Autonomy was established in such colonies shortly before the British were forced to grant them independence in the 1950s and 1960s. Hence, the period of autonomy was very short in those cases. Otherwise, the British granted autonomy to their settler colonies without preconditions.¹

One should note, however, that among the countries which experienced (exceptionally) a long colonial autonomy and subsequent democratic collapse, the positive effect of the former on democratic survival was still visible. In Burma, democracy survived for thirteen years after independence, and it would have probably survived for much longer if not for a historical idiosyncrasy. Namely, in 1958 the elected government of U Nu turned over the power, constitutionally, to the army chief of staff Ne Win, with the hope that the latter would stabilize situation in the country which was threatened by Communist conspiracies and ethnic separatist uprisings. Ne Win organized democratic elections in 1960 and handed back power to U Nu. However, the military, having experienced the power for once, desired to reestablish control. In 1962 Ne Win conducted a successful military coup after which one-party state was established. In the Philippines democracy survived for twenty-six years after independence until the 1972 executive coup, conducted by President Ferdinand Marcos. However, pressure to re-democratize remained strong in the country. Marcos failed to establish a stable form of authoritarianism and

¹ Israel also fit the former category.
was removed in a pro-democratic popular uprising in 1986. Finally, in Lebanon democratic rule survived for twenty-nine years until the outbreak of the civil war in 1975. Democracy, although in a flawed form, was subsequently reestablished in Lebanon after the country regained internal sovereignty in 2006. Hence, in Burma, the Philippines and Lebanon post-colonial democracies survived for much longer than in ex-colonies which experienced short periods of colonial autonomy. The true outlier to this pattern was Guyana, where democracy survived for only two years after independence was granted in 1968 in spite of a legacy of long colonial autonomy. Still, even there this legacy prevented the establishment of one-party state. Instead, competitive autocracy under personalist rule of President Forbes Burnham functioned during the Cold War era, and subsequently the country made a transition to democracy with the open-outcome 1992 election, which the opposition won. Exceptionally, the legacy of colonial autonomy did not lead to formation of commitment to democracy among the elected Guyanese elites. Instead, an openly Marxist power won the 1953 election under colonial autonomy, which forced the British to suspend the autonomous institutions for the period of four years.

This chapter offers a qualitative study whose goal is to illustrate the causal process linking the long periods of colonial autonomy with subsequent democratic survival. In order to identify relevant causal process, I will use the “most different systems” research design (also called the Mill’s method of similarity/agreement). In this design, a researcher compares cases which are very different apart from sharing one similarity and, obviously, the outcome of interest. In this case the variables whose values are different on particular cases are assumed to be controlled for, which increases the probability that the shared similarity is the cause of the outcome of interest.² Regarding this chapter, the shared similarity is the experience of a long

period of colonial autonomy before independence, and the shared outcome is democratic survival.

Still, one could argue that the philosopher who laid the theoretical basis for the method of agreement, J.S. Mill, argued that this method cannot be used to determine the existence of causal relationships in social sciences because each outcome can be produced by multiple causes. Yet, one should note that my application of the Mill’s method does not stand on its own; rather, it is a part of a wider research project which takes advantage of the mixed methods approach. Within the wider project, Chapter 7 traces the process through which long colonial autonomy led to democratic stability, while some cases from Chapter 8, which lacked both long colonial autonomy and democratic stability, serve as really-existing counterfactuals to the cases from Chapter 7. Hence, the goal of the analysis in Chapters 7 and 8 is to determine if there exists a real causal process hidden behind the statistical relationships detected in Chapter 3. Ultimately, the inference derived from the application of qualitative methods is enhanced with the inference achieved through the application of quantitative methods in the form of regression analysis on the relevant population. Hence, the problem of multiple causes leading to the same outcome, as identified by J.S. Mill, is to a large extent solved.

The cases chosen for analysis in Chapter 7 are Israel, Sri Lanka and Jamaica. These countries are different in numerous ways (the differences are summarized in Table 7-1), which should help identify the causal process leading from colonial autonomy to democratic survival. The first difference considers the level of development. At the moment of independence, Jamaica and Israel had GDP per capita 2.5 times larger than Sri Lanka, which was a generally an
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undeveloped country, and moreover, Israel started to develop very fast shortly afterward. In
terms of ethnic diversity, Jamaican society was relatively homogeneous with Black Jamaicans
constituting about 91% of the population and Afro-European Jamaicans about 6%, but the
cleavage between the two groups has never assumed political significance. Both groups spoke
English and were Christian. In contrast, Sri Lanka was characterized by several important and
politically relevant ethnic and religious cleavages. The dominant ethnic group, Singhalese,
formed about 70% of the country’s population at the moment of independence and was primarily
Buddhist. The predominantly Hindu Tamil ethnic group formed about 23% of the population and
was geographically concentrated in the northern and eastern parts of the country. Yet, half of this
group belonged to the so-called Indian Tamils, who lacked Ceylonese citizenship. Sri Lankan
Moors, who professed Islam, formed about 6% of the population and spoke a dialect of Tamil.
Finally, some Sinhalese and Tamils were Catholics (altogether about 9% of the population).
Since independence, the cleavage between Singhalese and Tamil communities has been a source
of political conflict and culminated in the civil war fought between 1983 and 2009, which
severely destabilized the Sri Lankan democracy and, depending on which definition of the
concept is used, resulted in its breakdown. Finally, the society of Israel was also ethnically
divided. During the period of British mandate (1920-1948), the Jewish community established its
own political institutions in which the Arab inhabitants of Palestine refused to participate. During
the creation of the independent Israel (in 1948), most Arabs were expelled, while the remaining
Arab population (9% in 1950, gradually increasing to 17% in 2000) was granted Israeli
citizenship with certain limited rights. In addition, the Jews of Israel remained divided into
Ashkenazi (of European descent) and Sephardic (Middle Eastern descent) groups. The ethnic
division between Jews and Arabs created political tensions, but it did not significantly destabilize
the Israeli democracy.

In contrast to the numerous cultural and economic differences, the three analyzed cases
shared one crucial similarity, which was the presence of long periods of colonial autonomy
installed by the British. The British mandate in Palestine was created in 1920, in a situation when
there was already a large presence of Jewish settlers in the territory. Under the terms of the
mandate, the British created autonomous institutions, which were however boycotted by the
Arab majority. Those included the legislature, Assembly of Representatives, and the self-
government, Jewish National Council, which was responsible to the assembly. In 1948, the
assembly became the first parliament of the independent Israel.

Sri Lanka became a British colony at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The first
legislative council with some elected members was established on the island in 1910. In 1924,
the majority of members of the legislative council became elected, but the suffrage was limited
to about 16% of male adults. In 1931 the British granted self-government to Ceylon, with its
legislature, the State Council, elected under universal male suffrage, and responsible
government. Independence came in 1948 and the State Council became the country’s first
parliament.

Jamaica became a British colony in 1655 and its economy was based on slave labor
which worked on sugar plantations. The Jamaican legislative assembly was created already in the
seventeenth century, but it represented only European plantation owners. The suffrage was
restricted and the majority of members were appointed. A major reform came in 1944 when the
British created self-government with legislature elected under universal suffrage and responsible
government. Independence was granted in 1962 and since then Jamaica has remained a democracy.

Hence, the three analyzed countries shared long periods of colonial autonomy (28 years in Israel, 18 in Jamaica and 17 in Sri Lanka). Their democracies also never collapsed after independence, although (especially in case of Sri Lanka and Jamaica) they experienced significant strains. As I would argue, the only single important factor responsible for survival of democracy in these countries was the common legacy of long colonial autonomy. Obviously, the other common feature of the analyzed countries was British colonial background. Yet, this factor did not help democracy survive, as I will show in Chapter 8 where I analyze how democracies collapsed in those British colonies which experienced a short colonial autonomy using the examples of Kenya, Zambia and Malaysia.

**Democracy by Default in Israel**

**Development of Jewish Autonomous Institutions under the British Mandate for Palestine**

Israel had been a functioning democracy since the first election to its parliament, Knesset, was held in 1949 one year after independence. The smooth functioning of the Israeli democracy has been usually explained by mostly European origins of its Jewish population and close connections with other Western democracies, especially the United States. Still, Israeli democratic institutions and parties did not emerge at the moment of independence like a phoenix from ashes. Independence was preceded by a long period of autonomy, which was established by the British for the Jewish community in the mandate of Palestine. Israeli democratic institutions were a direct continuation of the bodies which were founded already during the period of the
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mandate. As a result, Jews in Palestine gained experience in self-government already before independence.⁶

In the late nineteenth century, Palestine was an economically undeveloped province of the Ottoman Empire, inhabited mostly by Arab Muslims with relatively small Christian and Jewish minorities. At the time, in reaction to the growing anti-Semitism, the idea of Zionism spread among European Jewry. Zionists called for establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine, which was considered the ancestral Jewish land. Although the first Jewish rural settlements in Palestine were established already in 1878, it was the Zionist organization, formed in 1897, which coordinated the first waves of significant Jewish immigration to Palestine. As a result of these migrations, made possible due to cooperation and bribery among local Turkish officials, the number of Jews in Palestine reached about 85,000 in 1914, which was 12% of its total population.⁷ Still, the crucial moment during the history of Zionism came a few years later. When military defeat of the Ottoman Empire in WWI seemed increasingly likely, the British Foreign Secretary Balfour issued in November 1917 a declaration in which the British government committed itself to organize in Palestine “a national home for the Jewish people”. Apparently, the declaration would not have been issued if not for the intense lobbying by the Zionist Organization. Subsequently, the Ottoman Empire was defeated and Palestine came under the British occupation. In September 1923, the League of Nations legalized the occupation through foundation of the British mandate for Palestine; its provisions included a Jewish national home. The mandate was formally dissolved in 1948.
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Quickly after the beginning of the British occupation, the Jewish community in Palestine established institutions of self-government in which participation was restricted to Jews enlisted in the Register of the Jewish Community. This philosophy of separate institutions for each religious community was a continuation of the rules of the Ottoman millet system, which provided for separate courts and a medium of self-government for Christians and Jews in the empire. In 1920, the first election to the legislature of the community, Assembly of Representatives, was held. The suffrage was universal and the electoral system of proportional representation was used. The assembly was empowered to accept a budget and legislate on all matters relevant to the community. Although the legislature was to be elected every three years, only four elections were ultimately held: in 1920, 1925, 1931 and 1944. Various political troubles prevented the vote on numerous occasions. In particular, the mandate of the assembly elected in 1931 was constantly extended; initially due to problems with voter register, and subsequently because of the Arab Rebellion (1936-39) and WWII.8

The Assembly of Representatives elected an executive body, called National Council, whose membership varied between 23 and 42 members. The National Council, on the other hand, elected an executive of 6 to 14 members, which ran “departments of political affairs, local communities, rabbinate, education, health, social welfare, physical culture and information”. These departments worked alongside the ministries of the mandate government. Both in the National Council and the executive all parties enjoyed representation in proportion to their seat share in the assembly; in other words, the Jewish community executive was formed according to the Swiss model.9

Yet, initially the autonomous institutions of the Jewish community functioned and collected taxes without being formally legalized by the British mandate authorities. Only in 1928 two legal acts recognized the community of Jews in Palestine. The first act endorsed the assembly, the National Council and the Rabbinical Council (which dealt with religious matters), and local government. The community was granted specific judicial powers, the authority to provide certain services to its members (including education, housing, healthcare, transportation, religious establishments, etc.) and the right to collect taxes for that purpose. All Jews living in Palestine belonged to the community unless they declined membership. The British also encouraged the Palestinian Arabs to create their own autonomous institutions on the basis of the acts which formed the legal basis of the Jewish community, but the Arabs did not take advantage of this opportunity. In addition, Herbert Samuel, the First High Commissioner for Palestine, intended to establish autonomous institutions which would serve all the inhabitants of the Mandate. In 1922 a plan was announced to transform the appointed mandate Advisory Council into an elected body. The new legislative council was to have 23 members, including 12 elected and 10 appointed members. Among the 12 elected members, seats were provided for eight Arab Muslims, two Arab Christians and two Jews. Even though this solution was favorable to Arabs, they boycotted the subsequent election on the grounds that all legislation approved by the council was subject to the high commissioner’s veto. Hence, the legislative council of the Palestine was never convened and no further efforts to create an elected body for the entire mandate was undertaken by the British.10

Apart from the Assembly of Representatives and the National Council, the Jewish Community in Palestine developed other well-functioning elected institutions. One of the most
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important was General Federation of Labor (Histadrut). The organization was established in 1920 as a joint effort of two labor parties active in Palestine. It was led between 1921 and 1935 by David Ben-Gurion. Histadrut was not only a trade union as it also provided a variety of welfare services and facilitated arrival of new immigrants. Nearly a sixth of the Jewish population of Palestine belonged to Histadrut. Its internal institutions were democratically elected by the members according to the principle of proportional representation. Still, only socialist parties were represented in Histadrut in practice.\textsuperscript{11}

In 1929, the Zionist Organization established the Jewish Agency for Palestine. This body was recognized by the British and its main function was to facilitate Jewish immigration to Palestine, help the arriving immigrants, and advise and lobby the mandate authorities. It closely cooperated with the National Council, usually sending joint representations to the British mandate authorities and working together on legislative projects. The agency was organizationally linked with the democratically-organized Zionist Organization (whose members resided both in Palestine and around the world); its president was the same person. Last but not least, the Jews in Palestine enjoyed elected local government institutions.\textsuperscript{12} All of these democratic Jewish autonomous bodies, established during the mandate period, provided for a solid institutional foundation to the new state, which turned out capable of resisting the Arab invasion of 1948-49 and subsequently absorbed a large wave of destitute immigrants from Europe and the Middle East.\textsuperscript{13}

Along with self-governing institutions, Jews resident in Palestine developed their own political parties. Their origins go back to 1905, when two Zionist socialist parties were
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established with members both in Palestine and the Russian Empire. In 1919, both parties united into Unity of Labor Movement (Ahdut Haavoda), which became the dominant political force in Histadrut and the assembly. In 1930, Ahdut Haavoda united with a smaller socialist party (Hapoel Hatzair), forming Mapai (acronym for Worker’s Party of the Land of Israel). The two leaders of the party were Berl Katznelson (died in 1944) and David Ben-Gurion (the party’s founder in 1905 and prime minister in 1948-54 and 1955-63). Altogether, socialist parties received 42% of the seats in the 1920 assembly election, 41% in 1925, 56% in 1931 and 60% in the 1944 elections. The contemporary Israeli Labor Party, established in 1968, is their direct continuation.14

Apart from the socialist parties, other political groupings active in the Jewish community politics included right-wing, centrist, communal and religious parties. The right wing was dominated by the Revisionist Zionist movement, founded in 1925 by Ze’ev Jabotinsky (1880-1940) and subsequently led by Menachem Begin, prime minister in 1977-83. Revisionist Zionists argued for immediate creation of independent Palestine already during the British mandate on both banks of the Jordan River, if necessary by force. They also were firmly anti-socialist and opposed Histadrut and other cooperative institutions established by the labor parties. Yet, the party did not manage to achieve majority in the Zionist Organization, creating for that reason, in 1935, a separate New Zionist Organization. The Revisionists also established in 1934 National Labor Federation, a competing organization to Histadrut, but the union operated without much success. Revisionists obtained 7% of seats in the 1925 election and 23% in the 1931 election; they boycotted the 1944 vote. The movement engaged in armed struggle against the mandate authorities already during the 1930s, and intensified the hostilities after WWII, acting often

against the wishes and in conflict with the labor-dominated community government. The continuation of Revisionist Zionism after independence was until 1988 Herut (Freedom) and afterwards Likud (The Consolidation) parties. Religious and communal parties initially managed to obtain significant representation in the community’s institutions, but their strength gradually decreased as a result of continuing immigration. The former gained 20% of the seats in the 1920 elections, but subsequently their strength diminished to about 10% of the vote. The communal electoral lists obtained 23% of the seats in 1920, but only 4% in 1944. Finally, General Zionists were a moderate pro-capitalist middle class party, whose strength was about 5% of the vote.

One should note that Jewish political parties, in addition to political activities, engaged in various other undertakings, such as provision of housing, education, and establishment of new settlements for the arriving immigrants. At the moment they disembarked from a ship at Jaffa, new immigrants were targeted by various partisan and labor union activists, accepted party membership and experienced a quick acculturation to democratic values and procedures of the Jewish community. “It was largely due to existence of these parties, which had conducted intensive political activities for almost half a century, including periodical elections by popular vote, that independent Israel (1948) was able to proceed immediately to the establishment of an orderly and democratic parliamentary system.”

Democratic values developed within the Jewish community of Palestine in a sense by default. The ideology of socialist Zionism, dominant among Jewish immigrants, did not emphasize the civil rights aspect of democracy; rights had only a procedural meaning. Yet, Ben
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Gurion and other Mapai leaders were genuinely committed “to the restrictions of democracy and the rule of law, but they often interpreted them in their own way” so that such goals as security, good of the state or even good of the party were not undermined.\(^{17}\) In general, the Ben-Gurion’s statist ideology included commitment to a democratic form of government, although with emphasis on its majoritarian aspect.\(^{18}\) This majoritarian-procedural concept of democracy became subsequently dominant in the independent Israel, where elections were free and fair and freedoms necessary for democratic competition were respected, but civil rights were frequently undermined as they were not supported by a formal bill of rights.\(^{19}\)

**Democratic Politics in Independent Israel**

The political situation in the Palestine changed rapidly after the end of WWII. Although the British became increasingly pro-Arab as a result of wider foreign policy considerations, the international community became generally more pro-Jewish in reaction to the Holocaust. In the meanwhile, as a result of the continuing immigration, the Jewish population in Palestine increased from 100,000 in 1920 to 680,000 in 1947, which was about 33% of the total population. The future of the mandate was formally decided in the November 1947 UN resolution, which provided for the establishment of separate Jewish and Arab states and UN-administered Jerusalem. While the Jewish National Council accepted the resolution, the Arabs were vehemently opposed. This signified that the conflict could be resolved only by military means. At the moment when the resolution was adopted, the Jewish community of Palestine was ready to establish an independent state from the political, organizational and military points of view. “Two generations of intensive communal life, both on the local and national level,
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contributed great deal to the maturity of Jewish public life. On the whole, communal activity became gradually more democratic, and the wide experience in self-government thus gained by the yishuv [Jewish community] served the State of Israel well in setting up its constitutional organs and administrative machinery.”  

As independence approached and the mandate was to terminate in May 1948, the government structure of the Jewish community in Palestine underwent transformation. As a response to the 1947 UN resolution, in March 1948 the People’s Council was formed, which took over the function of the assembly as a legislative authority; it renamed itself Provisional State Council in May 1948, just before the independence. In terms of membership, the People’s Council was composed of fourteen members of the National Council, eleven Palestinian [Jewish] members of the executive of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, and twelve members from parties and communities who had been represented neither in the National Council nor the Jewish Agency. In practice, members of the Provisional State Council came largely from the elected Assembly of Representatives. In April 1948 the council elected its cabinet, or the People’s Administration, which became provisional government of Israel in May 1948. Regarding its composition and structure, the provisional government was a continuation of the executive institutions of the Jewish community of Palestine: the National Council and the Jewish Agency. After the former disbanded, most of its members came to work in the newly-organized government ministries; the government also absorbed most employees of the Jewish Agency. The political composition the Provisional State Council and the provisional government reflected the strength of Israeli political forces as shown during the last elections to the assembly, held in 1944 and 1931. Hence, all political forces were represented in these institutions, and Mapai and
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Mapam, the two socialist parties, did not have majority. In practice, the provisional government functioned as a government of national unity until the new government was formed in March 1949 after the first Knesset elections of January 1949. Other institutions active during the mandate were also preserved in the independent Israel, although their functions changed somewhat. These included the Jewish Agency for Palestine (renamed Jewish Agency for Israel), the Zionist Organization and Histadrut. Consequently, there was a great degree of continuity between the institutions of the Jewish community and the institutions of the independent Israel.21 “Indeed, although Israel formally declared her independence in 1948, that declaration would have remained on paper without the solid and steady growth of the Jewish community and its institutions under, and often despite, foreign rule.”22

This continuation was also evident in terms of the composition of the elected leadership of Israel and its political parties. Political leaders, accustomed to bargaining in conditions of democratic politics during the mandate, continued to rule Israel for almost three decades after independence. For example, of the 171 members of the fourth Assembly of Representatives, about fifty-five subsequently served in the Knesset. In 1971, there were still ten assembly veterans in the Israeli parliament. Joseph Sprinzak, a long-term member of the assembly’s presidium, became first speaker of Knesset and served in this capacity until his death in 1959.23 Otherwise, still at the beginning of the 1970s, leaders of most political parties were foreign-born and had gained political experience during the years of the mandate. The exception to this rule was Herut, whose leadership was mostly born in Palestine.24

22 Zohar 1974, 11.
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In general, despite frequent changes of governments, Israeli political life after independence was characterized by relative stability. All political parties, which had its roots in the mandate era, implicitly accepted the democratic political framework.\textsuperscript{25} Elections met democratic standards because they were organized by a multi-partisan Central Elections Committee. In this commission no party had a majority and hence decisions had to be made by consensus, which ensured impartiality.\textsuperscript{26} The army has remained loyal to the civilian government; this tradition also dates back to the mandate period when the Jewish self-defense units, Haganah, were formed by the National Council.\textsuperscript{27} The immigrants who came after independence were quickly acculturated to the democratic and nationalist political values. The existing political parties and Histadrut made sure to politically mobilize the new arrivals, similarly as they did regarding the waves of immigration which came during the mandate era.\textsuperscript{28} Hence, when Labor-led coalition lost electoral majority to the right-wing coalition in 1977, the first transition in power occurred without significant problems.

Generally, it would be hard to argue that the Israeli democracy would have function equally smoothly if it had been established from scratch only in 1948. Undoubtedly, the British greatly contributed to its survival by facilitating the development of the Jewish autonomous institutions during the mandate period. As a consequence “the masses and elites gained experience, well before independence, in the functioning of democratic political institutions.”\textsuperscript{29}

During the mandate years the elites habituated the norms of democratic politics, including the
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practice of bargaining and coalition buildings, and developed sufficient mutual trust to honor election results and other commitments after independence. The army firmly stood behind the principle of civilian control; and the citizenry refused to support the parties which renounced the democratic framework (the support for Communist never exceeded 5% of the vote). In general, long experience with democratic politics before independence greatly contributed to democratic stability in the independent Israel as it resulted in acceptance of democracy as the default political system both by the elites and the general population of the country.  

**Jamaica: Westminster Model in the Caribbean**

**Beginnings of Autonomy under British Colonial Rule**

Jamaica is one of a few countries in the developing world which has enjoyed continuous democratic government since independence. Not surprisingly, it is also one of a few countries that had experienced a relatively long, eighteen-year-period of colonial autonomy with responsible executive (1944-62). It was preceded by a much longer period during which Jamaican legislature was partially elected under restricted suffrage. Although after independence elections in several urban districts have been plagued by politically motivated violence and intimidation with patronage as a main incentive of party identification, the electoral process in Jamaica has been generally free and fair.  

Moreover, Jamaica has remained a relatively stable democracy despite being a predominantly rural country until the 1970s, with economy based on tourism and bauxite extraction, and economic stagnation. As of 2012, Jamaicans were poorer on average than in 1970.

---
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Jamaica was initially established as Spanish colony. During the period of Spanish rule, the majority of original inhabitants died of exploitation or diseases, and few Spaniards settled on the island. Hence, when the British took over Jamaica in 1655, only 3,000 people lived there. Subsequently, the British established a monoculture sugar economy based on imported slave labor. The overwhelming majority of the population was enslaved, although a small minority of whites also lived on the island, and there was a growing community of free Colored people. When the slavery was abolished in 1834, already 372,000 people lived in Jamaica. This included 84% of the former Black slaves, 12% of free Colored people, and only 4% of whites.

The first representative institutions were established in Jamaica already in 1662. In this regard, Jamaica was granted the same institutional setup as the British Northern American colonies. The executive power remained vested in the governor, who was appointed by the crown. The legislature consisted of an appointed upper chamber and an elected lower chamber, or the House of Assembly. The suffrage was restricted to property owners. These regulations resulted in relatively wide suffrage (with a small majority of white males enfranchised) in North America, but in Jamaica the scope of enfranchisement was very narrow due to the concentration of property among rich plantation owners. Slaves were of course restricted from the suffrage, and free non-whites were enfranchised only in the 1820s. Hence, because of its strictly elitist character, white political participation during the slavery era did not leave a lasting legacy in Jamaica.33

The political and economic landscape of Jamaica started to change after the abolition of slavery in 1834. On one hand, the economy experienced a deepening economic crisis caused by decreasing prices of sugar, the process which was related to the opening of the home market to
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sugar produced outside of the British colonies. The crisis affected both white planters and Black farmers. The former responded by importation of indentured laborers from India. The scope of this immigration, however, never reached the proportions of other British colonies in the region, notably Trinidad and Guyana. On the other hand, a large number of Blacks became political and economically empowered. With the help of missionary churches and government assistance, they abandoned sugar plantations and acquired their own plots of land. In this way they obtained the right to vote. In the 1850s, Blacks constituted already the majority of the electorate which was estimated at only 2% of adult males, however. Black farmers were politically mobilized by Colored politicians, who managed to win a few parliamentary seats in the 1851 and subsequent elections (although some Blacks met property requirements for franchise, few were wealthy enough to meet the much higher qualifications to hold political office). The indirect character of Black representation inhibited the influence of Black farmers over the political process, but their partial mobilization nevertheless threatened the political domination of the white elite.\(^{34}\)

The growing economic difficulties culminated in the outbreak of the Morant Bay Rebellion in October 1865. The rebellion, which was in fact a large-scale riot sparked by increasing efforts to eradicate squatting on abandoned plantations, was brutally crushed by the British governor. About 440 Black Jamaicans were killed, and further 350 tried and executed. The bloody suppression of the rebellion caused protests in London, where liberal reformers made calls to reform the system of the government in the colony. But the outbreak led also to a panic among white Jamaicans, who anticipated that under the existing political framework their domination would be gradually undermined, and opted for a more direct administration of the island by the British government. The white elites were also alarmed about the growing
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influence of the parliamentary representatives which were sympathetic to the Black interests. There was a real danger that Blacks, once effectively mobilized for political purposes, would assume control over the assembly. Hence, the legislature renounced the charter and dissolved itself. After 1866, Jamaica was ruled directly from the metropolis as a crown colony.\textsuperscript{35}

In the new institutional setup, there was only a single legislative chamber called the legislative council. It was entirely appointed by the governor until the 1884 reform, when in addition to ten appointed members (those included the governor with two votes), nine elected seats were added. Technically, the power of the elected members was enhanced by additional provisions: all elected members, if voting in unison, could block any legislation, and six of them could veto a revenue bill. The governor possessed the right, however, to enforce legislation which he deemed to be of “paramount importance”. The council was further reformed in 1895. The number of elected members was increased to fourteen and the number of appointed members to fifteen (including the governor). Nine members became sufficient to veto a revenue bill. The suffrage, however, remained restricted by property and income qualifications. The percentage of the enfranchised population fluctuated widely, however, as a result of changing economic situation and efforts to disenfranchise illiterate Blacks. Only about 6\% of male adults were registered for the first election in 1884. This percentage increased to 24\% in 1893, decreased to about 4\% in 1906, and reached 13\% in 1911. In 1919 women were granted the right to vote, but they had to meet stricter income requirements than men. Ultimately, during the interwar period the percentage of enfranchised adults was approximately 15\%. However, the perception of relative impotence of the elected members depressed the turnout, which was lower than 10\% at some elections and never reached 50\% of the electorate before 1944. Although
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Blacks formed the majority of the registered voters, and first Black representatives were elected already in 1889, most enfranchised Blacks remained politically apathetic. Otherwise, introduction of the crown colony system in 1866 actually hampered ascendancy of the Black majority, also from the economic point of view. Under the new administration, peasants were required to provide land deeds or face eviction. Thousands of squatters were evicted as a result. Plantation economy again became the dominant mode of production, with banana replacing sugar as the main crop.  

Colonial Autonomy under Responsible Government

The majority of Black Jamaicans underwent gradual political mobilization during the interwar period. One of the reasons of this development was active participation of Jamaican soldiers in WWI. In addition, the post-war economic crisis and the Great Depression led to recurrent waves of Black labor mobilization, both among the plantation and industrial workers. The strikes did not automatically lead to creation of viable political parties and trade unions, however. Only in 1928 Marcus Garvey, a radical Black activist expelled from the United States, formed the first anticolonial political party, which won one seat at the 1929 election. The first trade union was founded in 1935 by A. G. S. Coombs and Alexander Bustamante, but only a massive outbreak of labor unrest in 1938 resulted in formation of political organizations with substantial support. In 1938 lawyer Norman Manley founded the People’s National Party (PNP). The party was organizationally linked with Bustamante Industrial Trade Union (BITU), which quickly became the largest trade union in Jamaica. Manley and Bustamante were Colored intellectuals who aimed to mobilize Black masses with the demands of universal suffrage, land reform, and labor legislation. But a single political party turned out too small for two charismatic

individuals, and in 1942 Bustamante dissociated his trade union from PNP and left the party. One year later he established the Jamaican Labor Party (JLP). 37

The commission of inquiry sent from London to investigate the 1938 labor unrest recommended major social reforms and creation of a representative government based on adult suffrage, but implementation of the reforms was halted by the war. The major political breakthrough came in 1944, when Jamaica was granted a new constitution which provided for limited self-government. The lower chamber, House of Representatives, was elected under universal suffrage, and half of the members of the Executive Council, presided by the British governor, were elected by the members of the House. However, the elected members of the Executive Council were only partially responsible for government policies, which were carried in agreement with the nominated members of the government. The December 1944 election was won by the Jamaica Labor Party, whose leader, Bustamante, became the unofficial chief executive. The JLP obtained 22 out of 32 seats with 41% of the vote. Manley’s People’s National Party, which represented the left wing of the political spectrum, took the second place, winning four seats with 24% of the vote. JLP won the subsequent election in December 1949, although it actually obtained slightly less votes than PNP (42.7% v. 43.5%), the effect of the plurality electoral system, and Bustamante continued in office as the chief executive. 38

Further constitutional reforms came in 1953, when a post of chief minister was created, the power of the elected ministers was increased, and the latter became directly responsible to the legislature. The position of chief minister was occupied by the majority leader in the House of Representatives. Accordingly, Bustamante assumed the office, but he lost it in February 1955 to
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Norman Manley, after PNP won the general election in January 1955 gaining 18 out of 32 seats. In 1957, full internal self-government was granted to Jamaica with establishment of the cabinet system along the British model. PNP won the subsequent election in July 1959 with 55% of the vote, but lost the election in April 1962, which was conducted on the eve of independence. In April 1962 Bustamante took over as premier and in August 1962 he became the first prime minister of the independent Jamaica, ruling until the retirement in 1965. Hence, already before the independence there had been two alternations in power as a result of elections in Jamaica, which helped legitimize the principle of electoral turnover within the elite political culture. Since 1962, the PLP and the JLP regularly alternated in power. The JLP ruled in 1944-55, 1962-72, 1980-88 and 2007-12, while the PNP in 1955-62, 1972-80, 1988-2007 and since 2012. The two-party system emerged largely as a result of the plurality electoral system which was retained in Jamaica after the independence. Ideologically, both parties took centrist positions, with PNP adopting social democratic ideology and PLP a more conservative stance. In practical terms, political support has been based on patronage networks which ran across the race and class divisions. The politics in Jamaica after the 1972 election was also characterized by widespread political violence, with an important part played by neighborhood gangs tied to the main political parties.  

**Democratic Politics after Independence**

After the independence, the right-wing JLP government enacted policies aimed at stimulating economic growth and attracting foreign investment. Yet, the presence of foreign companies, which reserved top positions for expat white professionals, generated mixed feelings among the ordinary Jamaicans given the legacy of racism. In this context leftist ideas became
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increasingly popular among students and intellectuals. In the early 1960s, a Black Power Movement developed in Jamaica. One of its primary goals was to express support to the civil rights struggle in the United States and decolonization in Africa. Still, some of the intellectuals and students active in the moment espoused hardly democratic ideas, calling for the violent overthrow of the existing social order and empowerment of the Black masses. In October 1968 Walter Rodney, a Black Power Guyanese intellectual who had made trips to Cuba and the Soviet Union, was banned from returning to Jamaica. This decision stirred riots in Kingston, during which several people were killed and there was massive damage to the property. In reaction to the riots, the government restricted civil liberties. African American literature was banned, foreign Black Power activists were prohibited from entering the island, and native activists of the movement were harassed.  

Still, Jamaican democracy faced even more challenging trials. Partly in reaction to the crackdown on the Black Power Movement, the electorate voted the JLP government out of office in the 1972 election. PNP won 56% of the vote and its leader, Michael Manley (Norman’s son) became prime minister. In 1974 Manley launched an ambitious program of economic and social reforms known as “democratic socialism”. The reforms turned out unsuccessful, the country experienced severe recession and the PNP was defeated in the 1980 elections. The JLP doubted the Manley’s democratic credentials due to his good relations with several non-democratic leaders, including Fidel Castro. However, Manley insisted that Jamaica was to pursue socialist reforms under the principle of multi-party politics, which was to distinguish the Jamaican socialism from its Cuban counterpart.  
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furthermore it was indispensable for securing political support in Jamaica, where the concept is well embedded in political culture…” Although the PNP leader pursued certain anti-democratic measures, including passage of a controversial Gun Court Law in 1974, he agreed with the JLP leadership in 1978 on reforms of the electoral commission which enhanced its independent character and, consequently, ensured free and fair elections.42

Generally, the Jamaican elites’ strong commitment to democratic politics was clearly demonstrated through their actions during the crisis preceding the 1980 election. The socialist policies pursued by PNP, coupled with the worldwide recession after the 1973 oil crisis, led to economic downfall and extreme polarization between the PNP and JLP supporters.43 The campaign was marred by unprecedented level of political violence, and a coup plot was uncovered in the military. Certainly, “…the democratic system was under a genuine threat... Yet, Manley did not rig the election in order to stay in power; the JLP stopped just short of inciting complete breakdown of law and order; the Jamaica Defense Force caught the conspirators in its midst; and a team of honorable public servants was established to preside over the process of voter registration. Democracy came close to collapsing, but it did not do so”.44

According to Payne (1988), the democratic stability of Jamaica is a direct result of the British colonial legacy. Britain endowed Jamaica with democratic institutions, but this factor itself was not sufficient for democratic sustainability as similar institutions collapsed in different settings, notably in colonies which enjoyed much shorter periods of autonomy than Jamaica. Rather, what mattered was the substantial length of the period of colonial autonomy in Jamaica, which led to the situation in which “Britain socialized a generation of Jamaicans into broadly
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democratic values”. These Jamaican leaders, having been educated in British schools, practiced democratic politics during the period of colonial autonomy and then after independence. “The result was that, at independence, local leaders who genuinely believed in democracy took responsibility for its preservation and continued the process of education and dissemination into the next generation.”

This belief in democracy was built upon the mutual trust which originated from joint participation in the autonomous institutions. Hence, Jamaican political elites from the two main political parties shared a mutual expectation that election results and democratic rules of the game would be honored.

Overall, Jamaican leaders who ruled after independence began their careers during the period of colonial autonomy. This resulted in great degree of continuity between pre- and post-independence elite leadership. Alexander Bustamante, as mentioned, was a chief executive under colonial autonomy (in 1944-55) and later after independence (in 1962-67). However, he started his political career already in the interwar period, as a labor activist. Hugh Shearer, the prime minister from the JLP in 1965-72 and deputy prime minister in 1980-89, was an activist in the Bustamante’s trade union since 1943, member of House of Representatives in 1955-59 and 1967-72, and senator in 1962-67. Edward Saega, the JLP prime minister in 1980-88, was nominated to Legislative Council, the upper house of the Jamaican Parliament, in 1959. He was elected to the House of Representatives in 1962 and was a minister in Bustamante’s and Shearer’s JLP governments in 1962-72. He became the leader of JLP in 1974 and led the party to victory in the 1980 election on a platform of economic improvement and revitalization of liberal democracy.
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allegedly endangered by the PNP policies.\textsuperscript{48} Norman Manley, on the other hand, was
Bustamante’s cousin and knew him personally. Both leaders worked in the labor movement
during the interwar period. Manley, who founded the People’s National Party (PNP) in 1938,
expressed his commitment to democratic politics through both words and deeds. In particular, in
1952 he expelled Marxist politicians from the party. He authored several books and speeches in
which he outlined his commitment to multi-party politics.\textsuperscript{49}

Although undoubtedly the leaders’ actions prevented the collapse of Jamaican democracy
in 1980, it is also true that politicians in any democracy do not act in a vacuum. While elite
ideology influences the opinions of ordinary people, the elites also have to take into account
people’s expectations and reactions to hypothetical anti-democratic actions. In case of Jamaica,
an executive or a military coup would not have been welcomed by the general population, which
has been, apart from marginal groups of middle class radical intellectuals, overwhelmingly
supportive of the democratic principles. This support and general consensus on the rules of
multi-party politics was the result of decades of democratic practice during the colonial
autonomy and independence. Hence, the people’s attitudes constrained the leaders’ behavior in a
pro-democratic direction.\textsuperscript{50} On the other hand, it is also likely that grassroots civil society and
political party organizations, which had been developing since the late 1930s both in the urban
and rural setting, contributed to democratic sustainability of Jamaica in a longer term.\textsuperscript{51}

In Jamaica, long period of colonial autonomy led to a self-sustaining democracy, as I
would argue, through the socialization of democratic values and buildup of mutual trust among
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the elites and political leaders, while the general population followed suit. The Jamaica’s experience shows “that the democratic commitment of political leaders does have a significant impact on the prospect of stable democracy... The post-independence leadership of the Jamaican state has felt the necessary attachment to democratic system and has displayed an adherence to the rules of the game...”\(^{52}\) However, “if its political history in the 1940s had been different, Jamaica would have probably developed into a one-party, socialist state...”\(^{53}\) In other words, if the British had not preceded the Jamaican independence by several decades of colonial autonomy, Jamaica would have had a history similar to the British African colonies, where democracy collapsed shortly after independence and one-party states were established instead. Such cases are analyzed in the Chapter 8 of the dissertation.

**Sri Lanka: Democracy in Spite of Debacle**

**Early British Colonial Period**

One of the few instances of a relatively successful democracy in the developing world has been Sri Lanka. Until the controversial referendum of 1982 and the outbreak of the civil war in 1983 the country enjoyed more than three decades of a stable democratic government characterized by general respect for civil liberties and high participation on the part of ordinary citizens. At least until 1977, the conduct of elections was “beyond reproach”. Almost all instances of intimidation of vote-buying occurred at the local level and were usually punished. In case of electoral defeat, the party in power left office without any attempts to continue its rule indefinitely. In fact, Sri Lankan voters were ousting incumbents with regular frequency – alternation in office occurred six times in the period 1947-82.\(^{54}\) As I argue, the causal mechanism
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which contributed to a relative success of democracy in Sri Lanka was the same as in the cases of Israel and Jamaica. The country experienced a long period of colonial autonomy (in 1931-1948), during which both the elites and the masses internalized democratic values and procedures, and the elites developed mutual trust which resulted in the respect for principles of open-outcome elections and alternation in power.

Sri Lanka became a British colony in 1802 after periods of Portuguese and Dutch rule. In the nineteenth century its relatively prosperous plantation economy was based on coffee and tea cultivation. The long period of colonial rule led to emergence of Anglicized elite, which was however divided by ethnicity into Sinhalese, Tamil, and Burgher (European-Creole) subgroups, and by religion into Buddhist, Hindu, Christian and Muslim subgroups. The Sinhalese Buddhists formed a clear majority of the population, however (65% according to the 1901 census). In 1888 the Ceylon National Association (CNA) was founded. It was not, at least initially, an independence movement, but rather an elite association which lobbied the British for the increased employment of the Ceylonese in the civil service. In addition, CAN made a series of modest demands concerning introduction of self-government for the island.\(^{55}\) In fact, the British created a Legislative Council for Ceylon already in 1833, but it was for a long time an appointed body. As a result of pressures for increased elite participation, the council was reformed in 1910 and the first election was held in 1911. Out of twenty-one seats in the council, four were elected: two European, one Burgher and one at-large. In the at-large election, the level of enfranchisement was miniscule: only 3,000 voters out of 4.5 million people could vote; the number of voters among the Burghers and Europeans was even smaller. The next stage in the development of the Ceylonese nationalist movement came in 1915 when, after outbreak of an

ethnic riot, governor Robert Chalmers applied indiscriminate repression against social activists not directly related to the event. Most of the latter belonged to Buddhist temperance groups and religious elites. Several hundred people were killed and the repression stirred nationalist and anti-colonial sentiments in the colony. Subsequently, in 1919, the Ceylon National Council (CNC) was created as a merger of the Ceylon National Association with two smaller organizations. In the beginning, CNC united elite members of various ethnic backgrounds, but it quickly became dominated by the Buddhist Singhalese. Gradually, Tamils started to vote for their own candidates, while the leftist CNC members formed a separate Ceylon Labor Union.56

As a result of the pressures exerted by the CNC, further reforms of the Legislative Council were undertaken. The council elected in 1921 had thirty-seven members, out of whom sixteen were elected (eleven on the territorial basis and five by ethnic communities and special interests). In the 1924 election, out of forty-nine council seats, twenty-three were elected on a territorial basis and eleven by communal electorates. For the first time, the majority of council members were elected, but the suffrage was still limited to approximately 16% male adults due to property and income qualifications.57 In contrast to the earlier efforts at reform, the subsequent stage of political development came to a large extent as a result of an initiative of progressive British politicians. In 1927, the Secretary for the Colonies sent a commission to Sri Lanka whose aim was to prepare a reform of the existing constitution. The commission held numerous hearings; it determined that the existing institutions provided for insufficient minority representation and that the lower caste Sinhalese felt frustrated by the fact that the notables elected under restricted suffrage did not in fact represent their interests. As a remedy to this
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situation, the commission recommended introduction of universal suffrage and creation of
government departments responsible to the legislature. In fact, the idea of the universal suffrage
was not enthusiastically welcomed by most of the elected council members, but they could not
adopt a position which would be more conservative than the colonizer’s plan of reform.58

**Colonial Autonomy and Transition to Independence**

As a result of the commission’s recommendations, the so-called Donoughmore
Constitution was implemented in 1931. The State Council created in 1931 was composed of fifty
members elected under universal suffrage on the territorial basis, eight nominated members who
represented minorities, and three British officials. Executive power was divided; the departments
of defense, foreign relations, law, justice and finance were controlled by the British, but the other
were responsible to the State Council through an arrangement which provided for multi-ethnic
power sharing.59 At the same time, the assemblies elected in 1931 and 1936 were still dominated
by traditional notables (proficiency in English was required to register nominations), but
universal suffrage resulted in populist pressures which in the 1930s resulted in adoption of
several reforms which benefited ordinary Sri Lankans. Those included transition to the
Ceylonese civil service, introduction of income tax, and gradual expansion of healthcare
services. In the late 1930s, a system of accessible primary education was introduced with English
as the language of instruction. In contrast to these positive developments, universal suffrage
exacerbated ethnic tensions because candidates appealed to ethnic sentiments in order to get
elected. The Board of Ministers which emerged after the 1936 election had solely Sinhalese
members.60 The subsequent election, to be held in 1940, was postponed to 1947 because of the
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outbreak of WWII. After the war, Sri Lanka peacefully achieved independence as a British dominion in 1948. The process took place relatively smoothly and the British accepted a constitutional draft prepared by the Board of Ministers without reservations.  

The long experience of colonial autonomy provided a strong foundation for democratic politics in Sri Lanka after independence. As in Jamaica and Israel, the Sri Lankan democracy was characterized by the high degree of institutional and membership continuity between the periods of colonial autonomy and independence. Of the ninety-five members of the Parliament elected in 1947, twenty-nine had previously served in the colonial legislature. As of 1965, five former members of the colonial legislature still served in the government, including Prime Minister D. Senanayake (held office in 1952-52, 1960 and 1965-70). In the end of the 1970s, “the leading core of the parliamentary parties who constitute the effective decision-making and elite selection agencies [were] still made up of those who came into politics at or before independence”. In addition to D. Senanayake, other Sri Lankan Prime Ministers also began political careers before independence. At the time, they worked in the same political organization (CNC) and knew each other personally. J. L. Kotelawala (Prime Minister in 1953-56) was a member of the legislature since 1931 and a cabinet minister before the war. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike (Prime Minister in 1956-59 and leader of the Sri Lanka Freedom Party) was also a council member since 1931. After his assassination in 1959 the party was led by his widow, Sirimavo Bandaranaike (Prime Minister in 1960-65 and 1970-77). 

The period of colonial autonomy left also another important pro-democratic legacy, which was institutional growth of political organizations, most of which emerged before the
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independence or shortly after. The first modern political party, a Trotskyist Ceylon Equal Society Party (LSSP), was formed in 1935 and elected a few deputies to the 1936 council. Still, most deputies elected in the 1931 and 1936 elections remained loosely affiliated with the dominant CNC. In 1946, D.S. Senanayake, a member of the government since 1931, created United National Party (UNP) as a merger of CNC with two smaller conservative political parties. UNP was formed on multi-ethnic basis as it included representatives of the Tamil and Muslim communities. It supported equal status for Tamil and Sinhala languages, and resisted special privileges for the Buddhist religion. In the 1947 election, UNP obtained 42% of the vote and 44% of the seats; subsequently, D.S. Senanayake formed, with the support of independent deputies, a government which included significant Muslim and Tamil representation. D.S. Senanayake died in 1952; the loss of this moderate leader had a negative impact on the country’s politics. The other principal party was Sri Lanka Freedom Party (SLFP), founded in 1951 by S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike. Bandaranaike was a minister under UNP governments in 1947-51 and a member of parliament since 1931. He considered himself, however, marginalized within the party and for that reason founded SLFP in 1951. The party won the 1956 election on a platform which united leftist and nationalist elements. Bandaranaike called for increased role of the Sinhalese as a national language and introduction of state sponsorship of Buddhism; the government’s failed economic policies also played a part in the victory. At this time, peaceful alternation in power was an unprecedented event in the developing world.

The experience of democratic politics during the period of colonial autonomy resulted in a situation when all relevant political actors supported the principles of democratic politics in the
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independent Sri Lanka. Unlike the elites of most other Asian countries, the Sri Lankan’s elites took over at the moment of independence having become habituated, during the period of colonial autonomy, to the democratic exercise of power. The most important institutions transplanted by the British, and particularly responsible parliamentary government based on universal suffrage, remained acceptable to all major parties”, which was explicitly spelled out in their electoral manifestoes and programs. Generally, the politics in Sri Lanka, at least until the 1971 Marxist insurrection, was characterized by moderation on the part of political actors and decision-making preceded by careful debate and negotiation. UNP was unambiguously committed to parliamentary democracy, especially under the leadership of D.S. Senanayake and his son, D. Senanayake. The leftist SLFP also embraced democratic values, although emphasizing their radical, social aspect. “On the coming of effective independence Bandaranaike continued to support, in the strongest terms, the practices of parliamentary democracy bequeathed by the British, and to warn against the extremes of fascism and communism”. In December 1952 Bandaranaike stressed again that his party, SLFP, must remain both democratic and socialist.

In addition, because of the long colonial autonomy, the Sri Lankan Marxist parties remained relatively moderate. LSSP, the largest Marxist party, retained the Trotskyist ideology because of Stalinism’s strongly authoritarian aspects. The party scored its largest success in the 1947 election when it obtained 11% of the vote (two other Marxist parties scored 10% at the time). After independence, the Marxist parties remained ideologically ambivalent about the value
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of the parliamentary democracy, but played according to the democratic rules in practice. In particular, Marxists participated in elections and regularly joined coalition governments with SLFP (for the first time in 1956). LSSP still issued occasional pronouncements that the party’s ultimate goal is creation of a revolutionary state of the working class, although in 1970 its leader reiterated that this objective should be achieved gradually and within the legal means, as this was the prevalent wish of the population.\(^7\)

**Sri Lankan Democracy: From Democratic Stability to Ethnic Conflict**

Generally, the period after the 1956 election was characterized by growing politicization of ordinary Sri Lankans. Gradually, turnout levels increased to some of the highest in the world, reaching 77% of the voting-age population in the 1977 election. The interest in politics and knowledge of political issues became widespread among the rural population. There was also a rapid growth of the civil and political societies – membership in political parties and voluntary associations such as trade unions, co-operative societies, youth leagues and other associations increased considerably.\(^7\) Another and certainly a less welcome development was growing ethnic radicalization of the two main political parties, UNP and SLFP. Both catered to the Sinhala Buddhist vote and made few efforts to appeal to minorities. These parties regularly alternated in power until the 1982 presidential vote. Unfortunately, frequent turnovers contributed to increasing ethnic polarization, as the party in the opposition appealed to Sinhalese nationalist sentiments in order to undermine efforts at ethnic reconciliation with the Tamils by the party currently in power.\(^7\) The main point of contention considered language policy. After Sinhala was made the only official language in 1956, Tamil civil servants, who formed 30% of the civil
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service, were required to learn it or give up their jobs. Few were able to achieve the task and so the percentage of Tamils in the administrative service fell to 5% in 1975. The other sources of grievances were discrimination of Tamil-speaking students regarding university admissions, a nationalization program launched in the 1960s which targeted Tamil industries, and the government’s program of Sinhalese colonization in Tamil areas, which led to dispossession of many Tamil farmers. All these policies led to gradual alienation of the Tamil population and growing extremism among the Tamil youth. Instead of using parliamentary politics to redress grievances, a violent solution to the conflict came to be increasingly popular among the Tamils.73 The first Tamil terrorist separatist groups began activities in the late 1960s, and first terrorist attacks were organized in 1971. The pro-Sinhalese nationalist provisions in the new 1972 constitution also radicalized the main Tamil political party, which in 1976 openly adopted a secessionist platform and changed the name to Tamil United Liberation Front (TUFL).74

In addition to ethnic polarization, there were other processes and events which gradually undermined quality of the Sri Lankan democracy. First of all, two abortive military coups, in 1962 and 1966, undermined the trust of civilian politicians in the military leadership. The coup attempt in 1962 was motivated by ethnically discriminatory policies by the Bandaranaike’s government (which were resented by the Christian-dominated officer corps), political interference in the army, and increasing instability of the country.75 Moreover, the government’s policy of free education created a significant group of well-educated youth who could not find appropriate employment because of sluggish economic growth and lack of access to the highest positions in the civil service, which were still occupied by the English-speaking elite. This youth

74 Peebles 2006, 127-129.
75 Horowitz 1980.
became increasingly radicalized and also rejected the platform of the existing Marxist parties, which had abandoned the revolutionary route to power. One of the Marxist youth groups, Sri Lankan People’s Liberation Front (JVP) organized a violent uprising against the government in April 1971. It was crushed, but at the cost of several thousands of lives.76

As mentioned, the SLFP-Marxist coalition government elected in 1970 further exacerbated ethnic tensions through adoption of a nationalist constitution in 1972. This government also enacted a series of reforms which included nationalization of main enterprises and a land reform. These socialist policies not only did not improve the state of the economy, but led to economic disaster. Moreover, the SLFP government cracked down on unfriendly press outlets through nationalization of publishing houses, while the enactment of the new constitution was used to extend the life of the parliament by two years. All these policies gave rise to increasing government unpopularity and resulted in the UNP’s sweeping victory in the 1977 election.77 The first move of the new UNP government under the leadership of Junius Jayewardene was to take advantage of its two-thirds parliamentary majority to adopt a new constitution, which introduced a semi-presidential system of government based on the French Fifth Republic model, and the electoral system of proportional representation. The government also changed the course of economic policy by following the Taiwanese and South Korean models of development. The policy of “open economy” resulted in fast economic growth in comparison to the pre-1977 period. Still, Jayewardene further undermined democratic principles and his policies led to the outbreak of a full-fledged separatist civil war in 1983. In 1982, he stood in early presidential election, as allowed by the constitution, and won with 52% of the

76 Peebles 2006, 120-121.
vote. In 1982 a constitutional amendment was introduced through a referendum which extended the life of the parliament by five years, as Jayewardene wanted to preserve his party’s 3/5 majority in the assembly. The referendum was conducted under a state of emergency, which enabled the government to limit the opposition campaign activities and intimidate some of its members. In the end, the measure was accepted with 55% of the yes vote.\textsuperscript{78}

Whether to treat the 1982 referendum and/or the 1983 civil war outbreak as instances of democratic breakdown in Sri Lanka is a matter of legitimate disagreement. Still, the prolongation of life of the parliament in 1982 was achieved within the bounds of the law and voters had a chance not to agree with the decision. They had the same opportunity during the presidential election held a few months earlier. If Jayewardene had lost the 1982 presidential election, the new president from the opposition could have used his prerogative to dissolve the parliament and hold early election. In addition, subsequent presidential and parliamentary elections in Sri Lanka were not held under better conditions than the 1982 votes, and some of those led to incumbent defeats (in 1994, 2001 and 2004). Because UNP gave up power when it lost the election in 1994, one could then reasonably assume that the party would have done the same in 1982.

If the civil war outbreak in Sri Lanka is to be considered an instance of democratic breakdown, then one should do it on a basis of a consistent coding rule. Ultimately, Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) at the widest extension of their power managed to control about 22% of the Sri Lanka’s territory and no more than 10% of its population. There were instance of governments, often considered democratic, which lost control over larger portions of their countries’ populations. Those include the United States during the Civil War, Burma before 1962, Colombia after 1974 or El Salvador before 1994. Still, instances of civil wars in those
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countries are not usually treated as democratic breakdowns. In any case, I would argue that treating a civil war as a democratic breakdown is mistaken on ontological grounds unless the democratically-elected government is actually overthrown during such a war or loses control over majority of its country’s population. For example, one might want to pose a research question about whether democracies are more likely to experience civil wars than other regimes and then ask how democracies behave during such wars in comparison to other regimes. If every instance of a civil war under democracy is treated as a democratic breakdown, then such a question cannot be posed.

Ultimately, the separatist civil war and the Marxist uprisings of 1971 and 1987-89 can be regarded as devastating shocks which undermined the quality of Sri Lankan democracy to the point of its near-breakdown (depending on which definition of democracy is used). After 1982, Sri Lanka turned into an “illiberal democracy”, a political system in which the fundamental principles of democracy are honored (in particular, the elections are relatively free and fair so that it is possible to defeat the incumbents), but otherwise civil liberties are poorly respected and the constitutional rules are occasionally changed by the government in power to its advantage. Still, even if this unfortunate development is taken into account, the political development of Sri Lanka after independence should be treated as exceptional in the developing world. Until 1982, its democracy operated in a consolidated fashion, and the country has experienced continuous civilian elected government since independence. Undoubtedly, the fact that Sri Lankan democracy persisted for such a long period was a direct result of a long period of colonial autonomy before independence. According to a Buddhist nationalist D. C. Wijewardena, Sri Lankan democracy was “a gift for which the people must thank the Donoughmore
Commissioners [which granted the 1931 constitution]… It is the greatest boon conferred on the people of Ceylon since the inception of the British rule.”79

Final Remarks

The three ex-colonies analyzed in this chapter were different on numerous grounds. They were characterized by different levels of economic development (from relatively high in Israel to low in Sri Lanka), a degree of ethnic heterogeneity and conflict (from high in Sri Lanka to low in Jamaica) and finally, different religious traditions and patterns of nation-building. Yet, they shared the same experience of long periods of colonial autonomy granted by the British before independence. The also shared the crucial similarity of being relatively stable and successful democracies, especially if compared to other countries in the developing world. Consequently, using the logic of the Millean method of agreement, one can conclude that the long period of colonial autonomy was the most likely cause of subsequent democratic stability in Israel, Sri Lanka and Jamaica. This conclusion was further enhanced by the careful analysis of the connection between the period of colonial autonomy and the ensuing democratic stability. In fact, all three democracies emerged through to a very similar causal process with “seeds” of future democratic development having been sown during the period of autonomy.

Before independence was granted, both elites and the masses in the three analyzed countries experienced at least 16 years of democratic politics. During this time the elites participated in well-established democratic institutions: political parties, legislatures, civil society organizations and autonomous governments. Throughout the process, they habituated and became committed to the values and practices of democratic politics. The crucial element during this development was growth of mutual trust between the key members of the elite, most of
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whom knew each other personally having jointly participated in political parties or other organizations established during the autonomy. To give some details, Alexander Bustamante and Norman Manley, first two Jamaican chief ministers under the autonomy, worked in the same trade union in the 1930s, and later competed as leaders of the two main political parties during the autonomy and after independence. David Ben-Gurion, Levi Eshkol and Golda Meir, the first three Israeli prime ministers, worked in the same political party during the autonomy (Mapai) and participated in the autonomous institutions of the Jewish community: the trade union federation (Histadrut) and the Jewish Agency for Palestine. D.S. Senanayake, his son Dudley, John Kotelawala and S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike, first four prime ministers of Sri Lanka, were members of the colonial legislature and worked before independence in the Ceylon National Congress, which later transformed into the United National Party. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike subsequently established an opposition party in 1948 and won elections in 1956. As a result of these personal connections, members of the elite developed mutual trust which facilitated acceptance of the principle of alternation in power. In other words, the party which lost election was willing to hand over the power to the opposition because it recognized that the opponents would honor the principle of free elections and offer a chance to return to power at the next electoral circle.

Another crucial element of the process which led from colonial autonomy to self-sustaining democracy in the analyzed countries was high degree of elite continuity. As already mentioned, the elites which ruled the three countries after independence started their careers, and quite often held executive posts, already during the period of autonomy. In Sri Lanka, the first chief of executive who was not a member of the colonial legislature came to power only in
1989. In Jamaica, all prime ministers served in the colonial institutions until P. J. Patterson (1989) and in Israel nearly all prime ministers until Yitzhak Rabin (1974). Obviously, the personnel continuity between the periods of autonomy and democracy characterized not only the highest, but also the medium level of government and other institutions (such as the army or trade unions). To sum up, the same generation which practiced democratic politics during the period of autonomy ruled also during the first three decades after independence and habituated the next generation of politicians to the democratic values and practices; the parties formed during the period of autonomy ruled also after independence and in neither of the analyzed countries there emerged new political parties which would effectively challenge the existing ones. This situation was not beneficial for ambitious young politicians, because all high-level positions were occupied by the old guard for a long time after independence, but very likely it was beneficial to democratic stability.

The high level of commitment to democracy by the ruling elites was evident through their actions during the times of crises. Alternation in power was a frequent occurrence in Jamaica and Sri Lanka, and each time the ruling party lost elections it made no efforts to remain in power illegally. Otherwise, elections were organized by independent non-partisan bodies, and not by the party in power. Attempts at military coups in Sri Lanka in 1962 and 1966 and in Jamaica in 1980 were prevented by dominant pro-democratic elements within the militaries, which illustrated how the principle of civilian control over the military had been firmly established. Finally, the long periods of colonial autonomy also resulted in creation of comparatively pro-democratic citizenry which participated in well-developed civil society organizations. The citizens in the analyzed countries preferred to vote for the mainstream parties instead of anti-
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system actors, who remained marginal in Israel, Jamaica and Sri Lanka. Marxist parties reached the highest level of popularity in Sri Lanka, where they obtained 21% of the vote in the 1947 election, but even in this country they became committed to democratic politics in practice if not in official statements, as evidenced through Marxist participation in coalition governments. In other words, already during the colonial autonomy democratic politics came to be regarded as a default form of organization of political life by both elites and the masses, and this conviction persisted after independence, resulting in establishment of relatively successful democratic polities in Israel, Sri Lanka and Jamaica. Yet, this situation was a direct result of the fact that the periods of colonial autonomy were sufficiently long in all the analyzed countries; if they had been much shorter, the chances of survival of democracy would have been accordingly much lower. Indeed, in such countries as Kenya, Zambia and Malaysia, where colonial autonomy had been established for a much shorter time, post-colonial democracies quickly collapsed. These countries are the subject of analysis in the next chapter.
Table 7.1. Social, economic and political characteristics of Israel, Sri Lanka and Jamaica

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Israel</th>
<th>Sri Lanka</th>
<th>Jamaica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita at independence(^1)</td>
<td>3800</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>5246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita 10 years after independence(^2)</td>
<td>5543</td>
<td>1076</td>
<td>7434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of ethnic conflict</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic heterogeneity</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant religion</td>
<td>Judaism</td>
<td>Buddhism</td>
<td>Christianity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant mode of agricultural production</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Plantation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statehood before colonization</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long period of colonial autonomy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Int. 2005 GKS (PPP), data from Gapminder Foundation.

\(^2\) Ibidem.
CHAPTER 8
DEMOGRAPHIC BREAKDOWN IN THE FORMER COLONIES LACKING A LEGACY OF COLONIAL AUTONOMY: ANALYSIS OF KENYA, ZAMBIA AND MALAYSIA

This chapter further elaborates the argument started in Chapter 7 of the dissertation. While the purpose of Chapter 7 was to illustrate how long periods of colonial autonomy led to democratic survival, the purpose of Chapter 8 is to show how post-colonial democracies established without a legacy of long colonial autonomy quickly collapsed. At the same time, Chapter 8 applies the same research design as Chapter 7, which is “the most different with similar outcome” method of comparison. In this regard, a pair of similar countries, Kenya and Zambia, is compared to a rather different case of democratic breakdown, Malaysia. The following logic guided the choice of cases for comparison in Chapter 8. First of all, so that direct comparisons with countries analyzed in Chapter 7, which were all British colonies, could be possible, the countries in question also needed to be British colonies. They also needed to be democratized at independence and subsequently had to experience a democratic breakdown. This limited the choice of cases to seventeen countries. As the next step, the exceptional cases of democracies which collapsed in spite of relatively long periods of colonial autonomy (Guyana and Burma) had to be excluded as well because their analysis could not serve illustrative purposes. The same was true of Gambia, where democracy survived exceptionally long, i.e. for twenty-nine years, in spite of short colonial autonomy (one should also note the exceptional case of Botswana where democracy has not collapsed as of 2014 in spite of short colonial autonomy).

Ultimately, three cases were chosen for the analysis in this chapter. I decided to scrutinize two African cases because the majority of British post-colonial democracies (eleven) were
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1 Still, these cases are briefly described in the beginning of chapter 7. Because they are outliers to a general pattern, their analysis might help in understanding of the limitations of the theory advanced in this dissertation.
located there. As well, most of the British African ex-colonies shared similar political histories, with short colonial autonomy followed by quick democratic breakdown, which took the form of fraudulent elections and/or establishment of one-party state (the latter ultimately followed the former in any case). Hence, the choice of particular cases could be quite arbitrary. I decided to analyze Kenya and Zambia because democracy in those countries actually survived for a few years after independence, and development of viable opposition parties made introduction of one-party states harder for the ruling elites. On the other hand, such cases as Malawi or Tanzania, where one-party states were established shortly after independence because of the lack of viable opposition, were not as interesting for analytical purposes and hence were not selected.

In addition to two African cases, I decided to analyze one British colony from outside of Africa so that “the most different with similar outcome” research approach could be actually applied. In this regard the choice was quite limited: to Singapore, Fiji, Malaysia and Cyprus. Cyprus and Singapore generally followed the pattern of quick democratic breakdown resulting from short colonial autonomy, but otherwise these cases were too idiosyncratic to be included in the analysis. Fiji and Malaysia were quite similar as they shared the features of ethnic diversity and plantation economy. In the end, I decided to analyze Malaysia because it was substantially a more relevant case.

The basic differences between Kenya, Zambia and Malaysia are shown in Table 8-1. The two African cases were quite similar regarding the pre-independence history, the dominant mode of the agricultural production, and the prevailing religion. They differed regarding the importance of ethnic differences and conflicts (these were more pronounced in Kenya), the mode of agricultural production, and the level of GDP. In particular, Zambia derived significant income from copper mining; hence it was richer than Kenya at independence. On the other hand,
Kenya had a significant commercial farming sector. Commercial farms were initially owned by Europeans, but after independence they were bought by the state with British financial assistance, and resold mostly to Kenyan elites. Malaysia was on the other hand different from the African cases in numerous ways. It has been characterized by sharp ethnic divisions, with Muslim Malays forming about 50% of the population at the eve of independence, while the rest of the society belonged to the Chinese and Tamil immigrant communities. Just after WWII, a Communist insurgency supported by Chinese lower classes destabilized the colony, while the post-independence period featured regular outbreaks of ethnic riots. Malaysia was also characterized by the prevalence of plantation of agriculture and the level of GDP which was slightly higher than in Zambia.

On the other hand, there were few similarities between the African cases and Malaysia. Those included common British colonial background and short periods of colonial autonomy. While the British were reluctant to grant autonomy to their African colonies because they considered local elites as unready to participate in electoral politics (whereas in case of some colonies the additional constraining factor was presence of white settler minorities), the causes of Malaysia’s political underdevelopment were more complex. In this case, granting of autonomy after WWII was also hampered by the opposition of traditional rulers and the necessity to fight a Communist insurgency. Regardless of the causes, the effects of insufficiently-long colonial autonomy in the African cases and Malaysia were similar. In the three analyzed countries, post-colonial democracy turned out unsustainable and collapsed, although in Malaysia it functioned longer than in Kenya and Zambia – for twelve years. Hence, given numerous differences between the African cases and Malaysia, and only one significant similarity - short colonial autonomy – the latter factor emerges as the most likely cause of democratic breakdowns.
While “the most different with similar outcome” method is used to compare the cases within Chapter 8 to illustrate the effect of short colonial autonomy on democratic breakdown, another comparison undertaken in Chapter 8 takes place across chapters. In this regard, I implicitly compare one of the cases from Chapter 7, Sri Lanka, to a case from Chapter 8, Malaysia, using “the most similar with different outcome” research design (also called the Mill’s method of difference). In this design, which is in fact based on the experimental philosophy, the comparison takes place between cases which are otherwise very similar. They, however, differ regarding values on one crucial dependent variable, and are also different on the outcome of interest. The dependent variable in question is consequently presumed to be the cause of the divergence regarding the outcome variable. This dependent variable could be compared to a treatment condition in an experiment, which is applied differently to all, otherwise quite similar cases. Regarding the comparison of Sri Lanka and Malaysia, one should note their similarities pertaining to the British colonial background, modes of agricultural production (plantation economy), and similar character of ethnic cleavages resulting in high level of ethnic tensions. In particular, both in Sri Lanka and Malaysia the indigenous population, which formed a small majority of the population (Sinhala and Malays, respectively), felt threatened by minorities perceived as non-native immigrant groups. Both countries were also underdeveloped, with Sri Lanka being actually poorer than Malaysia; the latter factor should actually increase the probability of democratic breakdown in the former in comparison to the latter. The crucial difference between the two pertained to the length of colonial autonomy, which lasted twenty-four years in Sri Lanka and only two in Malaysia. The divergence regarding the outcome of interest pertains, of course, to the fate of post-colonial democracies. Democracy collapsed after
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twelve years in Malaysia but survived in Sri Lanka. Hence, the difference regarding the length of colonial autonomy could be identified as the most plausible cause of democratic survival in Sri Lanka and breakdown in Malaysia.

**Political History of Colonial Africa, and Its Effect on Elite Ideology**

Before moving to detailed discussion of the Kenyan and Zambian political histories, some background needs to be provided on the similarities regarding the history of African colonies, and its effect of dominant elite ideology at the moment of independence. One should note, first of all, that in contrast to European colonies in other regions of the world, European colonies in Sub-Saharan African experienced similar political developments taking place in the same historical periods. Africa was effectively colonized only in the late nineteenth century, and the state organizations built by the colonizers were characterized by relative weakness and low level of penetration of the hinterland. At the same time the British, and to a smaller extent the French, relied on indirect rule by reorganized native authorities because it was a viable cost-effective alternative to direct rule by the colonizer. Thus investments in local infrastructure and education were at best mediocre. For that reason, after WWII, the African Westernized middle class was relatively small in comparison to the middle class of such colonies as India, Sri Lanka or Lebanon. It was one of the main reasons, in addition to the opposition by native authorities, of the British reluctance to grant African colonies effective autonomy.

The political development of the French colonies proceeded according to a highly similar formula written in Paris. The first elected assemblies were established only in 1946, but they had strictly consultative powers apart from the prerogative to enact the budget, and were elected by a very restricted suffrage. Hence, it would be difficult to argue that the French granted effective autonomy to their colonies at this stage. Local elections under universal suffrage were held in 1956. In March 1957 citizens of the French African colonies elected under universal suffrage
territorial assemblies, which appointed responsible governments. The De Gaulle’s government, which came to power in June 1958 over the Algerian crisis, decided to give colonies effective independence in a situation when they brought little economic benefit to France and because of the growing difficulties in Algeria. The constitution of October 1958, which was accepted in all French African territories except Guinea, granted the colonies de facto independence with a status similar to the British Commonwealth realms. At this stage the French lost control over the effective political developments in the colonies. In many, democratic institutions were abolished with introduction of one-party states already in 1959 or early 1960. De jure independence was granted in June 1960.

On the other hand, each British colony experienced a slightly different political history, although similar stages of political development were ultimately shared by all of them. As the first step, just after WWII, the British created legislative councils in most of their colonies. The majority of council members were either appointed or elected by native authorities (which were themselves unelected), but they usually had also a few members elected under restricted suffrage. Next, legislative councils with a majority of popularly elected members, and with significant presence of appointed members, were established. The mode of election and the scope of suffrage varied widely among the colonies. For example, elections in the Nigeria’s Northern Region were indirect in five stages, in Zambia less than 5% of adults were enfranchised, and in Malawi there were separate rolls for white and African voters. With the establishment of popularly elected legislatures, most colonies were also granted limited ministerial systems of government, with several members of the executive council responsible to the legislature. The final step in the process consisted of introduction of elections under universal suffrage, which preceded independence. Ultimately, the length of colonial autonomy, measured
as the period between the establishment of majority-elected legislatures and independence, was short. It varied between nine years in Nigeria and one year in Tanganyika.³

Hence, regardless of their colonial background, the African colonies experienced short periods of autonomy with effectively elected institutions. This feature had a profound effect on the ideology of African independence movements. In contrast to nationalist parties in colonies such as India or Jamaica, which developed under colonial autonomy, African nationalist parties espoused clearly anti-democratic values. While the former participated in the democratic politics under colonial autonomy, taking advantage of the political freedoms and civil liberties to a large extent guaranteed by the colonizer, the latter developed in a situation when elected institutions were non-existent and civil liberties were limited. Because the African liberalization movements could not participate in electoral politics as a matter of fact, they did not embrace the Western ideal of pluralist democracy, which was generally rejected as a foreign import.⁴ Again, this development was understandable given that the nascent African parties functioned in the context of the authoritarian colonial state. In consequence, African political elites generally understood freedom as a negative freedom from foreign domination, not as the positive freedom of inclusive self-rule. “Emphasis was put on consensus as opposed to tolerance, on loyalty in contrast to self-expression, on identity and not on individual rights, on political boundaries but hardly on procedures. Nationalism in any parts of Africa was not, in any fundamental sense, liberal.”⁵ Lip service was paid to the idea of democracy, but the latter was understood in an abstract and rhetorical form.⁶
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³ For overview of political history of Sub-Saharan African in the period, see for example Gailey 1989.
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When the independence approached, the leaders of African nationalist movements accepted democratic constitutions devised by the colonizers solely to accelerate the process of decolonization. Overall, the colonial powers did not prepare Africans for independence in terms of democratic education. “By independence, Africans had barely a chance to familiarize themselves with competitive institutions and the franchise, let alone acquire any experience with their operation.” Hence, after the independence was achieved, democratic values were espoused by a minority within the African elites. Multi-party democracy was seen as a system which promoted ethnic divisions and political conflicts, and ultimately precluded achievement of national unity, which was supposedly a necessary condition for economic development. These evils were to be avoided through introduction of one-party systems, with the sole legal party and its ruler hailed as the embodiment of the nation. One should also add that lacking a middle class committed to democratic values, nationalist leaders were hardly constrained when they were eliminating democratic institutions in order to accumulate personal power.

African liberation movements could be contrasted with the Indian National Congress, which developed during a period of colonial autonomy in India. Its factions participated in the elected autonomous institutions, which took responsibility over important domains of provincial governments in 1920. Being embedded in a society characterized by intensive middle class participation in the associational life and electoral politics, the Congress leaders embraced the Western democratic values – the ideals of positive freedom – in addition to the concept of negative freedom understood as the liberation from the colonial rule. Hence, the generation of Indian politicians which took over at independence valued democracy as a good in itself.

7 Chazan 1994, 70-71.
8 Chazan 1994, 71-75; Branch 2011, 59; Nyong’o 1989, 231.
9 Sisson 1994.
Still, even in the African ex-colonies the relationship between the length of colonial autonomy and regime outcomes was clearly visible. In the colonies in which autonomy with legislatures elected under wide suffrage was established for five years or longer – Nigeria, Sudan, Ghana, Gambia, and Lesotho – democratic institutions took sufficiently deep root to effectively hamper establishment of one-party states after independence; hence, civilian one-party state was widely considered an illegitimate political system. In Nigeria, Sudan, Gambia and Lesotho civilian one-party states were never established. Although post-colonial democracies established in those countries were abolished a few years after independence (except of Gambia), the military regimes which took over felt compelled to promise a return to democracy at some point in the future, and made performance-based claims to legitimacy, arguing that military rule was necessary to eliminate corruption, provide order and foster development. In Ghana Kwame Nkrumah established a one-party state on the model followed in other African countries, but his regime was abolished after five years. The military junta which eliminated Nkrumah in 1969 justified the coup claiming that its main purpose was to reintroduce democracy, and indeed it transferred power to a democratically-elected government in 1970. Ultimately, Nigeria, Sudan, and Ghana were the only African countries which attempted to reintroduce democracy before the end of the Cold War. In addition, Botswana and Gambia were the exceptional cases of democratic survival in the post-colonial Africa. While democracy in Botswana has survived as of 2012, in Gambia it was abolished only in 1994. Yet, although elections in these countries were generally free and fair, and basic freedoms were respected, they have never experienced an alternation in power through elections. Whether such an alternation would have occurred in case of the opposition’s victory remains an open question given the absence of such events in Africa.

10 And the exceptional case of Burkina Faso.
before the end of Cold War. Ruling parties lost elections in Sierra Leone in 1967 and in Lesotho in 1970, but the opposition was prevented from assuming power in those countries by a military and an executive coup, respectively. It is quite possible that a similar scenario would have occurred in Gambia or Botswana in case of an opposition victory in the same historical period. The opposition also never won a competitive election in the two African cases which are analyzed in detail in this chapter, Kenya and Zambia.

**Kenya: Short Autonomy and Breakdown of Democracy**

**Early British Colonization**

The British established colonial rule over what is now Kenya in 1895. Since 1902 the colony was open to European settlement, the development which significantly influenced its political history. British settlers inhabited fertile farmland in the Central Highlands, where they set up large commercial farms employing African workers. At the eve of independence Europeans formed only 0.8% of the colony’s population, but they owned 50% of the arable land. Indians, who engaged mostly in commerce, were 2.1% of the population. In contrast to numerous African countries which were ethnically divided into dozens of small ethnic groups, most of the native population of Kenya belonged to several larger nations. Both from the numerical and economical perspective the most influential group have been Kikuyu, who formed about 22% of the country’s population.\(^\text{11}\)

From the time they established permanent settlements, the Europeans pressed the colonial government for creation of a representative legislative council. The first election in Kenya was held in 1920 when Europeans elected eleven seats in the assembly. However, given a small number of settlers, the colonial government refused in 1923 to grant Kenya a government
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responsible to the council, arguing that it would be unrepresentative of the native population. For the same reason, until 1948 the British refused to create a council with a majority of elected members. In practice, however, legislation was not adopted without agreement of the settler representatives. During the interwar period, the settlers demanded creation of a wider federation under their control, which would encompass all British territories in East Africa, but these plans were fiercely opposed by Indians and ultimately blocked by the British government. Although Indians were provided for representation in the council, they boycotted elections until 1933 on the grounds they were not included in the common electoral roll with Europeans. As of 1938, there were seventeen elected seats in the legislature: eleven white, five Indian and one Arab. Otherwise, the British did not provide for any form of elected native representation. The first representative of African interests in the legislative council was nominated by the government in 1924, but he was a white missionary. The first African was appointed to the legislature only in 1944.\textsuperscript{12}

Similar to other British African colonies, the local population in Kenya was ruled by native authorities appointed by the colonizer. In terms of higher levels of administration, Local Native Councils, composed mostly of British-appointed chiefs, were created in 1925. They were chaired by British district officers. Western-style civil society was slow to develop. Because of the regionally differentiated pace of economic development, a unified nationalist movement did not emerge in Kenya before WWII. Instead, several ethnically-based organizations struggled to represent native interests, of whom the most prominent was Kikuyu Central Association, established in 1924.\textsuperscript{13} In 1946, this association transformed into Kenya African Union (KAU),

\textsuperscript{12} Bennett 1964, 49-52, 58-59, 66-67, 83.
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the first African political party, whose nominal goal was to advise the only African member to the Legislative Council. KAU initially adopted non-violent tactics with the goal of convincing the British to grant Kenya increased autonomy and ultimately independence. KAU’s activities were also restricted through various administrative measures. However, given the lack of meaningful reforms, many KAU activists came to a conclusion that a more direct action was needed.

The watershed in the Kenyan post-war politics was outbreak of the Mau-Mau Uprising in 1952. This rebellion was caused by numerous grievances among the Kikuyu, first of all, the lack of access to land and the colonizer’s refusal to grant effective political representation to Africans. But in addition to that, the uprising was also a civil war fought among the Kikuyu. Because they suspected that KAU was responsible for the outbreak of the rebellion, the British banned the organization and introduced the state of emergency in October 1952. The principal leaders of the organization, including Jomo Kenyatta, the future president of Kenya, were arrested. In fact, these politicians were not directly responsible for the violence – those who did had already escaped to the bush. With banning of KAU, legal political life among the Africans came to a halt. Only trade unions remained legal during the emergency, and hence they became the primary organizational form of African politics. Some of the most important politicians of independent Kenya, including Oginga Odinga and Tom Mboya, began careers at this stage as trade union activists, replacing the imprisoned KAU leaders as the most prominent native politicians.  

**Short Period of Colonial Autonomy**

After largely suppressing the rebellion, the British government allowed for formation of African political organizations at the district level in June 1955. This restriction had long-term
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implications for Kenyan politics. The first African representatives, elected in 1957, lacked the backing of a nationwide political party and hence represented mostly localized tribal interests. This type of representation remained one of the dominant features of Kenyan politics also after the independence. Otherwise, the 1957 election marked the beginning of electoral politics among the native population. Until then, African interests in the Legislative Council had been represented by members appointed by the governor. Electoral politics before the 1957 election was restricted to the small immigrant minorities, which were insulated from the African majority. Hence it did not leave a lasting legacy in terms of its effect on native political participation during the short period of colonial autonomy and after independence.

In March 1957, five African representatives were elected and joined the legislature which had been composed of eleven European, five Indian and two Arab elected members. The registration process encompassed 126,508 Africans, who represented only about 4% of the adult population. However, only one-third of eligible population actually registered to vote. In order to become a voter, one had to meet certain income, education or government service requirements. Also those associated with the Mau-Mau uprising were prevented from registration: in the Central Province, voters had to obtain certificates of loyalty from district commissioners in order to register, which depressed the registration rates even further. Moreover, some voters enjoyed the additional privilege of being allowed to cast two or three votes. The turnout among the registered voters reached 78%. Among future notable politicians, Daniel arap Moi was elected from the Rift Valley constituency.\textsuperscript{15}

The colonial government expected that the constitution implemented in 1957 would last at least ten years, but the document was soon abrogated in reaction to the growing nationalist

\textsuperscript{15} Throup and Hornsby 1998, 8; Sanger and Nottingham 1964, 2; Gertzel 1970, 7-9; Ogot and Ochieng’ 1995, 52-59; Branch 2006.
pressure and changes in the British policies regarding the proper pace of decolonization. In March 1958, six additional African members of the legislative council were elected. The suffrage regulations did not change in comparison the 1957 election.\textsuperscript{16} The pace of political reforms increased after the so-called Hola Massacre. In March 1959, several prisoners were beaten to death in one of the detention camps for Mau Mau insurgents. This incident precipitated outrage among the British public opinion and ultimately forced the government to hold Lancaster Conference on the future of Kenya in January-February 1960.\textsuperscript{17}

After the Hola Massacre, the authorities made a decision to allow for multi-racial national political parties. The African members of the legislative council split on the occasion. Some joined Kenya National Party (KNP), formed in July 1959, which included some Europeans and members of smaller tribes, while the more nationalist parliamentarians established Kenya Independence Movement (KIA) in August 1959. Shortly after the Lancaster Conference of 1960, the national political organizations were again allowed in an unrestricted manner, and the previous split resulted in formation of two political parties in spring 1960: KIA was reestablished as the Kenya African National Union (KANU) and KNP as the Kenya African Democratic Union (KADU). KANU was supported by the Kikuyu and Luo, the two largest ethnic groups in Kenya, and KADU by smaller ethnic groups which were afraid of the latter’s domination. KADU favored the country’s federalization and KANU demanded creation of a centralized system of government. The parties were also divided ideologically. KANU was leftist as it favored nationalization of European farms and businesses, while KADU was more conciliatory towards Europeans and Asians, emphasizing its democratic credentials. In addition, KANU was
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internally divided into a radical faction, led by Oginga Odinga, and a dominant moderate faction, led by Jomo Kenyatta. Since its beginnings, electoral politics in Kenya reflected ethnic cleavages to a larger extent than ideological divisions, however.\textsuperscript{18}

During the Lancaster conference the British government agreed to create a more representative legislative council with a responsible cabinet. For the first time, the majority of seats were to be elected by Africans (thirty-three of sixty-five). Twenty seats were reserved for minority representatives, including ten European seats. In addition, there were twelve appointed members. The February 1961 election resulted in victory of KANU, which won nineteen seats with 72\% of the popular vote, while KADU obtained eleven seats with 20\% of the popular vote. However, KANU refused to enter the government because its leader, Jomo Kenyatta, was still imprisoned. Hence, KADU formed a ruling coalition with moderate settler representatives.

Subsequently, the British government released Kenyatta in August 1961 against the wishes of the colonial administration, believing that a transfer of power would be meaningless without the latter’s participation. After the release, Kenyatta was elected in a by-election and a grand coalition between KANU and KADU was formed in anticipation of independence.\textsuperscript{19}

The terms of the transfer of power were agreed in April 1962 at a constitutional conference concluded in London. KADU strongly pressed for a federal constitution, while KANU demanded creation of a unitary state. In the end, a compromise solution was achieved, with large powers devolved to the regions and regional interests protected in the Senate.\textsuperscript{20} The last pre-independence election was held in May 1963. The vote was generally free as it was still
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organized by the British administration. It was marked, however, by localized violence, intimidation, and vote-buying committed by members of the two leading parties. Because it enjoyed a superior organizational structure, KANU was widely expected to win the election. The party’s position was also enhanced by the fact that it was led by Jomo Kenyatta, who could justifiably claim the leadership of the independence movement in the 1940s and early 1950s. Kenyatta’s unjust imprisonment in 1953-61 increased his charismatic legitimacy as a hero of the nationalist cause. Meanwhile, KADU lacked a leader of a similar format. Ultimately, KANU won eighty-three seats with 54% of the vote and KADU thirty-three seats with 26% of the vote.²¹

**The Period of Competitive Politics in Independent Kenya**

Kenyatta became chief minister and subsequently prime minister of Kenya at the moment of independence in December 1963. After assumption of the office, his main intention was to consolidate power and create a de facto one-party state. Since the beginning of 1964, KADU deputies were pressured to join the ruling party through the mixture of carrot and stick tactics. Patronage was withdrawn from the districts represented by KADU; hence some of its members voluntarily joined the ruling party in order to regain it. At the same time, ministers toured provinces to gather support for abolition of regional governments, while regional administration was criticized by the ruling party for its allegedly prohibitive costs. In particular, the government publicized a case from the end of 1963, when legislators in a few regions voted themselves pay raises at the expense of teachers and the civil service. As a result of these pressures, in December 1964 KADU dissolved itself and its parliamentarians joined the ruling party. This was accompanied by adoption of constitutional amendments which abolished the country’s federal system, proclaimed Kenyatta as president, and created an executive presidency with wide-
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reaching powers. Formally, the president remained politically responsible to the parliament, and could dissolve the assembly only if he resigned himself, but this was a weak practical check on the Kenyatta’s powers.\textsuperscript{22} However, in spite of creation of a de facto one-party state, the Kenyan legislature was not entirely quiescent, because the government faced occasional criticism from party backbenchers, who had to be consulted in order to pass some of the most controversial pieces of legislation.\textsuperscript{23}

Clearly, the short period of colonial autonomy, which lasted only six years, turned out to be insufficient to instill commitment to democratic politics among the KANU leadership and, as it will be shown later, among leaders of other Kenyan political parties. Instead, Kenyan elites embraced the anti-democratic discourse typical of other African countries of the period. In particular, Kenyatta and other KANU leaders emphasized that national unity and stability could only be achieved under a regime which lacked formal opposition. It is necessary to emphasize that KADU before its dissolution shared the same ideological principles and could hardly serve as an example of a democratic opposition party. If KADU had won the May 1963 election instead of KANU, then its leaders would have tried to absorb KANU and establish a one-party state.\textsuperscript{24}

However, unification with conservatively-inclined KADU antagonized the KANU radical wing, which resented Kenyatta’s pro-business and pro-western policies, and demanded that European farms and foreign companies be nationalized without compensation, arguing also for a leftist turn in the foreign policy. Throughout 1965, the party visibly split into two main factions.
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The conservative faction, led by the president, responded to the radicals’ threat by holding a conference in March 1966, at which a new party constitution was adopted. The document abolished the post of the party’s vice-president, which had been held by the radicals’ leader Oginga Odinga, and established six vice-presidencies. Radicals were also excluded from other top party positions. After the conference, the radical wing split from KANU and formed a populist Kenya People’s Union (KPA). It was led by Odinga and the ex-minister of information Bildad Kagia. Altogether, twenty-nine members of the parliament left KANU and joined KPA. The party criticized the government on numerous issues. It was argued that the land reform benefitted solely the wealthy farmers associated with the government, that provision of social services to the poor was insufficient, and that the government remained subservient to the Western powers. KANU, on the other hand, accused KPU of plans to nationalize all private property. Still, although it was ideologically different from KANU, KPU was in practical terms an ethnic party, with the support concentrated among the Luo ethnic group from Western Kenya.25

Further desertions from the ruling party were prevented by a retroactive constitutional amendment sponsored by Kenyatta, which required members of parliament who changed party affiliation to stand in by-elections. The by-elections, held in June 1966 and also known as “Little General Election,” were unfair and partially rigged. The government took full of advantage of official resources to campaign, while KPU was denied any form of state assistance. The state radio was biased in favor of KANU. KPU campaigned effectively only in two districts where it had managed to take over local KANU organizations. In a few districts there was heavy intimidation of KPU supporters, and rallies of KPU candidates were disrupted by members of the

KANU youth wing. As well, in some areas ballots were stuffed or stolen to prevent the election of prominent KPU members, although such blatant methods of fraud were applied only in a few districts. KPU was also accused of undermining national unity which was supposedly necessary for national development. Although the idea of de jure one-party state was renounced before the split within KANU, it was openly advocated during the campaign. Ultimately, out of twenty-nine deputies who deserted from KANU, only nine were reelected in June 1966, and all came from the Luo ethnic group. KANU also won eight out of ten contested Senate seats, but the upper legislative body was abolished anyway in December 1966. The results of the Little General Election showed that KPA was unsuccessful in its desire to realign politics along the ideological dimension.26 In the same period, the Kenyatta regime consolidated control over civil society. In 1966, two independent umbrella trade union organizations, which had been largely controlled by KANU dissident factions, were dissolved. Instead, a single Central Organization of Trade Unions was formed, which was stacked by Kenyatta loyalists. Subsequently, the workers’ right to strike was severely limited by the government.27

After the Little General Election, the regime hampered KPU activities through legal manipulations and outright repression. First of all, the constitution was again amended to give president the right of detention without trial. This prerogative was used to detain several KPU activists. A new law adopted in April 1968 required that candidates in local and national elections be endorsed by a local party branch; in this way independent candidates were eliminated. The government routinely denied registration to KPU local party branches; 43% of KPU applications for branch registration were rejected. Opposition meetings were sometimes

blocked, while several KPU councilors were expelled from their jobs and its activists in the
countryside were intimidated. Ultimately, all 1,800 KPU candidates for the 1968 local elections
were denied registration on dubious grounds. Hence, KPU lost representation in the entire local
government. As well, opposition activists could not count on patronage and other benefits, which
were available only to the members of the ruling party. KPU’s organizational growth was
hampered also because of this factor. The party was also persistently characterized as illegitimate
and criticized for undermining the national unity. In order to symbolically delegitimize the party,
the president used a solemn ceremonial curse to condemn KPU leaders at a rally held after the
Little General Election.28 However, if KPU somehow had managed to win the struggle for power
with KANU, it would not have introduced a democratic regime in Kenya, because its ideology
was even less democratic than the KANU’s. KPU leaders favored creation of a single-party
repressive leftist authoritarian regime along the lines of the Nkrumah’s Ghana. Hence, Kenyatta
could not permit open-outcome elections in 1969, because opposition victory would entail
KANU’s permanent exclusion from power and its ultimate obliteration.29 Ultimately, lack of
legacy of colonial autonomy resulted in an effective absence of pro-democratic political
alternatives in Kenya.

**Introduction of One-party State**

In 1969, two political events were used by the government as a pretext to introduce one-
party state. First of all, Tom Mboya, KANU secretary general and an ethnic Luo, was
assassinated in July 1969. Kenyatta eliminated Mboya because the latter’s popularity was
growing and he managed to create an independent power base, hence threatening the president’s
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position. In reaction to the killing, riots broke out among the ethnic Luo when Kenyatta was attending the funeral. Subsequently, the president’s car was nearly overthrown when he was visiting the opposition heartland in October 1969. The event was apparently set up deliberately to provoke the crowd. During this incident, the president’s bodyguards opened fire, and one hundred rioters when killed. Subsequently, KPU was declared illegal and its leaders detained; this included eight duly elected MPs. Although Kenya was not a single-party state de jure, all further attempts to found opposition parties were blocked. After another such an attempt was made by Oginga Odinga, one-party state was formally established in 1982.\textsuperscript{30}

In practice, the government found it convenient to eliminate the opposition before the upcoming election in December 1969. Given that KPU managed to win an important by-election in May 1969, it was expected that it could pose a significant challenge to KANU several months later. The 1969 election was organized under an electoral law which permitted for competition among several candidates vetted by the ruling party which competed in each electoral district. Presidential elections were held simultaneously, and Kenyatta was elected unopposed. The competition for 158 parliamentary seats was fierce, and seventy-seven incumbents, including some government ministers, lost reelection. Voters rejected the parliamentarians who turned out ineffective in provision of patronage. Several critics of Kenyatta and Kikuyu domination were elected as KANU backbenchers. Still, turnout decreased significantly in comparison to the previous multi-party election (from 72\% to 47\%). It was the lowest in the ethnically Luo area, which had supported KPU.\textsuperscript{31}


Hence, in a country without true democrats, Kenyan democracy was doomed to fail from the start. As in most other African countries, a civilian one-party regime was established in 1969. Its history could be divided into two stages, which corresponded with presidencies of Kenyatta (until 1978) and Daniel arap Moi (1978-1991, and ultimately until 2002). Kenyatta’s regime was relatively liberal. It permitted for relatively free press, civil society and independent judiciary. The government allowed for criticism by parliamentary backbenchers and did not tamper with one-party elections held in 1974, although it retained ultimate control over candidate registration. The president and his closest associates remained beyond criticism, however. The one-party competitive elections served as a means to legitimate power, gather information on the state of public opinion, and incorporate talented politicians into the system. The voters’ primary concern under this system was to elect politicians who would effectively provide for patronage. Nevertheless, Kenyatta clearly marked the boundaries of the permitted opposition when he organized assassination in March 1975 of a prominent backbencher critic, Josiah Kariuki. After Kariuki was eliminated the internal opposition within KANU was to a large degree silenced. Ultimately, Kenyatta could afford to tolerate moderate opposition because his position as a chief executive was largely unchallenged. He enjoyed enormous prestige as the leader of the independence movement and ample opportunities for patronage resulting from sustained economic growth.

Kenyatta died in August 1978 and he was succeeded, according to the constitution, by Vice-president Daniel arap Moi. Moi, a non-Kikuyu, was able to consolidate his position by driving a wedge into the dominant ethnic group. In comparison to the Kenyatta’s rule, the
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Moi’s regime was more authoritarian. The new president did not enjoy Kenyata’s prestige and had to face powerful opposition within the party. He also governed during a period of economic crisis, when the amount of available patronage was diminishing, and was further restricted due to implementation of IMF-sponsored reforms. Moi based his rule on the support of his own tribe, Kalenjin, and diverted state resources from Kikuyu. This led to an attempted military coup organized by a group of Kikuyu officers in August 1982, after which the repression against real and potential opposition intensified. Moi also manipulated elections in order to prevent election of his critics within the party; in particular, the 1988 vote was heavily rigged. The end of the Cold War, as in other African countries, brought significant pressure for democratization in Kenya. Moi allowed for reintroduction of multi-party politics, but he survived the elections of 1992 and 1997, which he carefully manipulated. He ultimately lost the 2002 election, which opened a new era in the Kenyan politics. Hence, after its first unsuccessful attempt at democracy, only in the twenty-first century, in a radically changed international environment, Kenya experienced an alternation in power through elections and the first serious effort to build a self-sustaining democracy.

Zambia: From Democracy to One-Party State

Early Colonial Period

The current territory of Zambia was conquered by the British in the late nineteenth century. Establishment of a British colony in the area was a private initiative of the British South Africa Company (BSAC), led by Cecil Rhodes, which was only indirectly supported by the British government. Between 1899 and 1924 Zambia, known at the time as Northern Rhodesia, was a chartered colony administered by BSAC. The company’s rule was generally characterized
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by neglect as Northern Rhodesia was treated primarily as a reservoir of cheap labor for the more
developed Southern Rhodesia. In 1924 the rights to the territory were acquired by the British
government. In contrast to most British African colonies, Zambia was characterized by
significant presence of the mining industry, in particular copper mines, whose development
began in the 1950s. On the eve of independence 20.5% of the Zambian population lived in the
cities. Three main ethno-linguistic groups, Bemba, Nyanja and Tonga, account for about 70% of
the population of the country. The political divisions during the period of multi-party politics
were shaped to a large extent by the ethno-linguistic cleavages.

In contrast to the neighboring Southern Rhodesia, Zambia was not a subject of significant
white settlement. In 1921 there were only 3,600 white settlers in Zambia, the number which
increased to 13,800 in 1931 and 70,000 on the eve of independence (which was 2.3% of the total
population). In contrast to Kenya and Southern Rhodesia, however, the majority of White settlers
which came to Zambia did not engage in farming (there were only 1,000 of European farmers on
the eve of independence). The Europeans were represented in a partially elected legislative
council, which was created in 1926. At the local level, similarly as in other African colonies, the
British created a system of unelected native authorities. The system’s hierarchy culminated
with the African Representative Council. It was elected by native Provincial Councils, which
were on the other hand appointed by members of the urban advisory councils in the cities and
native authorities in rural areas. The members of the latter two bodies were nominated by British
provincial commissioners.
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After World War II, white settlers in Zambia began pressing the London government to create a federation with Southern Rhodesia. It was hoped that a federation with that territory, which had a much larger and better organized European population, would better protect white interests in the North. In spite of the opposition of the African native authorities, the federation was created in 1953. In addition to Southern and Northern Rhodesia, it encompassed also the neighboring territory of Nyasaland (the future Malawi). In the federation, African interests were marginalized. In the legislative council established in 1953, Africans of Northern Rhodesia were represented by three members. One of those was a European nominated by the governor, and the other two were chosen by an electoral college composed of unelected native authorities. Europeans of Northern Rhodesia directly elected eight members. The Northern Rhodesian representation in the council was reformed before the 1958 federal election. Fourteen members became directly elected by an electorate which included nearly all Europeans and very few Africans (1,600 in the entire federation, but thousands of eligible Africans did not register nevertheless), four were elected by native authorities, and two were nominated by the governor. Ultimately, four Africans (these included two independents and two members of a European-dominated party) and ten Europeans were elected from Northern Rhodesia in the 1958 federal election. However, the federation was generally considered illegitimate by the majority of the African elite, and this historical episode did not have much influence over the politics of independent Zambia.

---


Beginnings of African Politics

Development of modern civil society among the African majority proceeded in Zambia at a slower pace than in Kenya. The first African party, the Northern Rhodesia African Congress, was established in 1948 on the basis of a welfare federation. It initially grouped relatively moderate middle class Africans. In 1951, the party elected as its leader Harry Nkumbula, a radical schoolteacher, and changed the name to African National Congress. The ANC unsuccessfully opposed the British federation plan. The party also largely failed to obtain support of African trade unions, native authorities, and the African members of the Northern Rhodesian legislative council. In addition, many party members were frustrated by the Nkumbula’s increasingly autocratic leadership style, his intolerance for criticism, and acceptance of the British gradualist approach to the question of independence. In particular, Nkumbula was criticized for his decision to take part in 1958 federal election, in which ANC obtained only one seat. The final straw came when Nkumbula decided that the party would participate in the March 1959 Northern Rhodesian election in spite of British refusal to create a more representative legislative council. Motivated by these concerns, a group of radical young activists, led by Kenneth Kaunda and Simon Kapwepwe, broke from ANC in October 1958 and established a party which ultimately adopted the name of United National Independence Party (UNIP). UNIP adopted a more confrontational attitude toward the British. It demanded dissolution of the federation and immediate independence preceded by elections under universal suffrage. It boycotted the March 1959 election and refused to participate in the colony’s elected institutions, arguing that they did not provide for meaningful African representation.43

On the other hand, ANC was largely unsuccessful in the March 1959 election. Contrary to its hopes, it obtained only two out of twenty-two elected seats (additional eight members of the legislative council were appointed); while a European-dominated United Federal Party captured thirteen seats, and independent candidates six. There were 30,000 voters registered for this election out of population of three million. Only 7,600 Africans registered out of the eligible number of 25,000, which indicated relative success of the UNIP boycott.\textsuperscript{44} After the election, as a punishment for its boycott strategy, UNIP was banned in the Copperbelt region and its main leaders, including Kaunda, were arrested and banished in remote locations. The repression, paradoxically, helped UNIP achieve the status of the most popular party among the African majority. Despite the ban, the party coordinated a campaign of civil disobedience and sabotage in order to force the government in London into concessions. Gradually, the British became reconciled with the prospect of increased autonomy and ultimate independence of Northern Rhodesia. Kaunda was released in January 1960 and assumed the post of the party’s leader. He held talks with the Colonial Office in May 1960, and in December 1960 tripartite negotiations involving the Colonial Office, UNIP and ANC began. They resulted in adoption of a new constitution in March 1962. The document did not dissolve the federation, but increased the autonomy of Northern Rhodesia and the extent of African representation in the legislative council. UNIP rejected the constitution but decided nevertheless to participate in the upcoming election.\textsuperscript{45}

For the October 1962 election, the government in London adopted a complicated electoral law which divided voters into two rolls, but reserved a certain number of seats for
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parties which successfully obtained seats across the racial division. As a result, out of forty-five seats, ten remained initially vacant because none of the main three parties was particularly successful in gaining support outside of its target racial group. There were 130,000 voters registered for the 1962 election, which amounted to approximately 8% of adults. The main contestants for the African vote were UNIP and ANC, while the United Federal Party (UFP) was the dominant party among the Europeans. The latter obtained sixteen seats, including nearly all seats reserved for whites. The ANC obtained seven seats having lost its national prominence to UNIP, and retained popularity only among the Tonga speakers in the Southern Province. UNIP gained fourteen seats. As it turned out, even among the narrow strata of middle class Africans, the radical message of UNIP was more popular than the conciliatory tone of ANC. Even though the UFP had a secret pre-election pact with the UFP on formation of a coalition government, it broke it and instead formed a coalition government with UNIP after the election. This government remained in office until the next election held on the eve of independence in January 1964. The politics in this period was characterized by constant tension and violence between the supporters of the two parties, the phenomenon which persisted into the independence period. While ANC activists were persecuted by UNIP supporters in the Bemba speaking areas, UNIP activists met the same fate in the Tonga-speaking areas of the South, which remained the UNIP stronghold. This regional division of support persisted until the end of multi-party politics in 1972.47

As the country was preparing for the independence in 1964, it was clear that the democratic institutions established by the British would be difficult to maintain. Similarly as in

46 Sardanis 2003, 95.

47 Macola 2010, 34-35, 40-44.
Kenya, the experience of democratic politics before independence was too short to positively affect the probability of survival of democracy. First of all, there was a visible lack of trust between the government and opposition parties. The dominant expectation was that the opposition, if permitted to win elections, would permanently exclude the opponents from power. Hence the party in power quickly moved to introduce mechanisms with the aim to prevent opposition victory. In this regard, elections could be manipulated, or if feasible, one-party state could be introduced to eliminate the opposition altogether. Ultimately, the lack of trust was related to the conviction which was present both among the government and the opposition that multi-party politics was unsuitable for the Zambian reality. The short experience of colonial autonomy was insufficient to instigate a commitment to democratic values among the Zambian political elite.

**Period of Competitive Politics after Independence**

Independence, granted in October 1964, was preceded by elections under universal suffrage held in January 1964. The balance between the two main parties, UNIP and ANC, did not change. Of sixty-five seats elected under universal suffrage, UNIP gained fifty-five with 69% of the vote, while ANC obtained ten seats with 31% of the vote. In addition, ten seats were reserved for Europeans. The following years were marked by uneasy coexistence between the government and the opposition. Kaunda, along with other African leaders, did not hide that its ultimate goal was creation of one-party state in Zambia. His hope was that such a state would emerge through the ballot box, when no opposition party managed to obtain parliamentary representation. In practice, the government hoped that ANC would voluntarily dissolve and join
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the ruling party, as KADU did in Kenya, given the inability to obtain patronage outside of the ruling UNIP.\textsuperscript{49}

Officially, the UNIP regime was based on a vague ideology of Humanism, which was announced by President Kaunda in 1967. Humanism was an eclectic mixture of ideas deriving from Christianity, antiracism, and Fabian socialism flavored by the admiration for pre-colonial African cultures. Because of its ambiguity, however, Humanism failed to provide a viable ideological foundation for the party.\textsuperscript{50} Politically, UNIP’s ideology included an explicit commitment “to the desirability and inevitability of a one-party state,” which has been emphasized since independence. UNIP propagated a concept of ideological unity of the party, the state and the government, in which there was no space for a loyal opposition, while criticism was considered treacherous. Abandonment of UNIP was equal, according to the official ideology, to betrayal of the entire nation. In support of the one-party state, Kaunda used arguments heard in most other African countries. Supposedly, the one-party state was necessary to achieve national unity, overcome divisions along the ethno-regional lines, effectively confront the racist neighbors, and commit resources to national development. Multi-party politics was on the other hand portrayed as a Western invention, which was culturally alien to Africa.\textsuperscript{51} One should also note that there were few ideological differences between UNIP and the main opposition party, the ANC. This also stemmed from the fact that UNIP originated from a split within ANC. Although ANC and its leader, Harry Nkumbula, professed a token commitment to market economy, multiparty democracy and civil liberties, this did not result from sincere commitment to those values, but rather from a desire to be ideological different from UNIP. At
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the local level, Nkumbula approved of violence and ethnic chauvinism as the primary tools to extend the party’s influence and consolidate its base of support. Internationally, he enlisted assistance of Katanga separatists in order to obtain campaign funds for the 1962 election. There is little doubt that if in power, the ANC would use a strategy similar to UNIP to eliminate opposition and establish a one-party state.52

In 1967 the first viable third party emerged in Zambia, under the name of the United Party. Its support was concentrated in the Lozi-speaking Western Zambia. Grievances in the region were associated with abolition of the its traditional institutions and the government’s prohibition of temporary work in South Africa, which had been a major source of income for local residents. After formation of the United Party, its MPs were required to resign and seek reelection. This was possible due to adoption of a retroactive constitutional amendment following the Kenyan example. By-elections were held in February 1967 and were a victory for UNIP. Subsequently, however, the United Party was reinvigorated after its leadership was assumed by Nalumino Mundi, an important UNIP politician who had been expelled from the cabinet in 1966 and from the party in March 1967. Kaunda considered UP a threat to UNIP in Western Zambia and the Copperbelt, given that the party managed to set up effective organizations at the grassroots level. In contrast to ANC, which was largely tolerated, UP was persecuted by the government since its inception. Its leaders and activists were harassed, and organizational efforts were seriously hampered. Finally, using the pretext of ethnic unrest in the Copperbelt, the government banned UP in August 1968. Its activists subsequently joined ANC
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and contributed to its relative success in the Barotse Province in the December 1968 general election, where ANC obtained six out of eleven seats.\(^{53}\)

As in Kenya, the quality of democracy in Zambia and of elections in particular quickly deteriorated after independence. The UNIP’s government routinely denied patronage to the opposition-dominated districts. The party’s motto was “it pays to belong to UNIP”, in a literary sense, because business licenses, government jobs, and even places in public hospitals were restricted to UNIP members.\(^{54}\) During the campaign before the March 1967 by-elections, UNIP took excessive advantage of government resources, intimidated pro-ANC businessmen, and prevented the opposition from campaigning.\(^{55}\) Similar tactics characterized the campaign before the general election in December 1968. Ordinary citizens were coerced to register and vote for UNIP and widespread intimidation and violence was directed at opposition supporters. These tactics were only partially matched by reciprocal violence and intimidation directed at UNIP supporters in the ANC heartland.\(^{56}\) Ultimately, ANC obtained 23 out of 105 seats with 25% of the vote, and its leader, Nkumbula, scored 18% of the vote in the presidential election (but, as already mentioned, six of the ANC seats were won by former members of the banned United Party). Kaunda obtained 82% of the vote in presidential elections, while UNIP obtained 73% of the vote and eighty-one seats in the parliamentary elections. The ANC preserved its dominance in the Southern Province, but failed to extend it to the UNIP-dominated Bemba heartland. ANC campaign suffered when Nkumbula promised to restore trade relations with Rhodesia, South Africa and the Portuguese colonies if elected. The results ultimately showed that ANC was not
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going to disappear from the political scene through gradual decay, as hoped by the UNIP leadership.\textsuperscript{57}

After independence, Kaunda gradually extended the powers of the presidency and diminished the prerogatives of the cabinet and the legislature. The president’s policy regarding the ruling party concentrated on preservation of the balance between the three main ethnic groups and powerful personalities, while maintaining the ultimate hold on power. But Kaunda’s “divide and rule” tactics proved controversial. Because UNIP was initially dominated by activists from the Bemba ethnic group, in the early 1960s Kaunda promoted non-Bemba politicians for the positions of party leadership. In reaction, Bemba leaders mobilized support and were elected to key posts in the August 1967 intra-party election (the leader of the Bemba faction was Simon Kapwepwe, who became the party’s vice-president). This, on the other hand, led to mobilization among the non-Bemba within the party. The “Bemba faction” was accused of disloyalty by activists from the Eastern province, who in August 1969 demanded resignation of Kapwepwe from the vice-presidency of the party. Although Kapwepwe was publicly persuaded by Kaunda to keep the post, it was evident that the unity of the party was threatened. The probability of a split was further increased when in November 1970 a new party constitution was adopted, which further reduced the scope of representation of Bemba speakers. Although Kaunda spoke against ethnic divisions in public, in private the president cooperated with UNIP leaders from the Eastern region to undermine the Kapwepwe’s position within the party. He also used the accusation of tribalism to suppress all forms of opposition against his rule. In the meanwhile, Kapwepwe kept working behind the scenes to mobilize support for a breakaway party.\textsuperscript{58}

\textsuperscript{57} Burdette 1988, 74; Mwangilwa 1982, 115.

Kapwepwe publicly announced formation of a new United Progressive Party (UPP) in August 1971. He criticized Kaunda accusing him of autocratic tendencies, and arguing that his post-independence policies did not improve the economic situation of ordinary Zambians. UPP was officially committed to African socialism, an ideology which lacked a coherent meaning. This ideological ambiguity helped Kapwepwe. He managed to recruit both radical leftist students, who accused Kaunda that his anti-Apartheid policies were insincere, and small businessmen, who complained about the government’s statist approach. Ethnically, UPP had a stronghold among the Bemba speakers of the Copperbelt province, but it managed to obtain some support outside of this area among voters which were attracted to the party’s populism. Eventually, emergence of UPP posed the biggest challenge to the UNIP’s hold on power since independence, both from the ideological and organizational points of view. In most instances, UPP overtook entire branches of the ruling party at the local level. It also effectively mobilized local community leaders – businessmen, teachers and chiefs. The party’s growth was however quickly hampered by state repression. In September 1971 most of the UPP leadership, except of Kapwepwe, were accused of plotting a military uprising and arrested. A campaign of intimidation was launched against UPP supporters. Pro-UPP businesses were attacked by UNIP thugs and had their licenses revoked, while UPP supporters employed by public companies were sacked. The party was denied licenses necessary to hold public meetings and had to operate underground. There were also numerous clashes between supporters of UPP and UNIP in the Copperbelt. Kaunda accused the party of plotting to overthrow the government through violence and destruction.

Given the continuing strength of ANC in the Southern and Western provinces, and growing popularity of UPP in the North and the Copperbelt, the UNIP leadership feared that the opposition could win the general election planned for December 1973. These fears intensified after leaders of ANC, UPP and the banned UP held discussions on possible pre-electoral cooperation. After the December 1971 by-elections, in which UPP managed to win one seat but seriously challenged the ruling party, the pressure to create one-party state increased among UNIP activists, who considered it as the most secure means to prevent the opposition from achieving power.\textsuperscript{61} Subsequently, the government launched a campaign of violence directed against UPP activists. The clashes and waves of reciprocal intimidation between UPP and UNIP supporters were used as a convenient pretext by Kaunda to impose a ban on UPP in February 1972 and arrest its 123 leasing members, including Kapwepwe (most of them were subsequently released next year). Shortly after, a group of radical students tried to establish a successor party to UPP, but its leaders were also quickly arrested and the party was banned. Acting under pressure from party elites, in March 1972 Kaunda announced establishment of a “democratic” one-party state. The regime insisted that under the changed institutional framework Zambia would eliminate political violence and achieve national unity which was necessary to confront South Africa, Rhodesia and the Portuguese colonies. On 4 December 1972 a constitutional amendment which created a one-party state was adopted by the legislature, and in December 1972 the first competitive one-party election was held.\textsuperscript{62} ANC refused to dissolve, however, and continued to function until July 1973. Faced with a prospect of detention, Nkumbula refused to


become a political martyr and instead decided to accept a lucrative mining concession, dissolved ANC, joined the ruling party and encouraged his supporters to do the same.  

**Politics under One-party State**

Given that, similarly as in Kenya, there were few democrats among the Zambian political leadership, the collapse of the Zambian democracy could be anticipated since its inception. Competitive politics persisted for eight years after independence mostly because UNIP faced substantial opposition from ethnically-based parties, which made establishment of a one-party state politically more costly. The Zambian one-party state, ultimately established in 1972 under the Kaunda personal leadership, shared certain features with the regimes established in Kenya and other African countries, for example, Cote d'Ivoire. As in any personal dictatorship, the leader’s personal features had a significant influence on the regime’s character. In particular, civil liberties were largely respected under the Kaunda’s rule, and he generally preferred to co-opt the opposition instead of repressing it. He also refrained from assassination of political opponents. In spite of the economic recession, which hit Zambia in the late 1970s, Kaunda successfully eliminated all challenges to his rule. However, faced with the growing resistance after the end of the Cold War, he permitted multi-party election in October 1991 and after losing, transferred the power to the leader of the opposition, Frederick Chiluba (the second African leader to do so).

The new one-party constitution was adopted in December 1972 in spite of significant opposition of the UNIP’s liberal wing, which preferred to preserve political competition de facto if not de jure, advocating for competitive presidential elections and term limits. Instead, term limits were abolished, and the UNIP leadership decided that candidates for the presidency had to
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be nominated by a political party. In conditions of a one-party state this meant in practice that the UNIP National Council, controlled by Kaunda supporters, would nominate the only presidential candidate. As in Kenya, one-party competitive elections were held to the parliament. In each district voters had a choice between three candidates which had been previously elected in UNIP primaries. The UNIP central committee vetted the parliamentary candidates, however, which limited their independence and hampered criticism. In one-party competitive elections, a candidate’s electoral success depended first of all on his ability to deliver patronage to his district. MPs who were ineffective in this regard, even government ministers, were occasionally defeated. Otherwise, the elections legitimized the Kaunda’s regime, permitted for expression of local grievances, and provided for elite turnover. Still, in the changed circumstances of the one-party state, parochial issues and tribal divisions conditioned electoral outcomes. Politics was no longer structured along the Zambia’s ethno-linguistic cleavages.

Ultimately, even though the Kaunda regime failed to economically develop Zambia, it provided for a long period of political stability under a civilian leadership, and managed the country’s ethnic cleavages with relative success. This positive legacy increased the probability of the Zambia’s democratization after the end of the Cold War. Although the regime which came to power in 1991 manipulated the 1996 and 2001 elections, open-outcome votes were held after 2006, and Zambia ultimately emerged as one of the few African success stories in terms of democratic development. The country experienced the second alternation power at the 2011 presidential election.

Malaysia: From Democracy to Competitive Authoritarianism

Malaya under the British Rule

The territory of the Malay Peninsula was divided since the sixteenth century into several sultanates which were either independent or functioned as Portuguese, Dutch or Thai protectorates. The British colonization of the Malay Peninsula progressed gradually during the nineteenth century. In 1819 the British bought Singapore from the Sultan of Johor and used it as a trade outpost. In 1824 Melaka was acquired from the Dutch, who renounced all claims to Malaya in exchange for the recognition of their rights to what is now Indonesia. Initially, the British were reluctant to extend their colonial possessions in the peninsula, but internal disturbances in several sultanates, which hampered the production and trade in tin, prompted them to intervene. In 1874 Penang was forced to accept the status of a British protectorate. In 1909 Thailand was compelled to cede four northern sultanates, which already had been to a large extent controlled by British advisors. The last peninsular sultanate which formally accepted the British tutelage was Johor in 1914. At the time most British possessions in the Malay Peninsula had the status of protectorates. The exception were the territories acquired in the early nineteenth century (Singapore, Melaka, Dinding and Penang) which, with a much smaller population, had a status of a crown colony. 67

In 1877 British investors started to develop rubber and oil palm plantations in Malaya, an activity which required a large and disciplined labor force. For that purpose, farm labor was imported from Southern India, primarily from Tamil-speaking areas. Simultaneous development of tin mines and port facilitates required, on the other hand, importation of cheap foreign labor;
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in this case the need was fulfilled mostly by the Chinese. The Chinese and Indian communities did not integrate with the Malay society and formed separate communal organizations. While the Indian community continued to live in rural areas, the Chinese inhabited cities in large numbers, quickly dominating the colony’s financial and industrial sectors. Their growing prosperity was envied by the native Malay population, which was however privileged by the colonial authorities regarding employment in the administration, law enforcement and the armed forces. At the eve of independence in 1957, Malays constituted 50% of the population, while the Chinese 37% and Indians 11%.\(^{69}\) Malaysia’s ethnic diversity resulted in a similar range of challenges to democratic government as in the other ethnically-diverse British plantation colonies: Trinidad, Sri Lanka, Guyana and Mauritius. These challenges had a slightly different character in Malaysia, however, because of the Malay population’s insistence on the inherent right to rule due to its native character in contrast to the immigrant Chinese and Indian communities. As well, because of higher economic status of the latter, policies of economic discrimination privileging the Malays were enacted, contributing to ethnic tensions.\(^{70}\)

The British did not establish colonial autonomy in Malaysia during the interwar period. Two interrelated factors were responsible for this outcome. First of all, similarly to British African territories, Malaya was colonized only in the late nineteenth century. For that reason in the interwar period there did not yet develop a viable, Westernized middle class to which the British could transfer power at the level of autonomous institutions. In addition, development in this direction was hampered through the preservation of traditional native authorities in Malaya. Because their control over the colony depended on the support of traditional rulers, the British
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were reluctant to diminish the latter’s authority. The weakness of the westernized middle class was manifested through late emergence of a local nationalist movement. The first Malay nationalist organization was established only in 1938 as Young Malays Union (Kesatuan Melayu Muda, or KMM). Its goal was to establish a unified state which would encompass ethnic Malay areas both in Malaysia and Indonesia. KMM became largely discredited during the Japanese occupation (1941-45) as it collaborated with the occupiers in the hope that they would establish an independent Malaya. In the interwar period, political activity was more prevalent among the Chinese, who were infiltrated by underground organizations of the Kuomintang and the Communist Party. Otherwise, the period of Japanese occupation left the British distrustful toward the Malays, many of whom cooperated with the occupier. On the hand, Chinese were treated as enemy aliens by the Japanese and faced severe persecution. Consequently, a resistance movement supported by the British emerged among the Chinese, which was led by the Malayan Communist Party (MCA). Over the war, MCA resistance network became a powerful force whose military capabilities were preserved during the first years of the post-war era.  

After the war, the remnants of the Young Malays Union reorganized into a leftist Malayan Nationalist Party (MNP), whose goal remained creation of a supranational Malay state. On the other hand, the British government was financially strained and decided to prepare its Asian dependencies for independence. As the first step in the process, the British envisioned creation of the Malayan Union, a unified colony composed both of the sultanates and Straits Settlement (the crown colonies). Within the union, the remaining powers of the sultans would be largely abolished. The traditional rulers would only serve as chairmen of advisory councils in their respective states, being responsible solely for the matters of customs and religion. The
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immigrant communities would enjoy the union citizenship on the same rules as ethnic Malays. The plan stirred intense protests among the Malay Westernized elites, which erupted after several traditional rulers signed the proposed plan of the union. Malaysian nationalists argued that the rulers did not have the right to renounce sovereignty, while granting citizenship to the Chinese and Indians would pose an existential threat to the Malay nation. The Malay elites also feared that ultimately the British would grant independence to Malaya after leaving the power to the Communist-inclined Chinese, who were better organized than the native population. For that reason, pressures for independence remained muted among the Malays.  

The protests against the union resulted in formation of the United Malays National Organization (UMNO) in March 1946. It grouped numerous smaller Malay organizations, most of which were led by moderately-inclined civil servants. MNP joined UMNO but left after two months over ideological disagreements. UMNO pressured the British to modify the terms of the union, and its lobbying was largely successful. After prolonged negotiations, the Federation of Malaya was established in February 1948. It unified the protectorates and Straits Settlements (apart from Singapore which remained to be ruled separately). Within the federation, the rights of the traditional rulers were restored, citizenship rights for non-Malays became restricted and special privileges regarding recruitment to the civil service and armed forces were granted to the Malays. The federation’s Legislative Council was composed of the governor’s appointees and members appointed by the sultans. Mostly because of the latter’s opposition, the council did not include any elected members. Nevertheless, UMNO’s success in preserving the rights of

---

traditional rulers and ethnic privileges for the native population increased its popularity among the Malays.\textsuperscript{73}

The negotiations and subsequent creation of the federation were however opposed by MNP along with other nationally-inclined Malay organizations, and by the Chinese-dominated Communist movement. The former criticized the arrangement as undemocratic, as it did not provide for elected institutions. They also favored granting citizenship rights to the locally born Chinese and Indians under the condition that they would swear loyalty to Malaya. The Communists simply considered the federation as a puppet state controlled by the British imperialists and feudal rulers, which would relegate the immigrant groups to the second-class citizenship. In June 1948, inspired by Communist successes in China and Vietnam, the Malayan Communists began direct action against the British, starting guerrilla insurgency in Northern Malaya. The British responded introducing the state of emergency and outlawing the Communist Party and other leftist and nationalist organizations, including MNP. The insurgency was de facto ethnic in character, as the Communist movement was supported mostly by the Chinese with few Malays joining it. The rebellion and the associated state of emergency lasted until 1960, although the guerillas did not pose a direct threat to the Malayan state after 1954. The outbreak of the insurgency undoubtedly hampered the progress toward establishment of truly representative institutions within the framework of the Malayan Union.\textsuperscript{74}

\textbf{The Short Period of Colonial Autonomy in Malaya}

Before granting independence to Malaya, the British aimed negotiate an agreement between representatives of the communal groups over the future constitution of the country. In
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1949 the Communities Liaison Committee was established as a forum of negotiations. Ultimately, the Malay representatives agreed to grant citizenship to the immigrant communities in exchange for positive discrimination programs which would reduce the economic gap between the Chinese and the natives. During the negotiations, UMNO emerged as the most popular political organization within the Malay community; its growth was bolstered by the fact that the nationalist Malay parties remained illegal. The British also pressured UMNO to engage in cooperation with the representatives of the Chinese and Indian communities. It was hinted that independence would not be granted unless the communities enter into a formal agreement. In consequence, before the first municipal election under universal suffrage, UMNO formed an alliance with the conservative Malayan Chinese Association (MCO) and Malayan Indian Congress (MIC). The coalition, known simply as Alliance Party, handily won a series of local elections held between 1952 and 1954.75

At this time the main goal of the British was to form a legitimate government which would take over the troublesome colony. The first general election under universal suffrage was held in July 1955. The Alliance won 51 out of 52 elected seats with 80% of the vote. The party was challenged by two small Malay parties which represented nationalist and Islamic ideologies. Further twenty-two seats in the council were appointed. In August 1955, UMNO’s leader Tunku Abdul Rahman76 became the chief minister of the responsible government of the Malay Federation. Subsequently, the British organized negotiations over the shape of the independence constitution. Throughout the process the immigrant communities agreed to the formal predominance of the Malays in the army and the civil service, introduction of programs
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promoting education and economic development among the Malays, the monarchical form of

government,\textsuperscript{77} and to establishment of Malay as the only official language. In return, all racial
groups received citizenship on equal terms and non-Malays were guaranteed a fair share of
positions in the representative institutions. In August 1955, Tunku became the first prime
minister of the independent Malaya.\textsuperscript{78}

Hence, Malaya became an independent democracy, similarly to nearly all British African
colonies, after a very short period of colonial autonomy, which lasted only two years.
Democratic values and practices were not entrenched among the Malayan civil society at this
stage. Still, in contrast to the overwhelming majority of parties which took power in Sub-Saharan
African at independence, UMNO and its leaders were initially committed to democracy. Several
hypotheses could be advanced to explain this phenomenon. First of all, the experience of the
Communist insurgency discredited non-democratic left-wing alternatives to democratic
government in Malaya. The parties which would advocate a single-party regime, such as MNP,
were banned during the Emergency and never again reached political significance. In Africa, on
the other hand, parties which were ideologically similar to MNP, such as KANU in Kenya or
UNIP in Zambia, took over at independence and subsequently introduced one-party states.
Hence, because of the initial UMNO predominance, post-independence democracy in Malaysia
survived much longer than in nearly all post-colonial African countries (twelve years, to be
precise). Although competitive politics persisted for similarly long periods in Kenya and Zambia,
one should note that already the first post-independence election in the latter countries did not
meet democratic standards; hence one could reasonably argue that they made a transition from
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democracy to competitive authoritarianism shortly after independence. A comparable
deterioration of democratic standards did not take place in Malaysia, and all three post-
independence elections held in the country were generally free and fair. But as it turned out in
1969, the commitment to democracy among the UMNO leadership was not unconditional. This
ultimately resulted from the fact that the Malaysian democracy lacked a legacy of colonial
autonomy.

The Emergence and Breakdown of the Malaysian Democracy

In August 1959, a second general election was held in Malaya to the national legislature
and state assemblies. In comparison to the 1955 election, the percentage of non-Malay electorate
increased from 16% to 43% as a result of the new citizenship regulations. Accordingly, the
Alliance’s majority diminished to 74 out of 104 seats, which were obtained with 52% of the vote.
Among the parties which competed with UMNO for ethnic Malay vote, one should first of all
mention the Pan-Malaysian Islamic Party (PAS), which obtained thirteen seats with 21% of the
vote. PAS was popular among the rural population of Northern Malaya. It mobilized ethnic
Malays appealing to Islamic values, arguing for eventual establishment of an Islamic state in
Malaya. PAS accused UMNO of subservience to the Chinese, who allegedly controlled it
through the Alliance. The Alliance was also challenged by two multi-ethnic parties: Malayan
Peoples' Socialist Front (which obtained eight seats with 13% of the vote) and People’s
Progressive Party (four seats with 6% of the vote). The former was itself a coalition of two
smaller parties, one of which was popular solely among the Chinese. In the subsequent election,
held in April 1964, the Alliance recovered its strength, however, obtaining eight-nine out of 104
seats with 59% of the vote.79

The early years of independence were characterized by deliberations over the ultimate territorial shape of Malaya. In 1963, after a two-year process of negotiations and political consultations, the British colonies located on the island of Borneo (Sarawak and Sabah) along with Singapore joined the Federation of Malaya. The newly-created state was named Malaysia. The aforementioned territories united with Malaya mostly because of a conviction that they would not be economically or strategically viable as separate independent states. On the other hand, Malayan government was willing to absorb Singapore out of fears that this Chinese-dominated city would become a hotbed of Communist activity if left on its own. The union with Singapore was however problematic. First of all, UMNO broke an unwritten agreement with the Singapore’s ruling party, People’s Action Party (PAP), not to compete against each other in the respective constituencies, and registered its candidates in the 1963 state election in Singapore. In retaliation, PAP ran its candidates in the 1964 election on the mainland. It won only one seat, but its participation still caused considerable anger within the Alliance. Eventually, growing racial tensions in Singapore, its strong economic position in relation to the mainland, and the fear of destabilization of the ethnic balance in favor of the Chinese, convinced the Malaysian government that the country would be better off without Singapore. The final straw came when the Singaporean prime minister attempted to organize a broad opposition coalition against the Alliance. The territory was expelled from the federation in August 1965.  

Democratic politics in ethnically-divided Malaysia was ridden with contradictions. The Alliance’s electoral success depended on continuing support both from the Malay and Chinese communities. However, the Alliance was confronted by competitors who were not interested in mobilization of cross-community support. From the right, UMNO’s position was undermined by
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80 Cheah 2002, 93-102; Slater 2010, 118-119.
PAS, which accused it of selling off to the Chinese interests and betrayal of Islamic values. But when the Alliance enacted pro-Malay policies, it risked losing support of the Chinese community which would then vote for socialist parties. This happened when in 1961 an education reform was enacted. The bill abolished public funding for non-Malay primary schools, eliminated secondary schools which did not teach in Malay or English, and introduced obligatory teaching of Malay in the Chinese and Tamil primary schools. In the same period the Alliance government began transferring resources from the Chinese community in order to provide development services for the impoverished Malay rural regions. In general, the two main communities could be political mobilized with ease through argumentation touching upon their deep-seated grievances: The Chinese over the monopoly of the Malay political power, and the Malays over the persisting economic power of the Chinese.  

The situation came to a head with the May 1969 election. Before the vote, Malaysian People's Movement Party (or Gerakan), a new non-communal left-wing opposition party, was established. It appealed both to the Chinese organized labor and a growing class of secular and well-educated, but frequently unemployed, urban Malays. While PAS continued to pose a challenge from the right, the Alliance was also confronted by a left-wing Democratic Action Party, which was a continuation of the party established by the Singaporeans in 1965. Election results came as an unpleasant surprise to the Alliance. The party won only 45% of the vote countrywide, obtaining seventy-seven out of 144 seats.  

PAS won 21% of the vote and twelve seats, Democratic Action Party 12% of the vote and thirteen seats, and Gerakan 8% of the vote and eight seats. The opposition also won control over several key states, including Selangor,
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81 Cheah 2002, 86-90; Crouch 1996, 18-23;.

82 A regional party operating in Sabah, allied with the Alliance, won additional 13 seats, in mostly unopposed constituencies.
which was the seat of the national capital. Moreover, MCA, the Chinese coalition partner within the Alliance, shortly after the vote decided to withdraw from the government arguing that it had lost confidence of the Chinese community. It remained a part of the Alliance and hence it would support the government in the parliament, but its decision contributed to the distrust of UMNO among the Chinese. Shortly after the provincial results were announced, the opposition celebrated the victory in the capital with a parade, throwing insults at the Selangor’s chief minister and demanding his resignation. Anti-Malay slogans were also heard. After the government organized a counter-manifestation to celebrate its victory in the national election, the situation spiraled out of control. In the resulting riot almost 200 people died, predominantly Chinese, and there was a substantial damage to property. The authorities declared the state of emergency and a curfew. On 16 May 1969, six days after the election, the government reconstituted itself as National Operations Council (NOC), while Tunku remained the figurehead prime minister until September 1970. According to one of the UMNO leaders, Ismail Abdul Rahman, “democracy was dead.” Taking advantage of the constitution’s article 150 on the emergency powers, the junta suspended the constitution and the national and state legislatures. Several opposition leaders and numerous political activists faced detention, while civil liberties were dramatically restricted. The parliamentary government was resumed only in February 1971.83

The riots and the establishment of NOC marked the breakdown of democracy in Malaysia. As mentioned, democratic government survived in Malaysia even longer than it would be expected given that its democratization was preceded by only two years of colonial autonomy. As mentioned, certain idiosyncratic circumstances were responsible for this outcome. In

particular, openly anti-democratic ideologies became illegitimate in Malaysia with the demise of the Communist insurgency. The popularity of Communism within the Chinese spurred counter-reaction within the Malay community, which instead embraced conservative values. As a result, the main nationalist party in Malaysia, in contrast to the dominant post-independence parties in the post-colonial Africa, openly embraced political pluralism. Malaysia was also lucky regarding the choice of its first prime minister, Tunku Abdul Rahman, who was a committed democrat alongside such leaders as Jawaharlal Nehru or D.S. Senanayake in Sri Lanka. His achievement was creation of the multi-ethnic Alliance, which united representatives of the three dominant ethnic communities of Malaysia. One should note that similar political groupings did not emerge in other former British colonies characterized by comparable ethnic divisions, such as Sri Lanka, Mauritius, Trinidad or Guyana. Still, given the lack of legacy of pre-independence open-outcome elections, the Malaysia’s elites’ commitment to democracy was shallow and it vanished when faced with adverse circumstances. When it appeared that ethnic unrest might spiral out of control, and that the hegemony of ethnic Malays was under threat, a large faction of the ruling party came to a conviction that introduction of openly-authoritarian system was necessary. UMNO’s diminishing electoral returns, which indicated the risk of a future electoral defeat, might also have played a part in the elite’s calculation when the decision to abolish democracy was being made.

The behavior of UMNO leadership could be compared to the attitudes of the Philippine or Sri Lanka elites during similar crises of democracy. In the Philippines, independence was achieved in 1946 after thirty-six years of colonial autonomy, but in the late 1940s the north of the country was destabilized by a leftist insurgency known as the Hukbalahap Rebellion. The elites in Sri Lanka were faced with constant resurgence of ethnic riots and pogroms, with the largest
(e.g. the riot of 1958) reaching the proportions of the Malaysian riot of 1969. Yet, as a reaction to the rebellion, the Philippine elites did not abolish democracy. Quite the contrary, the fraudulent electoral practices, which were one of the causes of the unrest, were addressed, and the standards of free and fair elections were enforced before the 1951 vote, which helped suppress the insurgency. In Sri Lanka, although the deep-seated causes of the ethnic unrest were not seriously addressed, the abolition of democracy was also out of question. Contrastingly, the reaction of Malaysian elites to the growing ethnic unrest represented quite the opposite. “Malaysian elites have therefore generally lacked the confidence of their Philippine counterparts that democracy and stability can go together.”

The most plausible explanation of this divergence points to the difference regarding the strength of commitment to democracy. The commitment was shallow in Malaysia and deep-seated in Sri Lanka and the Philippines, which directly resulted from the legacy of colonial autonomy in the latter countries and the lack of such a legacy in Malaysia.

Still, after reintroduction of the constitutional government in February 1971, Malaysia did not evolve into a one-party state. Given the perceived illegitimacy of leftist institutional solutions, introduction of one-party state was simply considered unfeasible by the UMNO leadership. Hence, a democratic form of rule was preserved, but not the substance. Indeed, the first act of the reconvened parliament was to adopt a series of constitutional amendments which dramatically reduced the scope of freedoms enjoyed by ordinary Malaysians. In particular, discussion of matters referring to the official language, citizenship, the monarchical form of state, and special position of the native population was explicitly prohibited, and the ban encompassed the members of the federal and state parliaments. The reconvened parliament also adopted amendments to the Internal Security Act of 1960, which allowed the government to
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detain without trial, or prohibit political activities, of anyone who threatened internal peace, economic stability, or interethnic harmony (the concrete definition of the latter concepts was the prerogative of the government). Freedoms of speech and the assembly were also further restricted via other legislative acts accepted or amended in 1971 and 1972, such as The Official Secrets Acts, The Sedition Act and the University Act.

Through application of this legislation, Malaysia was transformed into an institutionalized competitive autocracy firmly ruled by the Alliance. The latter reconstituted itself in 1971 as the National Front (Barisan Nasional) and subsequently absorbed two opposition parties: PAS and Gerakan. After 1971, elections in Malaysia were held at constitutionally proscribed intervals, and the regime refrained from direct fraud (such as ballot stuffing or protocol falsification). Yet, because of the remaining severe restrictions on civil liberties, which directly inhibited the freedoms of campaigning and possibilities of voter mobilization, the opposition’s chances of electoral victory were effectively reduced to zero. The regime, which has based its legitimacy on the provision of economic growth and interethnic peace, has withered all challenges to its rule, which intensified after the end of the Cold War, and remained in power as of 2014.85

Final Remarks

The countries analyzed in this chapter, the African cases on one hand and Malaysia on the other, were different in numerous ways. While the post-colonial economies of Zambia and Kenya were dominated by subsistence and commercial agriculture, with some presence of mining and industry in Zambia, Malaysia was characterized by the prevalence of a plantation economy. Malaysia was also slightly wealthier in comparison to Zambia and Kenya. Its politics was also undermined by sharper ethnic cleavages, with the population divided into non-

85 Hwang 2003, 104-09; Cheah 2002, 121-58.
integrated ethnic groups of ethnic Malays and the Chinese and Tamil immigrant communities. On the other hand, in Kenya and Zambia the character of ethnic politics was different. The ethno-linguistic cleavages, although still pronounced, were not as divisive and affected politics to a smaller extent (leaving aside the problem of miniscule settler minorities); these countries also lacked a politically-activated religious cleavage. Ultimately, however, the aforementioned factors did not influence directly regime outcomes in the analyzed countries during the post-colonial period. Instead, as I tried to show in this chapter, breakdown of post-colonial democracies in Kenya, Zambia and Malaysia can be convincingly explained by the fact that these countries experienced only very short periods of colonial autonomy before independence. Absence of colonial autonomy was the only significant common historical legacy in the three analyzed cases; hence it can be identified as the probable cause of their democratic breakdown. I also tried to provide additional support for this explanation through implicit comparison of Malaysia and Sri Lanka (analyzed in Chapter 7), the cases which were otherwise very similar, but differed regarding regime outcomes. On one hand, Sri Lanka and Malaysia shared a similar mode of agricultural production (plantation economy) and sharp ethnic divisions between native and (supposedly) immigrant communities. On the other, they differed regarding the length of colonial autonomy (substantial in Sri Lanka and very short in Malaysia) and regime outcomes (democratic survival in the former and breakdown in the latter). Again, the length of colonial autonomy emerges as the most viable causal factor conditioning regime outcomes in the post-colonial democracies.

In the former colonies which lacked a legacy of colonial autonomy, democracy functioned under a very high risk of breakdown. Pre-independence nationalist movements which developed in such colonies did not have a chance to participate in electoral politics and embrace
democratic values. Instead, they operated in conditions of an authoritarian state which did not hesitate to use repression against the emerging nationalist parties whenever necessary. Hence, the values and patterns of behavior of the political parties which gained power at independence were predominantly authoritarian. Multi-party democracy was viewed as a Western invention which was unsuitable for the post-colonial realities. Moreover, anti-democratic values were shared both by the government and opposition parties. Hence, the ruling parties had a strong incentive to bar the opposition from an electoral victory given that it would entail the former’s permanent exclusion from power. In other words, ruling parties in the post-colonial democracies which lacked a legacy of autonomy eliminated democracy not only because of their authoritarian ideologies, but also because it was the only secure method to preserve power in a situation when the opposition, if allowed to win an open-outcome election, would have done exactly the same. Still, it is not possible to argue that in all post-colonial democracies which lacked a legacy of colonial autonomy there were no true democrats. In an exceptional case of Malaysia, the ruling party which came to power at independence, because of idiosyncratic reasons, was sincerely committed to multi-party democracy. But as it turned out, this commitment was not deep-seated (diffuse) and it disappeared when the Malaysian democracy faced a severe crisis. This contrasted sharply with the situation in Sri Lanka and other ex-colonies which enjoyed a legacy of colonial autonomy, where democracy survived confronted with similar difficulties.
Table 8.1. Social, economic and political characteristics of Kenya, Zambia and Malaysia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Zambia</th>
<th>Malaysia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita at independence(^1)</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita 10 years after independence(^2)</td>
<td>1241</td>
<td>1789</td>
<td>2277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of ethnic conflict</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic heterogeneity</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant religion</td>
<td>Christianity</td>
<td>Christianity</td>
<td>Islam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant mode of agricultural production</td>
<td>Subsistence &amp; commercial</td>
<td>Subsistence</td>
<td>Plantation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statehood before colonization</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long period of colonial autonomy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Int. 2005 GK$ (PPP), data from Gapminder Foundation.

\(^2\) Ibidem.
CHAPTER 9
CONCLUSION: HISTORICAL LEGACIES, ACTORS’ PREFERENCES, AND PARADOXES OF DEMOCRATIC DEVELOPMENT

How Historical Legacies Matter

The purpose of this dissertation has been to propose a new explanation of how democracy developed in Europe and in the post-colonial world. Two historical trajectories or “paths” to self-sustaining democracy were identified. In Europe, before WWII, self-sustaining democracies emerged through democratization from PA monarchy (with possible intermediate stage of competitive oligarchy). In the post-colonial world, self-sustaining democracies emerged in those ex-colonies which experienced long-lasting colonial autonomy before independence. As I will elaborate further, PA monarchy and colonial autonomy shared a crucial characteristic which rendered them unique regime forms: namely, the practice of open-outcome elections was externally enforced in these regimes, which rendered it self-sustainable. The self-sustainable character of open-outcome elections was subsequently retained after these regimes made transitions to democracy. In other words, the practice of open-outcome elections was unlikely to emerge unless enforced by an external unelected power, which could be a monarch or a colonizer. Under different settings the basic dynamics of prisoner’s dilemma made the failure of free electoral competition extremely likely. This pertained both to democracies and competitive oligarchies. Still, regarding transitions from PA monarchy to democracy, one important caveat should be emphasized. That is, if such a transition was characterized by regime discontinuity (whether a military coup or popular uprising), the positive effect of the legacy of open-elections was nullified. Otherwise, as I found in this dissertation, when a regime which did not practice open-outcome elections transitioned to democracy, the type of transition (whether through or without discontinuity) did not matter for democratic stability. Overall, this dissertation offers a deeply historical argument about development of democracy. It shows how “history matters”, but
not in a naïve understanding of the maxim. Rather, it illustrates the importance of historical sequences and emphasizes how in order to understand a country’s history one needs to identify and analyze crucial historical junctures which initiated path-dependent processes, largely determining the nature of subsequent political developments.

The concepts of critical juncture and path-dependent processes have been discussed by numerous scholars.¹ Paul Pierson, while elaborating on the importance of such processes in politics, argued that they could be conveniently divided into two stages.² The early stage of a path-dependent process, which is much shorter than the later stage, largely determines the ultimate outcome of the process during the later stage. During the early stage, political actors have the opportunity to choose among several options. This stage of a path-dependent process is often conceptualized by political scientists as a “critical juncture”, which could be described as a window of historical opportunity during which a wide set of choices is available to political actors, while the effects of political actions, and political actions themselves, become highly contingent.³ Still, once a particular choice is made during a critical juncture, the path-dependent process enters into a self-enforcing dynamics of increasing returns in which reversing to a different choice becomes more and more costly and for that reason less and less likely. As Pearson⁴ emphasized, timing and sequencing of events also plays a crucial rule during a critical juncture. A particular outcome might be possible only if event A takes place before an event B during a critical juncture, while an entirely different outcome could be a result of an event B took place before an event A, or if the time span between events A and B was longer. To give an
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¹ E.g. Capoccia and Kelemen 2007; Pierson 2000b.
² Pierson 2000a.
³ Pierson 2000b, 75.
⁴ Pierson 2004, chap. 2.
example from this dissertation, the ultimate fate of alternation-permitting regimes in the
nineteenth-century Europe depended on the length of period between establishment of PA
monarchy and granting of responsible government. If this period was shorter than approximately
ten years, the practice of open-outcome elections was terminated shortly after the responsible
government was granted.

In the light of the theory of critical junctures, political histories can be ultimately divided
into stages when actors have either significant or almost no freedom regarding the choice of
particular solutions. Once certain choices are made, actors become “stuck” in a process which is
for all practical purposes irreversible, with certain political goals becoming unattainable. The
existence of path dependent processes undermines certain common assumptions often made
about the political world. Firstly, it shows that in most circumstances political actors are not free
to design an optimal solution to a political problem. Certain solutions, even if objectively
rational, are not attainable because they would be too costly to adopt for the political actors who
make decisions at a later stage of the path-dependent process. Secondly, it shows that numerous
outcomes should not be treated as “natural” or functionally efficient. Indeed, choices made
during a critical juncture might be optimal for the time being (or even suboptimal already when
they are being made), but become gradually suboptimal in a longer term due to changed
circumstances.\(^5\) However, due to the character of a path-dependent process, choices once made
are to a large extent irreversible. For example, the United States constitution was probably a
good institutional choice for the late eighteenth century, but as of the early twenty-first century
many of the institutional solutions it envisioned have become obsolete. They are, nevertheless,
hard to change. Finally, one should emphasize that extensive study of history is necessary to

\(^5\) Pierson 2000a, 252.
determine path-dependent processes because the early stages of such processes (or critical junctures), when the crucial choices were made and the political process became self-reinforcing, might have occurred several decades, or even centuries ago.

In the same vein, in case of the processes described in this dissertation, the critical junctures in question might have taken place in a relatively recent past (as in Jamaica in 1945-62) or quite distant history (as in the 1820s in the Netherlands or Spain). To give some examples, Belgium’s democratic stability cannot be explained unless its history under the Kingdom of the Netherlands in 1815-30, when the practice of open-outcome elections became entrenched under PA monarchy, is taken into consideration. The political development of Sri Lanka was fundamentally conditioned by the British decision to endow this colony with responsible government in 1931 and maintain it until independence. In order to understand the failure of the Italian democracy in the years 1919-23, one needs to analyze in detail the crucial events which occurred in the Kingdom of Piedmont in the 1850s, in particular, the king’s decision to accede to parliamentary government, and the Cavour’s decision to manipulate the 1857 election in order to preserve his parliamentary majority. The aforementioned periods were of critical importance regarding these countries’ respective histories, and hence should be analyzed much more carefully than periods of less “eventful” history which followed later. Once the practice of open-outcome elections became entrenched in Belgium and the country made a transition to competitive oligarchy, it entered into the later stage of a path-dependent process, during which introduction of an autocratic political system became less and less likely due to increasing returns stemming from the practice of open-outcome elections. Hence, what happened in the subsequent decades had a relatively small effect on the political history in the twentieth century. As well, once the practice of electoral manipulation became an integral part of the Italian
political system, the causal effect of the each manipulated election was much smaller in comparison to the first manipulated election of 1857. In other words, the period of 1848-57 was a critical juncture in the Piedmontese/Italian history. Once the decision to manipulate the 1857 election was made, the practice became self-enforcing and the likelihood of reversal to free electoral politics diminished with each passing year due to increasing returns originating from electoral manipulation.

In spite of the recent changes towards greater recognition of importance of historical legacies, the contemporary study of politics is still to a large extent dominated by quantitative analysis of the effect of socio-economic variables, such as economic development, on political outcomes. In this context, the lesson to be taken from this dissertation is that contemporary political outcomes often cannot be explained with the variables pertaining to social or economic structure. Rather, one needs to analyze long-lasting historical legacies to achieve that goal. No matter how diligently one would scrutinize the contemporary variables such as the level of development, type of political system, character of relations between the communal groups or the effect of the international environment, such analysis will not account for the reasons of contemporary democratic stability in Belgium, the Netherlands or Jamaica. In the same vein, in order to understand the collapse of the first Italian democracy, the analysis of the Italy’s social structure in the early interwar period would be definitely insufficient. In those cases, the causes of the respective political outcomes are hidden deeply in the past and should be located during critical junctures which took place at the beginning of these countries’ modern political histories.

**Unique Character of PA Monarchy and Colonial Autonomy**

The crucial events which shaped subsequent political development of the countries analyzed in this dissertation were associated with the emergence (or lack of emergence) of two crucial and unique regime types: PA monarchy and colonial autonomy. PA monarchy
subsequently gave rise to modern democracy, and then some democracies (mostly Britain) established colonial autonomies; hence the rise of the latter was also historically related to the emergence of the former. PA monarchy and colonial autonomy were unique regime types because they were characterized by self-sustainable practice of open-outcome elections. In consequence, one could safely claim that if PA monarchy had never emerged in Europe as a regime form, we would also never have seen modern democracy emerging.

Historically, PA monarchy was first established, rather incidentally, in England after the 1688 coup, or Glorious Revolution. After the upheaval the new monarch, William III (who had helped the revolutionary cause with his Dutch troops) promised to respect the parliament’s rights, which was the condition under which he assumed the throne. Under the new arrangement, legislation and taxation could only be enacted by mutual agreement of the monarch and the legislature, basic civil rights were to be guaranteed, while the executive power was to be retained by the monarch (for the time being). Hence, PA monarchy was in practice a form of compromise between the monarch and the English middle class. In order for the compromise to remain meaningful, the practice of open-outcome elections had to be permitted; otherwise, if the elections had been manipulated by the executive, the parliament would not have effectively represented the middle class and the deal would have been broken. If the king had decided to manipulate elections, or if he had curtailed the parliamentary prerogatives, he would have risked another middle class revolution and could meet the fate of James II of England, himself abolished in the Glorious Revolution, or Charles X of France, removed in the July Revolution of 1830. Hence, the practice of open-outcome elections was self-sustaining within the political system of PA monarchy (or, using the language of game theory, it was an equilibrium solution).
Obviously, the first PA monarchy would not have emerged if there had been no parliament in England in the first place. The emergence of representative assemblies – and those had been solely a Western idea – was a precondition of development of PA monarchy and, in consequence, of modern democracy. Such assemblies were first established in the medieval Europe and shared different fates. In some countries, as in Spain or France, they gradually lost power and were effectively obliterated by absolutist monarchs. In others, as in Hungary, Sweden (in the eighteenth century) or the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, they managed to establish effective sovereignty until abolished by monarchs or through foreign invasions. Undoubtedly, a first PA monarchy could have emerged in another country which had an established legacy of representative assemblies. However, perhaps it was a fortunate historical coincidence that it was first established in England. The growth of Britain as a worldwide empire in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries vindicated its political system as an example to follow by other countries. The British institutional model served as an inspiration for the first French constitution of 1791. It subsequently was followed by several countries which established representative institutions in the post-Napoleonic period: the Netherlands, Sweden, and several German states. After years of hiatus, another wave of expansion of constitutional government came after the Spring of Nations, when the system of PA monarchy was adopted in Denmark and Prussia. Ideologically, PA monarchy was implicitly supported by several thinkers such as John Locke or Jean-Jacques Rousseau, whose ideas were enthusiastically embraced by the European middle class, struggling to limit the excesses of absolutism.

The spread of democracy in the post-colonial world is also to a large extent the result of British policies. Because the British practiced representative government at home, they also granted it to some of their overseas possessions, starting with the thirteen American colonies and
subsequently Canada. The United States was established as a self-sustaining
democracy/competitive oligarchy mostly because its independence had been preceded by several
decades of colonial autonomy, with freely elected assemblies established in each of the
American colonies. As described in Chapters 7 and 8, the British ultimately established long
colonial autonomies in a small number of their non-settler colonies. They were willing to do only
if they considered a colony “ready” for autonomy, by which they meant that they could find a
reliable partner to which partial responsibility for governance at the level of elected autonomous
institutions could be transferred. In practice, thus-understood “readiness” entailed presence of a
viable Westernized middle class, which could have developed only in the early-established
British colonies: those which were founded in the first half of the nineteenth century. Territories
which were acquired by the British at a later stage, and territories colonized by other European
powers, experienced very short periods of colonial autonomy, or did not experience such periods
at all, which led to quick collapse of their post-colonial democracies. Ultimately, however, even
a very short period of colonial autonomy was positively associated with the probability of
democratization, in particular after the international environment became pro-democratic after
the end of the Cold War. Overall, in light of this historical process, democracy appears to be
largely a Western institutional invention spread to the non-Western world through colonization.

The causal mechanism through which long colonial autonomy led to self-sustaining
democracy was similar to the mechanism of democratization from PA monarchy, but still
differed from the latter in numerous ways. First of all, the practice of open-outcome elections in
colonies was not initially self-sustainable, in a sense that it was enforced by the colonizer. The
British or the French controlled the quality of elections in their colonies, and (with few
exceptions, which applied to French colonies) ensured their open-outcome character. However, it
appears that the practice of open-elections became self-sustainable in many colonies already during the autonomy. This was evident through the fact that this practice was maintained by the ex-colonial political elites once these countries achieved independence. Still, the colonizer performed a similar function as the monarch under PA monarchy in ensuring that the standards of open-outcome are respected. The British respected these standards for ideological reasons, but also because, alike post-absolutist monarchs, they could not have claimed to grant meaningful representation to the colonial middle class if they had manipulated the electoral process. In this situation, creation of colonial autonomy would defy its primary purpose, which was alleviation of social tensions and satisfaction of the westernized middle class’ demand for representative government.

Nevertheless, few colonies experienced long periods of colonial autonomy, and consequently few post-colonial democracies survived. As mentioned, with the exceptions of Lebanon (a French colony) and the Philippines (a US colony) only the British granted long periods of autonomy to some of their colonies, and these colonies were located outside of Africa. Hence, the findings of this dissertation apply to Latin America and Sub-Saharan Africa only in a sense that they largely explain the failures of post-colonial democracies in those regions. In particular, no African colony enjoyed a period of colonial autonomy longer than nine years, and independence of nearly all French African colonies was preceded by only one year of elected self-government. Hence, as shown in Chapter 8 through examples of Kenya and Zambia, post-colonial African democracies began their existence with a historical legacy which made establishment of self-sustaining democracy very unlikely. In a related development, the Spanish and Portuguese colonies in America achieved independence in the early nineteenth century through a process of violent extraction, having experienced no periods of colonial autonomy.
Hence, negative historical legacy characterized also a few democracies or competitive oligarchies established in some of the former American Spanish and Portuguese in this era. Elites inspired by the Enlightenment ideology and the successful experience of representative government in the United States, established such political systems in Mexico, Central American countries, Colombia, Venezuela and Paraguay, but they collapsed sooner or later and turned into often-unstable civilian or military dictatorships, with the longest stretch of freely elected government functioning in Colombia between 1831 and 1854. One should also note that with the exception of Brazil, newly established American countries were republics; hence in contrast to European polities they could not engender the practice of open-elections under PA monarchy. In Brazil, PA monarchy was established in 1826 under Pedro I from the Portuguese house of Braganza, but it survived only until the latter’s forced abdication in 1831. Subsequently, competitive oligarchy functioned under regency until the rigged elections of 1840, which marked the breakdown of free electoral competition; fraudulent elections marked the rule of Pedro II after he came to age in 1841. In the case of Brazil, the legacy of open-outcome elections under PA monarchy was too short to ensure survival of free electoral competition after an elected executive was introduced in 1831.

Given the fate of democracies in the post-colonial world, the findings of this dissertation have also certain normative undertones. If one accepts democracy as a normatively desirable system, then the fact that the overwhelming majority of colonies were granted independence without experiencing long periods of autonomy could be treated as a historical irresponsibility, and the blame should be placed on the European colonizers. If a long period of autonomy had been a standard of decolonization, most of the post-colonial world would be now overwhelmingly democratic. In possible defense of the colonizers, one could reply that few
colonies were “ready” to receive colonial autonomy before the pressure for decolonization forced Britain and France to grant them independence in the 1960s. It is true that the British preferred to grant autonomy to those colonies which they considered socially advanced, particularly in terms of presence of a British-educated, Westernized middle class. However, the presence of such a middle class did not on its own contribute to survival of post-colonial democracies, as detected in Chapter 3 through quantitative methods. For example, a post-colonial democracy in Cyprus, which lacked a legacy of colonial autonomy, collapsed even though it had a relatively well-developed Westernized middle class. What mattered for democratic survival after independence was not the strength of the Westernized middle class, but the values espoused by a much narrower group of ruling elites, and the period of colonial autonomy was necessary to instill democratic values among the latter. In addition, post-colonial democracies were helped by the presence of well-developed civil society and political parties. From this point of view, granting of an autonomous status appeared to be the most efficient trigger of democratic development. Democratic political parties and civic society organizations developed to a large extent in order to take advantage of the civil liberties and electoral institutions which had been already established. Hence, if the British had established such institutions in their African colonies in the interwar period, their presence would have on its own instilled pro-democratic values among the local elites and led to the emergence of strong political parties and civil society organizations. Simultaneously, democratic values would have been spread among the general population, gradually mobilized to participate in electoral politics by the emerging political parties. Hence, introduction of colonial autonomy much earlier than initially planned was definitely feasible.
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6 The most reliable proxy variable for the strength of Westernized middle class was the prevalence of Protestant missionary activity, as identified by Woodberry, 2004. Yet, this factor did not increase chances of democratic survival once the length of colonial autonomy was controlled for. Hence, the causal role was rather played by colonial autonomy, but the presence of Westernized middle class increased the likelihood that the autonomy would be granted.
Subsequently, the British decolonized their possessions in a rapid pace even though most of the latter were not ready for independence, not only from the point of view of democratic development, but also basic state-building. Truly, in some colonies vocal pro-independence movements developed which demanded unconditional independence. But in others, such as in Nigeria, the British, which had gradually started to perceive colonies as a burden, actually pressed for independence contrary to the opinions of local elites, who preferred to wait. The British were in fact aware that African elites would not maintain democratic institutions once granted independence, in contrast to the elites in such countries as Sri Lanka and India.\(^7\) Hence, they were to a large extent responsible for the tyranny and economic mismanagement which ensued in many of the ex-colonies. The responsibility of the French for similar outcomes is even greater. France did not establish effective autonomous institutions in any of its colonies (with exceptions of Lebanon and Syria) and subsequently decolonized its possessions in a single step. This occurred in spite of the fact that nearly all French colonies preferred continuation of the union with France, as expressed during the 1958 referendums in the French Community.

The fact that European PA monarchies gradually gave rise to self-sustaining democracies constitutes probably the greatest paradox of democratic development. The rulers who agreed to establish PA monarchies would be greatly surprised to find out how they inadvertently helped the cause of democracy, as they were of course no democrats and, if given free choice, would have preferred to retain the system of absolute monarchy. PA monarchy was usually seen as a compromise institutional solution which hampered the middle class desire to establish a full parliamentary government. Paradoxically, when such a desire was immediately granted, then democracy was helped in a short term but doomed in a long term, as it happened in Piedmont

\(^7\) Iwunze 2013, 87-88.
and Hungary, whose history was discussed in Chapter 6. In those countries, introduction of competitive oligarchy was not preceded by a legacy of PA monarchy, and hence their political systems quickly degenerated into non-competitive oligarchy, characterized by manipulated electoral competition and restrictions of civil liberties. Self-sustaining competitive oligarchies or democracies could be, and were established only in countries endowed with a legacy of PA monarchy when the practice of open-outcome elections, because it was self-sustainable, could have become entrenched and habituated by political actors. Hence, in case of the European political development, too much democracy in a short term prevented establishment of self-sustaining democracy in the long term. If the process of political modernization had not started with establishment of PA monarchy, a country entered into a path which usually led to a failure of democracy. A similar paradox of democratic development occurred in the colonies. If a colony was granted independence and democracy too early, having not experienced a long period of colonial autonomy, this usually led to a failure of its post-colonial democracy. For instance, if the British had conceded to the demand of the Congress Party and granted India independence in the 1920s, India would not have probably survived as a democracy as it would have experienced only a few years of colonial autonomy. In any case, independence and democracy was indeed granted too early regarding the majority of colonies, at least from the point of view of prospects for their democratic development. Moreover, decolonization occurred “too early” also in many countries where the colonizers were not pressured by pro-independence movements similar to the Indian National Congress, such as Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Lesotho or Gambia. A complex mixture of factors was responsible for those outcomes. First of all, at the domestic level the British public opinion gradually became either apathetic or negatively inclined toward the idea of an empire for ideological reasons. On international fora, such as the United Nations, the British
were pressured to decolonize by the Communist countries, ex-colonies, and to a smaller extent by the United States. Economic benefits of the colonies were also declining. Ultimately, once the British granted independence to Ghana, they could no more in a long term justify their presence in other African colonies.  

Historical Legacies and Elite Preferences: The Causal Mechanism

Democracies which were established after long periods of PA monarchy or colonial autonomy survived because legacies of these regimes deeply affected preferences of key elite actors (and, which was of smaller causal importance, of ordinary people). Favorable historical legacies shaped elite preferences in a pro-democratic direction, and then elite actors made crucial decisions which led to preservation of democratic institutions. It is truism to notice that real people made concrete political decisions on whether to organize open-outcome elections or otherwise try to rig them, or else to organize a military coup or instead respect the constitutional order. Yet, quite frequently the perspective of really-existing politicians, of the choices they faced and the motivations they developed, gets lost when one analyzes long-term historical processes or takes into account large social structures. On the other hand, it is tempting to treat really-existing people as automatons and model their behavior through mathematical equations, without previous determination of sound assumption for such equations. The latter is not necessarily a wrong approach, but any researcher who constructs a mathematical model which predicts behavior of social actors should first carefully determine, through empirical analysis, the preferences and the structure of social situation in which the actors operate; otherwise the model remains just an exercise in mathematics. From this point of view, the argument presented in this dissertation emphasizes how history matters in yet another way. Namely, it shows that it is

8 Fieldhouse 1986, 3-27; Heinlein 2013.
necessary to study history in order to determine actors’ preferences (which again sounds like a forgotten truism). Political science, when its goal is to understand how regime outcomes differ across countries, can only be historical. We need to analyze history to determine how actors’ preferences have been conditioned, even if other tools (such as formal modelling) can be used to understand how these preferences determine current outcomes.

Democracy survived in the countries analyzed in this dissertation, sometimes against most odds, mostly because elites believed in its value and, as a result, on numerous occasions acted contrary to their narrowly-conceived self-interest. In PA monarchies, introduction of open-outcome elections was initially a form of convenient compromise between the middle class and the monarchy. Hence it was supported, or rather tolerated, by the conservative monarchical elite out of necessity. Of course, Liberals, who demanded introduction of representative government in the first place, sincerely believed in its value. But this commitment was in the beginning quite shallow; and representative institutions were mostly seen as a convenient tool to further middle class interest. After Piedmont and Hungary made a direct transition from absolute monarchy to competitive oligarchy, Liberals assumed power in those countries. They initially adhered to the principle of free electoral politics, but abandoned it after a few years when faced with the possibility of an opposition victory. Hence, one could hypothesize that a similar development would have taken places in such countries as the Netherlands and Sweden had they made a direct transition to competitive oligarchy or democracy having not experienced a period of PA monarchy. Only after a sufficiently long period of PA monarchy, when the practice of open-outcome elections was being enforced by an actor external to the electoral process (the government responsible to the monarch), did Liberals in the Netherlands or Belgium develop a
deep-seated commitment to the principle of free electoral politics. In other words, elected politicians in those countries came to value free electoral politics for its own sake. The Liberals’ support for this principle no longer depended upon the current performance of the political system, and did not vanish in the face of uncertain electoral prospects. In the same period, the principle of free electoral politics was also embraced by the conservatives and the emerging social democratic parties. At this stage, already before PA monarchies made a transition to competitive oligarchy or democracy, the practice of open-outcome elections had become self-sustainable. Liberals were no longer afraid to organize open-outcome elections and risk losing power to conservatives, or another opposition party, because they knew that the latter were also committed to free electoral politics and would organize another open-outcome election, at which the power could be regained. But ultimately, Liberals in the Netherlands or Belgium would still have been better off if they had decided to rig an upcoming election and remain in power forever. However, this did not happen because their commitment to free electoral politics had become not only deep-seated, but also to a large extent idealistic, or based on norms, and it no longer relied on narrowly-conceived self-interest, but was instead based on value rationality. The Liberals’ decision to hold open-outcome element and transfer the power to the opposition could also be explained in instrumentally-rational terms, as being an equilibrium outcome in a reiterated game.

---

9 See Easton 1975 for a detailed analysis of the concept of deep-seated support (which he labelled as “diffuse support” for democracy).

10 Unfortunately, this causal process was broken if a transition to democracy was accompanied by regime discontinuity, as discussed in chapters 4 and 5.

11 Weber 1968 [1921], 85-86.
Yet, rational choice models which try to explain this outcome converge only if actors’ normative commitments are ultimately taken into account.\footnote{For example, one could apply the Przeworski’s (1991, 26-37) model to Liberals’ behavior. Under this model, Liberals would rig elections (subvert democracy) only if the benefits of remaining in office illegally (multiplied by the probability that the rigging would be ultimately successful) were higher than the cost of rigging itself. Yet, under this model the benefits from remaining in office illegally are much lower if the opposition is normatively committed to the principle of free elections, hence permitting the Liberals to compete in the future and possibly regain the office. On the other hand, costs of election rigging are higher, and the probability of successful rigging lower, if other important actors (such as the military, the monarchy, and middle class Liberal supporters) are normatively committed to the principle of free elections and would not support the Liberals’ subversive actions. These calculations could explain why even actors uncommitted to democracy might decide not to rig. Last but not least, however, the probability of rigging also depends, obviously, on the scope of normative commitment to the principle of free elections among the Liberals themselves.}

A similar process through which elites became committed to democracy took place under colonial autonomy. Initially, many politicians who participated in representative institutions did it for opportunistic reasons, simply taking advantage of the political opportunities created by the colonizer. Others sincerely believed in democratic values, but this commitment was not probably deep-seated. In this case, a comparison may be made between elites in Malaysia and Sri Lanka. Commitment to democracy among Malaysian elites evaporated when the country was faced with a severe crisis, whereas Sri Lankan elites, who had become committed to democracy during a long period of colonial autonomy, upheld it when faced with comparable troubles. Hence, a long period of colonial autonomy, when the principle of open-outcome elections was enforced by an external actor (the colonizer) turned out necessary to develop a deep-seated commitment to democracy, or in other words, a type of commitment which was not dependent on the political system’s performance. In such countries as post-colonial Sri Lanka and Jamaica, elected elites held open-outcome elections and honored the outcomes knowing that their opponents respected the same principle, and hence would allow for an opportunity to regain power at the ballot box in the future. And indeed, alternation in power through elections was a frequent occurrence in the
post-independence politics of those countries, which was a rarity in the developing world at the time. This is not to say that such democracies as Sri Lanka, Jamaica or Mauritius were free of significant problems. Elections and campaigns were plagued by occasional violence and constitutional rules were sometimes amended for partisan advantage.\textsuperscript{13} The fundamental rules of democratic politics were ultimately respected, however.

The elites’ commitment to democracy in countries which experienced a legacy of PA monarchy or colonial autonomy was evident through their actions during crises of democracy. Such crises did not arise in many countries with a legacy of PA monarchy in the first place, which indicated how healthy these democracies were. In Sweden, Denmark, or the Netherlands the popularity of anti-democratic parties was marginal even during the Great Depression, and democracy was never under a significant threat. In Belgium, democratic politicians, including Prime Minister Van Zeeland, successfully resisted the growth of the fascist Rexist Party. Rexists were actively confronted by the elected elites and the movement was largely suppressed. This contrasted sharply with the situation in countries lacking a legacy of PA monarchy, such as Italy, where mainstream politicians cooperated with the Fascist Party, or Latvia and Estonia, where growth of anti-democratic movements was used as a pretext to abolish democracy by democratically-elected politicians. In the post-colonial democracies with a legacy of colonial autonomy, democratically elected politicians also took various actions to defend democracy. During the crisis before the 1980 election in Jamaica, Michael Manley was faced with a temptation to abolish democracy in order to preserve his socialist policies and prevent a likely military coup. In contrast to numerous postcolonial leaders who conducted executive coups in

\textsuperscript{13} The worst examples are probably such actions as the prolongation of the Mauritian parliament elected in 1967 until 1976 through a constitutional amendment, the Sri Lankan referendum of 1982 which also prolonged the parliament’s term, or the Indian Emergency of 1975-77 (Mauritius and India are mentioned here because they also experienced long periods of colonial autonomy).
similar situations, he organized an open-outcome election and handed over the power to the opposition. On other occasions, post-colonial leaders extended democratic freedoms even though they were not forced to do so. The most illustrious example is the decision of Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru to introduce universal suffrage before the Indian 1951 election. In contrast to European politicians in such countries as Belgium and the Netherlands in the late nineteenth century, Nehru and the leadership of the Congress Party were not under a pressure of popular movement which would have demanded suffrage extension. In fact, extension of the suffrage could only harm the narrowly-conceived interest of the Indian middle classes. Instead, the decision to enact the reform stemmed first of all from the elites’ pro-democratic convictions.

**Challenges to the Existing Theories of Democratic Development**

This dissertation added a new explanation regarding survival of democracy in Europe and in the post-colonial world. This explanation casts a new light on some of the existing theories of democratic development. First of all, the findings of this dissertation challenge the idea that democracy can be habituated lacking external enforcement of democratic norms.\(^\text{14}\) As emphasized in Chapter 3, the evidence that democratic breakdown becomes less likely just because of the passage of time is weak. Political actors do not become committed to democratic norms just because they operate in a democratic framework. Rather, an initial period of external enforcement of democratic norms is usually necessary to develop a deep-seated commitment to democracy (as it occurred under PA monarchy or colonial autonomy). In the particular case which was used by Rustow to develop the idea of habituation, Sweden, the crucial events occurred actually before, and not after democratization. That is, political actors developed the commitment to free electoral competition and constitutionalism during PA monarchy, and

\(^{14}\) Rustow 1970.
subsequently this commitment resulted in self-sustainability of the Swedish democracy after 1911.

Regarding development of democracy in Europe, the findings presented herein refine the historicist argument proposed by Robert A. Dahl and structural accounts developed by Barrington Moore and Gregory Luebbert. According to Dahl, democracy was more likely to survive in certain European countries, such as Britain or Belgium, because it had been preceded by a long period of competitive oligarchy, during which the norm of free electoral competition was first habituated among the wealthy elite before it was extended to lower classes through the process of suffrage extension. However, this dissertation showed that free electoral competition was not more likely to survive under restricted suffrage. In fact, controlling for the legacy of PA monarchy, competitive oligarchies were as likely to break down and turn into dictatorships as democracies (as shown through quantitative analysis in Chapter 3 and qualitative analysis of the cases of Piedmont and Hungary). Indeed, some European competitive oligarchies appeared consolidated, but only because they had been preceded by a period of PA monarchy (which was the case in Britain, Belgium and the Netherlands).

Among the structural accounts of democratic development in Europe, the work of Barrington Moore remains foundational. Moore proposed a complex theory of democratic development which emphasized the importance of class variables. In this account, the strength of the bourgeoisie was the primary factor conditioning regime outcomes, with liberal democracy emerging in countries characterized by bourgeoisie domination. The latter was achieved either through revolution (France), civil war in which the landed interests were defeated (United States), or gradual assimilation of the landed interests into the bourgeoisie through the spread of

---

commercial agriculture (as in Britain). Where landed aristocracy subjugated the bourgeoisie during the process of modernization, the upper classes turned out unable to maintain social control in conditions of liberal politics, and the ultimate result was fascist dictatorship. Regime outcomes in other cases analyzed by Moore, Russia and China, are not of direct interest here. Moore’s biggest achievement is probably his observation pertaining to the crucial role of the landed aristocracy as an obstacle to democratization. Where landholding inequality was severe and the upper classes derived most of the income from the land, they struggled either to block democratization or abolish democracy once it was established (but only IF they were unable to control the peasant vote). Undoubtedly, in Britain, the landed aristocracy, as long as it was economically powerful, blocked reforms aiming at extension of the suffrage (for example, it actively opposed the 1832 reform – but Moore does not raise this point in his book), while in Germany it was the backbone of the authoritarian coalition during the Imperial period. Interestingly, the causal mechanism leading from high landholding inequality to authoritarianism was probably the most visible not in the European cases analyzed by Moore, but in Latin America (in Guatemala, El Salvador, or Chile in connection with the 1973 coup). Otherwise, however, the Moore’s explanation of regime outcomes in Britain, France, and Germany suffers from several weaker points.

In general terms, the causal narrative as outlined by Moore does not contain much of historical detail. Even though Moore is ultimately interested in political outcomes, there is very little space for politics in his theory. Rather, the narrative is presented in big-picture, abstract terms, with a lot of space devoted to description of socio-economic changes. For that reason,

---

16 For a more detailed overview of the Moore’s argument, see Bernhard 2005.

17 Which was not the case during the French Second Republic, in general terms – hence landlords did not oppose peasant enfranchisement there.
Moore’s explanation does not take into account how political legacies shaped preferences of the key class actors. In particular, in order to fully understand the political choices of landed aristocracy, it is necessary to take into account the political context in which the ideology of this class was being shaped. For example, in Britain the aristocracy’s ideology had been conditioned by the presence of representative assemblies which had guaranteed certain minimal rights to the upper class already since 1215. In consequence, it would be hard to expect the British aristocracy to perform a role of harbinger of a fascist dictatorship. In France, landed aristocracy opposed the revolution, but later assumed political dominance under the Restoration (in 1815-30). During this period, it came to cherish the representative government and the civil liberties it entailed. Subsequently, landed interests opposed introduction of a modernizing dictatorship by Louis-Napoleon. In Germany, landed interests acted against democratization during the Imperial period not unlike the landed aristocracy in Denmark and Sweden. Different patterns of democratization in Germany and in the Scandinavia conditioned the landlord’s anti-democratic stance during the Weimar Republic and their reconciliation with democracy in Scandinavia in the same period, as I argued in Chapter 5.

Moreover, because Moore’s argument relies on the “big picture” method of analysis, one finds it hard to identify causal mechanisms linking his principal explanatory variables to regime outcomes (given that he does not discuss in detail how these regimes, let’s say the Nazi dictatorship or British democracy, were established, and how the socio-economical legacies which he identified mattered at those particular moments). For example, how the fact that Britain had commercialized agriculture in the eighteenth century, whereas Prussia still relied on labor-repressive serfdom, did condition regime outcomes two centuries later? In fact, Eastern Prussia transitioned to largely commercial agriculture with the abolition of serfdom in 1810 (while its
Western provinces never applied labor-repressive agriculture in the first place). Thereafter, the mode of functioning of the large Prussian and British estates became quite similar. Regarding the emergence of the Japanese quasi-fascist regime, no political historian mentions the necessity to repress labor as an important reason of the 1932 military takeover, which terminated the Japan’s first short experiment with liberal democracy. In Germany, landed interests were relatively marginal within NSDAP, the party which was responsible for the overthrow of the Weimar Republic. And although some elements within the bourgeoisie supported the Hitler’s movement, rightfully hoping that he would prevent a possible Communist takeover, the necessity to repress the Labor was not the primary raison d’être of the German fascism. Last but not least, some of the Moore’s socio-economic variables are unclearly operationalized. For instance, Moore’s main explanation of the ultimate success of the French democracy points to the importance of the revolution as the moment when the landed interests lost to the bourgeoisie. Still, the power of the landed interests was largely restored during the Napoleonic period and after 1815, up to the point when the landed aristocracy became the ruling group during the Restoration, similarly as in Germany during the Empire. In this period, landed aristocracy’s political power equaled its economic power, as reflected in empirical measures of landholding inequality, which showed that the latter was higher in France than in Germany as a whole during the entire nineteenth century. On the other hand, Britain in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century was characterized by a degree of landholding inequality which was the highest in Europe, and landed aristocracy played a dominant role in the political system until the 1832 reform. There is a similar, if not stronger, empirical basis than in the case of Germany to characterize the British

18 See more detailed discussion of this problem in chapter 5.

19 See chapter 4 for more extensive discussion.

bourgeoisie of the eighteenth century as a junior partner in the ruling coalition in which the landed aristocracy was the dominant partner.

Another important account of regime outcomes in the interwar Western Europe was proposed by Gregory Luebbert. Luebbert distinguished four regime types existing in the period: liberal democracy, social democracy, traditional dictatorship and fascism. Liberal democracies emerged in the countries where Liberal parties managed to coopt and largely marginalize the working class movement already before 1914. If it did not happen, the only possible regime alternatives during the interwar period, according to Luebbert, remained social democracy and fascism. The latter emerged in the polities where social democrats made successful efforts to mobilize landless peasants. This development forced smallholding peasantry into anti-democratic coalitions with the middle class. Finally, traditional dictatorships were established in the economically undeveloped countries. The dominant critiques of the Luebbert’s account point to the problems with concept operationalization and subsequent variable measurement, as well as to insufficient evidence for existence of the proposed causal mechanisms. First of all, Luebbert’s classification of certain countries into the four regime categories is problematic, even in the light of the evidence he provided himself. Two countries which fit closely the paradigm of Liberal democracy in the interwar period, Belgium and the Netherlands, were not classified as such by Luebbert (he argued that they merged liberal and social democratic features). In the light of the Luebbert’s theory, Belgium and the Netherlands should have actually adopted social democracy or fascism in the interwar period (but they did not), given that before 1914 they were characterized by weak liberal parties which failed to incorporate the labor movement (in fact, confessional parties played a leading role in those countries both before and after WWI). Czechoslovakia is classified as an example of social democracy by Luebbert even though it
lacked corporatist arrangements, which was a necessary condition to classify it as such. Finland is classified as a traditional dictatorship (and not democracy) because of its anti-extremist legislation, which in fact was also adopted in a similar form in other countries in the period, including Czechoslovakia.

Another drawback of the Luebbert’s account is his failure to properly operationalize and measure the degree of liberal hegemony before 1914, which is his crucial explanatory variable affecting regime outcome in the interwar period. The Scandinavian countries, which Luebbert classified as social democracies, did actually develop before 1914 strong liberal parties which made significant efforts at worker mobilization (Venstre in Denmark, Free-minded National Association in Sweden). In France, Republican Radicals, the dominant party in the late nineteenth century, hardly made any efforts at labor mobilization. Nevertheless, the interwar France has been classified as liberal democracy by Luebbert. As discussed in Chapter 5, there is also little evidence in support of the Luebbert’s main explanation of the emergence of fascism. According to Luebbert, in the countries in which Social Democrats successfully mobilized farm workers, smallholding farmers decided to support anti-democratic alternatives.\footnote{21 Capoccia 2005, 226-227; Ertman 1998.} Yet, smallholding farmers did not feel economically threatened by social democratic mobilization of landless farmers in the Luebbert’s fascist case, Germany (the scope of this mobilization was quite limited in any case). In a Luebbert’s case of social democracy, Denmark, Social Democrats did actually enter into an alliance with a party representing landless farmers, this alliance threatened economic interests of smallholding farmers (who employed a large number of farm workers in contrast to the German smallholding farmers), but the emergence of this coalition did not result in anti-democratic stance of the main party representing the farmer constituency,
Venstre. Ultimately, the Luebbert’s argument about liberal hegemony is based on the observation that the countries which were liberal democracies in the late nineteenth century, i.e. France, Britain and Switzerland, remained liberal democracies also in the interwar period. This is not particularly revealing, given that one needs to ask, in the first place, why did those countries manage to establish self-sustainable democracies in the late nineteenth century?

Also the theories which explain regime outcomes in the interwar with the strength of the civil society suffer from the same problem as Luebbert.22 Namely, civil society was the strongest during the interwar period in the same countries in which it had also been strong before 1914. Those countries were democracies after 1918 and had been democracies, competitive oligarchies or PA monarchies before WWI. It is no surprise that civil societies had been well-developed in these policies, given that they were characterized, almost by definition, by open-outcome elections and guarantees of civil liberties, which are the conditions favorable to growth of non-governmental organizations.23 Again, the crucial outcome to be explained is why the countries in question established liberal political systems in the late nineteenth century. Ertman noted that the civil society was also strong in Germany after WWI (no surprise given than Germany had been a PA monarchy) and explains its anti-democratic attitudes with the supposed weakness of political parties in the Imperial Germany. Again, this argument strikes me as unconvincing on empirical grounds. I would argue exactly the opposite, that political parties in Imperial Germany were in fact quite strong from the comparative perspective. Sweden did not develop modern political parties until the 1890s, and in the French Third Republic political parties, with the exception of Socialists, were mostly coteries of notables. In the Netherlands and Belgium, because of

22 Ertman 1998.

23 Paxton 2002.
restricted suffrage, political parties encompassed only the middle classes, and serious efforts to
mobilize lower classes were made only after the suffrage extension in the 1890s (with the
exception of the emerging Socialist parties). This contrasts sharply with the strength of such
parties as SPD or Zentrum, which had built extensive organizational network encompassing the
lower classes already in the 1880s (the result of universal male suffrage in Germany). In fact,
SPD served as an organization model for the emerging Belgian and Dutch socialist movements.
In summary, I would argue that the argument presented in this dissertation, which emphasizes
the effect of historical legacies on regime outcomes, achieves a higher level of parsimony in
comparison to structural theories, or theories emphasizing the role of the civil society.²⁴ This is
not to deny, however, that social structure significantly affects regime outcomes. For example,
establishment of PA monarchies was more likely in the countries characterized by a viable
middle class which could successfully challenge the absolutist regimes in order to demand
constitutional freedoms.²⁵ Such a middle class could emerge, on the other hand, only after the
first stage of capitalist development had taken off. These are only exploratory hypotheses,
however, because further research, which goes beyond the scope of this project, is necessary to
analyze the factors which conditioned the emergence of PA monarchies and colonial autonomies.

In addition to the theories explaining development of democracy in Europe, some of the
findings presented in this dissertation refined other explanations of democratic survival.
Regarding the effect of British colonial experience on the latter variable, this dissertation
showed, both through quantitative and qualitative analysis, that it had on its own quite limited
effect on the rate of democratic survival in former British colonies. This is not to deny that the

²⁴ For overview and criticism of other accounts of democratization in Western Europe, see Ertman 1988.
²⁵ I am grateful to Michael Bernhard for this observation.
British contributed positively to the spread of democracy in the post-colonial world, but they did that mostly through the fact that they were the only colonizer which granted long periods of internal autonomy to some of its colonies. But in those British colonies which were not granted autonomy before independence, or where the periods of autonomy were short, democracies quickly collapsed. In this regard, post-colonial democracies which were not characterized by legacy of colonial autonomy met a similar fate, regardless the colonizer’s identity. On the other hand, according to this dissertation’s findings such factors as the legacy of Protestant missions, viability for European settlement, or the type of British rule did not directly affect the rate of survival of post-colonial democracies (as detected in Chapter 3). The effect of the type of British rule, whether direct or indirect, performed rather a function of an intermediate variable. That is, indirectly-ruled colonies were less likely to be granted long periods of colonial autonomy in the first place. Introduction of colonial autonomy required abolition of the institutions of indirect rule; hence it was hampered by native authorities. Still, institutions of indirect rule were disestablished, for example, in India, which is the only instance of a mostly indirectly-ruled colony which subsequently experienced long colonial autonomy and also democratic survival after independence. On the other hand, post-colonial democracies collapsed in directly ruled colonies which did not experience long autonomy, such as Kenya, Zambia or Cyprus. Hence, although the type of British rule affected the probability of establishment of autonomy, ultimately length of autonomy affected the probability of democratic survival. Legacy of protestant missions, although it did not affect the probability of survival of post-colonial democracies, still had a strong effect on the probability of democratization of ex-colonies.26

---

26 Woodberry 2012.
Finally, the findings of this dissertation confirmed the importance of economic development and international environment as variables affecting democratic survival. Wealthy democracies almost never break down, and after the end of the cold war democracies survive at a much higher rate than before 1989 because of pro-democratic policies of the United States and the European Union. In fact, pro-democratic pressure of the great powers has worked to a certain extent in a similar way as the colonizer’s efforts to organize and maintain democratic institutions during the periods of autonomy. The international community has coordinated efforts at electoral observation in developing countries and in some instances has organized elections entirely from scratch (as in Cambodia in 1993), while leaders of poor democracies have had to cope with aid conditionality and diplomatic pressures which have made anti-democratic behavior, such as election rigging or constitutional manipulations, much costlier than it would have been otherwise. Obviously, there is a limit to this comparison, since even in those colonial autonomies in which elected politicians enjoyed a degree of executive power, the colonizer still controlled the forces of law enforcement and the bureaucracy responsible for electoral management; hence the scope of possible anti-democratic actions by the elected politicians was very limited. It is also possible that international environment, as operationalized in the statistical analysis in Chapter 3, stands as a proxy for pro-democratic ideological hegemony, which might have developed in such regions as Eastern Europe, or to some extent Sub-Saharan Africa, partly as a result of the great powers’ pro-democratic policies and partly as a result of mutual interactions between the newly-established democracies. However, democracies which appear consolidated as a result of economic development or international environment might again become prone to breakdown if the values of the latter variables change (this is obviously more likely in case of international environment, as few countries have ever become poorer in absolute terms once having reached
high levels of development). As detected through quantitative methods in Chapter 3, true consolidation has only been achieved in democracies characterized by a legacy of either PA monarchy or colonial autonomy. Such democracies have not been more likely to collapse even during the periods of recession or unfavorable international environment.

**Overall, Is History Predetermined?**

At the first reading, the conclusions presented in this dissertation seem quite pessimistic. Those countries which did not experience a favorable historical legacy of colonial autonomy or PA monarchy did indeed have very dim prospects for establishment of self-sustaining democracy (at last until recently, when increasing wealth and changing international environment brought about better times for democracy). Political actors discussed in this dissertation seemed to have been bound by powerful historical forces beyond their control. If they lived in a country with a pro-democratic legacy, they were almost certain to support a democratic form of government, or were constrained not to act against democracy; if they assumed power in a country lacking a favorable legacy, they exhibited anti-democratic ideologies and/or, given the lack of commitment to democracy among other social actors, decided to abolish democracy for opportunistic reasons. In consequence, one might ask: is the argument presented in this dissertation deterministic? Is democracy bound to collapse if not preceded by a favorable legacy? Can human agency and willpower influence democratic development, after all?

Undoubtedly, historical legacies have exhibited a powerful effect on actors’ behavior, but this effect, nevertheless, can be in some instances overcome. Numerous democracies survived for relatively long periods even though they were established in poor countries lacking a favorable historical legacy, and subsequently functioned under neutral or at times anti-democratic international environment. As the first suitable historical example one could mention Colombia, where democracy survived between 1831 and 1859 (with a short break of
constitutional government in 1854). This was to a large extent an achievement of Francisco de Paula Santander, one of the leaders of the war for independence, who was elected president in 1832, respected the fact that the constitution provided for a single term in office, and once his hand-picked successor was defeated in the 1837 election, he transferred the power to the opposition. Subsequently, Colombia experienced alternation in power through elections in 1849 and 1857 (until free electoral competition broke down with the fraudulent 1859 election).

Another example of a democracy surviving against most odds would be Greece in the period 1875-1909. Again, also in this instance the establishment of democracy could be largely attributed to a single politician, Charilaos Trikoupis. He had led a reform movement demanding introduction of parliamentary government and standards of free elections. After brief imprisonment by the monarchical government, Trikoupis succeeded and was nominated prime minister after winning the 1875 election, the first open-outcome vote in Greece. Greece experienced numerous transfers of power through open-outcome elections until democracy was abolished in the 1909 military coup.

In similar circumstances, a competitive oligarchy, which subsequently made a transition to democracy, was born in Chile in 1891. The leader of the military coup which abolished a corrupted oligarchy, Admiral Jorge Mont, refused to continue the practice of electoral manipulation and refrained from government interference in the 1891 vote, which brought him to power. Mont truly believed in the value of free elections and civil liberties, hence he transferred the power to the opposition once his party lost the 1896 election. Democratic government survived in Chile until the 1924 military coup and was reestablished for the period 1932-73. An even more conspicuous case of a “surprising” democracy has been Botswana, initially one of the poorest countries in Africa, where democracy has survived since independence in 1966 even
though the country lacked a legacy of colonial autonomy. It happened so mostly as a result of personal influence of the country’s first president, Seretse Khama (1966-1980), who preserved democratic constitutional government. Yet, as already mentioned, Botswana never experienced an alternation in power through elections, which is always a crucial test of the depth of the elite’s commitment to democracy. The cases of Colombia, Greece, Chile and Botswana represent “surprising” democracies, which emerged as statistical outliers in the quantitative analysis in Chapter 3. In these countries, relatively stable democracies were established against historical odds by determined leaders who sincerely believed in the value of free government for the sake of its own. Such instances have been rare, however, and the fact that democracy ultimately collapsed in the first three cases shows how difficult, even if ultimately possible, it is for human agency to overcome an unfavorable historical legacy.
APPENDIX A
EXPLANATION OF VARIABLES IN BDD REGIME TYPE MEASURE

1. **ccode**
   Numeric country code from Polity project

2. **scode**
   Alpha country code from Polity project

3. **Country**
   Country name. Coded are all the countries which reached 500,000 inhabitants before 2000. This resulted in addition of Hejaz, Transvaal (South African Republic), Hanover, Hesse-Darmstadt, Hesse-Kassel and Mecklenburg-Schwerin to the list in Polity IV. Non-western countries were coded in the period before 1900 if they were independent in 1900. Periods when a country or territory was not independent de jure were coded if such a country or territory subsequently became independent de jure and if it experienced pluralism during the period in question.

4. **Year**
   The dataset encompasses the period 1789-2012. This is motivated by the fact that the first modern democracy, the United States, emerged in 1789.

5. **Year part**
   Part of the year. The main unit of observation is country-half-year. Division of years does not indicate temporal dimension as all events are coded to occur in the first half-year unless there were two events of the same category in a given year (for example, a military coup and a popular uprising leading to regime transitions).

6. **Territorial changes**
   This variable codes for percentage change in population of a country as a result of territorial changes. It considers only changes as a result of which country population decrease or increase was 1% or more. If underlined, it signifies uncertain estimation. [BETA, work in progress]

7. **Stateness (disintegration)**
   This variable measures the scope of control of the central government over the country’s population. If the central government lost control over more than 40% of a country’s population, or there if was no effective central government, the country is considered to have disintegrated (for example, Spain in 1936-39 or Lebanon in 1973-90) and disintegration=1. If disintegration=1 then all indicators are inapplicable apart from regime type, sovereignty de facto, sovereignty de jure. However, if disintegration=1 and there was a government which controlled the capital and at least 40% of a country’s population, I also coded for type of executive recruitment, transitions in executive authority, and regime discontinuities. In this case, these variables encompass regime transitions pertaining to the government controlling the capital.

8. **Confederation**
   This variable measures if a central government had a confederated character. If confederation=1 and sovereign de facto=1, it indicates that there was a central authority, but agreement of representatives of all constituent units was in principle necessary to adopt government decisions;
the constituent units did not have de jure state status in international relations. If confederation=1 and sovereign de facto=0, it signifies that a territory which later became an independent state was divided into several units governed separately and characterized by pluralism, but lacked a central governing authority characterized by pluralism (as India in 1920-35 or Canada in 1792-1867) OR the central governing authority was characterized by pluralism, but constituent units were characterized by completeness. If confederation = 12, it signifies that there was a central executive authority, but there was no central legislative authority (i.e. each constituent unit had its own legislature, and consent of all representatives of constituent units was necessary to adopt legislation).

Only confederations which subsequently transformed into federal or unitary states are included in the dataset. There are relatively few cases, for example, United States in 1776-1789 or Switzerland in 1815-48. Constituent parts of such confederacies are not included in the dataset (e.g. there is no polity “New York” in the period 1776-1789, only “United States”). When coding regime characteristics of a confederacy, BDD takes into account the most prevalent characteristic among its constituent parts. Hence, because the majority of Swiss cantons in 1815-48 were characterized by pluralism and alternation, Switzerland received positive coding on these dimensions in the period.

Generally, confederations which subsequently disintegrated are not included in the dataset on their own terms (e.g. Senegambia in 1982-89 or German Confederation in 1815-66). Instead, only the regime type in the constituent units is coded (hence, Senegal, Gambia, Bavaria, Prussia, etc. are included in the dataset on their own terms). Federal countries which subsequently disintegrated are included in the dataset (e.g. Federal Republic of Central America in 1823-1840 or Yugoslavia/Serbia and Montenegro in 1990-2006). However, constituent units of such federations are also included in the dataset if they were sovereign de facto i.e. were able to determine the form of their political regime independently of the federal government, and after the disintegration became independent de jure. For example, Honduras appears in the dataset in 1824, Slovakia in 1990, and Serbia and Montenegro are coded already since 1990.

9. Regime type
Type of a pluralist regime is coded herein if the regime in question was sovereign de jure or de facto.
1 - democracy. A regime is coded as democracy if confederation=0 and sovereignty de facto=1 and sovereignty de jure=1 and pluralism (electoral)=1 and completeness=1 and alternation in executive elections=1 and alternation in legislative elections=1 and (suffrage≥0.5m or suffrage≥0.5); otherwise democracy= 11 if other conditions are fulfilled, but sovereignty de facto=0, and democracy=12 if other conditions are fulfilled, but sovereignty de jure=0.
Other regimes:
2 - competitive oligarchy; a regime is coded as competitive oligarchy if it fulfills the same conditions as democracy apart from the fact that suffrage<0.5m or suffrage<0.5 (21 signifies competitive oligarchy which is sovereign de jure but not de facto, 22 - competitive oligarchy which is sovereign de facto but not de jure),
3 - PA monarchy, or monarchy characterized by open-outcome legislative elections; it fulfills the same conditions as democracy or competitive oligarchy apart from the fact that completeness=0, pluralism in executive elections=0 and type of executive recruitment=1 or 12 (31 signifies PA monarchy which is sovereign de jure but not de facto, 32 - sovereign de facto but not de jure),
4 - PA republic; such a regime fulfills the same conditions as democracy or competitive oligarchy apart from the fact that completeness=0 and the form of government is republican, that is either legislature is elected in open-outcome elections but the legislature is not, or vice versa (41 - signifies PA republic which is sovereign de jure but not de facto, 42 - sovereign de facto but not de jure), 5 - signifies other types of pluralist regimes (51 - signifies other pluralist regime which is sovereign de jure but not de facto, 52 sovereign de facto but not de jure).

10. Sovereign de facto
If sovereign de facto=1 it means that a country’s political regime was not determined by an external power. In other words, a polity was free to decide on its form of political system; it was not effectively restricted by an external actor regarding the choice of its political system or head executive (i.e. the regime type was determined endogenously). If sovereign de facto=12, it means that a country was independent de facto and formed a constituent unit of another country which was also independent de facto (e.g. Slovakia in 1990-92). Polities which were independent de facto but not de jure were included in the BDD dataset if they were pluralist during the period of sovereignty de facto and subsequently became sovereign de jure. See more explanation in the first part of the chapter.

11. Sovereign de jure
If sovereign de jure=1 it means that a country was sovereign according to the international law; it was recognized by the international community.
One should note that several polities were sovereign de jure although they were not sovereign de facto (e.g. Poland in 1945-88, or Germany in 1949-55). See more explanation in the first part of the chapter.

12. Pluralism in executive elections
Within this and subsequent two dimensions, BDD aims to distinguish between two fundamentally different types of modern political regimes – those which organize elections in which opposition candidates and/or parties are allowed to participate (pluralist regimes), those in which the opposition to the government is not allowed to participate in elections but it otherwise exists legally and/or is tolerated by the government, and those which do not allow for any organized opposition to the government.
If pluralism in executive elections=1, it indicates a situation in which the executive is elected in elections in which oppositional political organizations or candidates can participate de facto (i.e. pluralist elections). Pluralism in executive elections=0 indicates that the executive authority is constituted through other means. The executive could be elected indirectly, as in parliamentary systems, or directly, as in presidential systems. In case of colonial regimes, I have coded for pluralism in executive elections if the executive power was at least partially elected in pluralist elections (see here for an example).
Pluralism in executive elections begins when pluralist elections to the executive are effectively held (meaning that such elections are conducted and the winner assumes power). Pluralism in executive elections terminates when opposition becomes de facto illegal, i.e. when single-party or no-party rule is introduced, or in case of an effective regime discontinuity (as a result of which an authority which did not originate from pluralist elections took control over more than 40% of a country’s population for a period longer than one month).
Pluralism in executive elections also terminates when executive elections are postponed unconstitutionally and the postponement results in the lack of pluralist executive elections for the period of longer than seven years, or when pluralist executive elections are not held during a period longer than ten years unless extension of the term of the executive was approved in an open-outcome referendum.

13. Pluralism in legislative elections
If pluralism in legislative elections=1, it indicates a situation in which the legislature is elected in elections in which oppositional political organizations or candidates could participate de facto (i.e. pluralist elections). Pluralism in executive elections=0 indicates that the legislature is constituted through other means or that it does not exist. The legislature is classified to originate from pluralist elections if at least 50% of its members were elected in such elections and if its consent was formally necessary to adopt legislation.

For example, there was no pluralism during legislative and executive elections in Poland in 1952-1989 because, even though there were many political parties, all of them belonged to one regime front. On the other, legislative elections in contemporary Bahrain are pluralist because opposition candidates participate de facto, even though political parties are de jure illegal. Pluralism in legislative elections begins when pluralist legislative elections are effectively held (meaning that such elections are conducted and the legislature thus elected convenes). Pluralism in legislative elections terminates when opposition becomes de facto illegal, i.e. when single-party or no-party rule is introduced or when the legislature originating from pluralist elections in unconstitutionally dissolved. To give some examples, pluralism terminated in Germany in July 1933 when other parties besides NSDAP were banned and the ban was effectively enforced, or in Argentina in 1955, when the junta dissolved the Congress after a military coup, although most political parties continued to function legally.

Pluralism in legislative elections also terminates when legislative elections are postponed unconstitutionally and the postponement results in the lack of pluralist legislative elections for the period of longer than seven years, or when pluralist legislative elections are not held during a period longer than ten years unless extension of the legislative term was approved in an open-outcome referendum.

14. Pluralism, electoral
If electoral pluralism=1, it indicates a situation in which either executive or legislature were elected in elections in which oppositional political organizations or candidates could participate de facto (i.e. pluralist elections). Electoral pluralism=0 indicates other conditions.

15. Pluralism, non-electoral
This variable is applicable if pluralism (electoral)=0. If non-electoral pluralism=1 it indicates a situation in which the government permits oppositional political organizations de facto, but both executive and legislature did not originate from pluralist elections. Non-electoral pluralism=0 indicates that the opposition is de facto illegal.

Non-electoral pluralism terminates when opposition becomes de facto illegal, i.e. when single-party or no-party rule is introduced.

16. Elected institutions (completeness)
This variable is applicable if pluralism = 1. If completeness = 1, it indicates a situation when both executive and legislature originated from pluralist elections. Completeness = 0 indicates that either the executive or the legislature did not originate from pluralist elections. The great majority of modern pluralist regimes were also complete. Pluralist polities with incomplete set of elected institutions have been relatively uncommon. They include both polities in which the executive was unelected while the legislature was elected (such as German Empire in 1871-1918, where the chancellor was responsible to the Emperor and not to the elected legislature), polities in which the elected executive authority wielded less powers than the non-elected executive authority (such as the contemporary Morocco, where the elected prime minister yields less powers than the non-elected king), and some transitional regimes. Many dependent polities were partial, as they elected only the legislature with the executive power held by the colonial authorities, e.g., the Philippines in 1907-1935.

17. Alternation in executive elections
This variable is applicable if pluralism in executive elections = 1. From the ontological point of view, it simply identifies whether a polity practiced a particular type of executive recruitment (see variable 25 for other possible types of executive recruitment). If alternation in executive elections = 1, it indicates that the executive originated from open-outcome elections which could be indirect, as in parliamentary systems, or direct, as in presidential systems. Open-outcome election to the executive is defined as a pluralist election whose outcome is not predetermined in advance, i.e., which the opposition has a positive probability of winning without the need to enforce the true outcome through forceful means. This obviously includes situations when the government is genuinely popular and for that reason the victory of the opposition is unlikely (but is still possible).

Alternation in executive elections = 0 indicates other conditions. First of all, it characterizes regimes which hold pluralist elections during which there is null probability of government being defeated and opposition coming to power. In other words, the outcome of such an election is ex ante certain. Such regimes (e.g., Russia or Ethiopia as of 2014) prevent opposition victory through electoral fraud, creation of unequal conditions of electoral participation, or (more rarely) they cancel results once the opposition wins. The condition of lack of alternation in executive elections also covers situations when the chief executive is formally elected by the legislature originating from open-outcome elections, but is de facto responsible to an authority which did not originate from open-outcome elections (as in Thailand in 1979-91, when the prime minister, although formally responsible to the legislature, was de facto responsible primarily to the military). In such situations I coded for pluralism in executive elections but lack of alternation in executive elections.

Alternation in executive elections starts when open-outcome executive elections are effectively held (meaning that such elections are conducted and the winner assumes power). Alternation in executive elections terminates when pluralism in executive elections terminates or when closed-outcome executive or legislative elections are held. In the latter situation closed-outcome legislative elections are interpreted as a signal that hypothetical executive elections held at the same time would also be closed-outcome; hence the regime had lost its alternation-permitting character. The following exception applies, however: If a chief executive who originated from open-outcome elections holds closed-outcome elections and is subsequently removed from

---

1 Przeworski at al. 2000, 17.
power through regime discontinuity as a result of which the true winner of the election comes to power, alternation in executive elections (and pluralism in executive elections) do not terminate. This applies to events in Panama in 1951 and Madagascar in 2002. Alternation in executive elections also terminates in case of an executive coup (as in Peru in 1992). This rule does not apply if the executive originated from open-outcome elections while the executive coup led to the closure of a legislature which originated from closed-outcome elections (as in Russia in 1993).

Note: See rules on uncertainty regarding alternation (variable 19) for exceptions to the above and detailed definitions of closed-outcome and open-outcome elections.

18. Alternation in legislative elections
This variable is applicable if pluralism in legislative elections=1. If alternation in legislative elections=1, it indicates that the legislature originated from open-outcome elections. A legislative open-outcome election is a pluralist election in which the opposition has a positive probability of winning the majority of seats without the need to enforce the true outcome through forceful means. Alternation in legislative elections=0 indicates other conditions.

Alternation in legislative elections begins when open-outcome legislative elections are effectively held (meaning that such elections are conducted and the legislature thus elected convenes). Alternation in legislative elections terminates when pluralism in legislative elections terminates or when closed-outcome legislative elections are held.

Note: see rules on uncertainty regarding alternation (variable 19) for exceptions to the above and detailed definitions of closed-outcome and open-outcome elections.

19. Uncertainty regarding alternation
Identification of pluralist and/or complete regimes is relatively unproblematic from the empirical perspective. Usually, it is not difficult to determine if the regime permits the opposition to compete in elections, or if it elects the legislature and executive, or only the legislature. Given that a regime is pluralist, complete and applies universal franchise how can one say whether it also allows for electoral turnovers? Most people would be ready to call democracies those regimes in which governments actually lose elections and hand over power to the opposition (i.e. those which experienced alternation in power). However, numerous regimes that held pluralist elections have never experienced a transfer of power (sometimes because such regimes were, or have been, short-lived), while others experienced it so long ago that they might have already lost their democratic character in a sense that their governments would not permit the opposition to win elections and assume power nowadays, although they would have done so in the past.

Admittedly, the identification of open-outcome elections is a complicated undertaking. The task is crucial, however, also because the number of pluralist but non-democratic regimes increased rapidly after the end of the Cold War. Regarding this problem, BDD suggests the following steps. First of all, it considers elections during which the opposition won and actually assumed power as open-outcome as a matter of fact (see below for exceptions). Taking into account the scope of electoral manipulation observed during a vast majority of such elections, it subsequently develops a standard of open-outcome elections. For most practical purposes, the standards of democratic elections developed in this chapter are equivalent to the standards outlined in the 2005 Declaration of Principles for International Election Observation, which is used as a benchmark by leading electoral observation organizations (e.g. EU, OSCE-ODIHR).
compared to this standard in order to assess their quality (i.e. the scope of electoral manipulations) and decide if they could be generally treated as (potentially) closed or open-outcome. The process is based on the assumption that the quality of elections organized by the government sends an informational signal on whether opposition victory would be permitted. Additional informational signals regarding the possibility of electoral alternation are provided via regime legacies and the scope of independence of electoral management bodies. Regimes which originated from elections in which the government was defeated are considered to be more likely to permit opposition victory in the future than regimes which originated from closed-outcome elections or other non-democratic means. As well, regimes which permit for operation of independent electoral management bodies are considered to be more likely to allow for opposition victory in comparison to regimes which directly control such bodies.

A skeptic might raise two points at this moment. First of all, assuming that the standard of democratic elections is developed, is it possible to observe whether an election actually meets this standard? I would argue that the task is indeed difficult to achieve, but it is possible, and that the quality of elections is more or less observable. A vast majority of pluralist elections covered in the BDD dataset was described in historical sources, and historians agreed in the assessment of their quality. If the historical sources were conflicting or scarce, I coded for “objective” uncertainty regarding possibility of alternation (see here for explanation).

Additionally, one could concur that autocracies might for a long time conduct elections that meet democratic standards, and decide to violate these standards only when threatened by likely opposition victory – this would lead to mistake coding of such autocracies as democracies. Still, this kind of autocracies is empirically rare; it is hard to pinpoint concrete historical examples in this regard. When a regime is not democratic, this situation is usually reflected by the fact that it does not respect civil rights and liberties “on everyday basis”, and such problems with human rights are also visible and even intensify during election periods. In other words, autocracies, like Putin's Russia, almost never liberalize just for the election period; they conduct elections that do not meet democratic standards also when the opposition victory would be unlikely also under fair conditions.³

In the subsequent part of this section I present detailed formal rules on identification of regimes practicing electoral alternation. The first step in the process consists of introduction of a number of definitions of concepts.

First of all, I propose that pluralist elections may give a democratic signal, autocratic signal, mixed signal, democratic-leaning signal, democratic signal or autocratic-leaning signal. Elections which send democratic or democratic-leaning signal will be generally considered as open-outcome while elections which send autocratic or autocratic-leaning signal will be generally considered as closed-outcome (see exceptions below under “coding rules”). The elections which give mixed signal are considered as neither; they could be subsequently classified as open-outcome or closed-outcome when new information on the regime which held them becomes available.

A regime with autocratic legacy (further “autocratic regime”) is a regime which came to power through closed-outcome executive elections or other ways than pluralist election. A regime with democratic legacy (further “democratic regime”) is a regime which came to power through open-outcome executive elections.

³ See Simpser 2013.
By “incumbent” I will understand the chief executive or the ruling party/coalition, or an electoral contender backed by the chief executive.

As “neutral authority” I will understand a government or an effectively ruling authority which does not claim to support any side in a pluralist election which it organizes, and it does not do so in practice (so that it becomes impossible to identify an incumbent during such elections). In colonial polities by “effectively ruling authority” I understand not the chief executive, if one is elected, but the external authorities, provided that they are able and do control the quality of elections. I also classify elections as organized by a “neutral authority” if there are two or more sources of executive power of which none can claim ascendancy and which support different contenders in pluralist elections (so that again it is impossible to identify an incumbent).

Elections are classified as giving autocratic signal if the incumbent made verbal statements before the elections indicating that opposition victory would not be tolerated regardless of the outcome of the election, or when electoral process was stopped when the results were being counted and subsequently incumbent’s victory was announced. They are also classified as giving autocratic signal if there was a high probability that as a result of direct fraud the preference of more than app. 5% of votes was changed (these includes fraud instigated by the incumbent OR by the opposition). Direct fraud includes such actions as obstacles to registration of opposition voters, prevention of opposition voters from voting, stuffing or stealing ballot boxes, multiple voting and voting by ineligible persons, and altering the election results during counting or tabulation.

Elections are also classified as giving an autocratic signal if several of the following conditions occurred during the campaign or the election period and such acts were instigated by the government (incumbent). If only one or two of the following government-instigated conditions occurred, elections are classified to give an autocratic-leaning signal.

Beating, arrest or murder of several journalists; closing or legal harassment of several media outlets; beating, arrest or murder of several significant election candidates (one or more if presidential candidates are concerned); beating or property destruction of more than app. one hundred of voters or political activists; murder of app. twenty or more of voters or political activists; harassment or intimidation of several thousand or more voters or political activists (e.g. threatening public employees with dismissal if they don’t vote for the incumbent candidate) – provided that the acts of intimidation did not occur entirely during a single or a few public demonstrations or acts of violence; heavy inequality of campaign conditions i.e. a situation when the incumbent takes significant advantage of the state resources to campaign while preventing opposition from using state resources to campaign; heavily unequal access to media i.e. more than app. 75% of the most popular media outlets in a country displays overwhelmingly pro-incumbent views; buying of votes of more than 100,000 people. In case of smaller polities the numbers required to determine the existence of a given condition are accordingly smaller.

Elections are classified as giving autocratic-leaning signal if there was a high probability that as a result of direct fraud the preference of app. between 2-5% of votes was changed, and the fraud was instigated by the incumbent. However, if the central electoral authority supervising the elections was effectively independent of the incumbent, or if the direct fraud was instigated both by the incumbent and the opposition, or if it was instigated by the opposing parties in a situation when there was no incumbent, such elections are classified to give democratic-leaning signal.

Elections are classified as giving democratic-leaning signal also if there was a high probability
that as a result of direct fraud the preference of app. between 1-2% of votes was changed, and the fraud was instigated by the incumbent.

Elections are classified to give an autocratic-leaning signal if most of the following conditions occurred during the campaign or the election period and such acts were instigated by the government (incumbent). If several of the following government-instigated conditions occurred, elections are classified to give a mixed signal. However, if most or several of the following government-instigated conditions occurred, but the central electoral authority supervising the elections was effectively independent of the incumbent, elections are classified to give democratic-leaning signal. As well, if most or several of the following conditions occurred, but they were instigated both by the incumbent and the opposition, or they were instigated by the opposing parties in a situation when there was no incumbent, elections are classified to give democratic-leaning signal. If only one or two of the following government-instigated conditions occurred, elections are also classified to give democratic-leaning signal.

Beating, arrest or murder of a few journalists; closing or legal harassment of a few media outlets; beating, arrest or murder of a few significant election candidates (one if presidential candidates are concerned); beating or property destruction of more than app. twenty of voters of political activists; murder of a few voters or political activists; harassment or intimidation of a few thousand of voters or political activists (e.g. threatening public employees with dismissal if they don’t vote for the incumbent candidate) – provided that the acts of intimidation did not occur entirely during a single or a few public demonstrations or acts of violence; some inequality of campaign conditions i.e. incumbent taking certain advantage of the state resources to campaign while opposition is largely prevented from using state resources to campaign; somewhat unequal access to media i.e. more than app. 75% of the most popular media outlets in a country displayed largely pro-incumbent views; buying of votes of more than one thousand people. In case of smaller polities the numbers required to determine the existence of a given condition are accordingly smaller.

Elections are classified to give a democratic signal if they resulted in alternation in power, that is, if the incumbent lost and the opposition duly took over the power (or, regarding alternation in legislative elections, the opposition won more than half of seats in the legislature and the legislature was effectively assembled). This does not apply if the true outcome of elections was enforced only through the use of force (a coup or popular uprising) or if both the incumbent and the opposition had committed widespread direct fraud (see above). Elections are also classified to give democratic signal if the scope of electoral manipulation was smaller than in case of elections giving democratic-leaning signal. Finally, elections are assessed to send democratic signal if they were organized by the neutral authority i.e. there was no identifiable incumbent side. Again, this does not apply if one or more of participating parties had committed widespread direct fraud (see above).

In justification of the abovementioned rule I would concur that most elections organized by a neutral authority can be usually treated as having ex ante uncertain outcome. As instances of such elections one can give those organized by colonial governments that led to the formation of autonomous authorities (as elections in the Philippines in 1935 or in Ghana in 1951), or elections

---

4 As the reader might have noticed, the quality of elections is assessed on the basis of occurrence of certain types and scope of electoral manipulation. The same events are taken into account to assess whether an election sent an autocratic, autocratic-leaning, or democratic-leaning signal, but the scope of manipulation needed is different regarding the different types of signals. Hence the text appears repetitive, but it was not possible without losing the conceptual clarity, unfortunately, to classify elections in a more accessible way.
organized by military leaders who themselves did not participate and did not endorse any contenders (such as Argentina 1983 or Mauritania 2006), or those organized under a divided government, when two beholders of the executive power backed different contenders (as the presidential election in Russia in 1991 or in Benin in 1991).

Naturally, elections organized by a neutral authority do not necessarily meet all democratic standards, but I would argue that holding other variables constant, the probability of fraud during such elections is lower than during the elections in which the incumbent participates. This is because all sides have relatively equal opportunity to prevent fraud or commit fraud, so in the end the outcome of the vote remains ex ante uncertain.

Some examples of really-held elections and their classification:
Elections sending a democratic signal (further “democratic elections”): Sweden 2010, Ghana 2012, Taiwan 2012 (generally, nearly all elections held in countries which received the score of one or two on Freedom House political rights ranking and nearly all elections in which the incumbent lost as a matter of definition).


Election sending an autocratic signal even though organized by a neutral authority: Nigeria 1999 (probably the only historical example of such an election).

Election sending an autocratic signal in spite of being won by the opposition: Peru 1872 (again, probably the only historical example of such an election).

The variable “uncertainty regarding alternation” (further “uncertainty”) is applicable if pluralism=1. If coded as 1 it indicates “objective” uncertainty which occurs because of limited amount of available information on the quality of elections. In other words, the available information points either to alternation or lack of alternation. However, it is scarce and to a certain extent conflicting, hence it results in coding decisions of limited certainty.

If uncertainty=11, 12, 13, 14 or 15 it indicates a situation when information is not scarce, but it is still not sufficient to determine whether the last election was open-outcome or closed-outcome.

In other words, one knows objectively much about the quality of a given election, but the information is still insufficient to determine if the government would in fact turn over the power if defeated in the election. Subsequent elections may bring sufficient information and the variable alternation could be recoded. See the pertinent coding rules (11 to 15) below.

If uncertainty=2 it indicates periods of “past uncertainty”. Such periods would have been coded as uncertain if the coding process had taken place during their length. For example, Lebanon received the coding of “2” on uncertainty regarding alternation in the period 1947-51. The 1947
election in Lebanon was autocratic-leaning, but the 1951 election was democratic. If the coding process took place after the 1947 but before the 1951 election, Lebanon would have received the coding of “14” on uncertainty regarding alternation (see below “rule 14” for explanation). Yet, the 1951 election provided enough new information to code regime in Lebanon as alternation-permitting in the period 1947-51. In other words, given the character of the 1951 election, one could presume that the regime would still have permitted the opposition electoral victory in the 1947 election. See more examples of such situations under particular rules below.

The following coding rules are used to code regimes on uncertainty regarding alternation (application of rule 11 gives the coding of “11” on this variable, etc.). For the easiness of reading, I will subsequently call periods or regimes characterized by alternation (alternation in executive elections=1) as “democratic”, periods or regimes lacking alternation (alternation in executive elections=0) as “autocratic”. “Uncertain period” or “period with uncertainty” refers to a period with positive coding for uncertainty. “No uncertainty” refers to periods when uncertainty regarding alternation was coded as “0”. “Past uncertainty” refers to periods with uncertainty coded as “2”.

**Rule 11**
If an autocratic regime organizes autocratic-leaning or mixed elections, such a regime continues to be coded as autocratic while uncertainty receives the coding of 11. If such a regime subsequently holds democratic-signal election, the period between the last mixed election and democratic election is recoded to democratic. This pertains to Pakistan in 2004-08, for example. If an autocratic regime which held a mixed or autocratic-leaning election subsequently holds autocratic election, the period between the last mixed election and the autocratic election continues to be coded as autocratic with no uncertainty. In other words, in this case the variable “alternation” will not be recoded in the future because sufficient information on the character of the regime had been received.

For example, Kocharian’s regime in Armenia was autocratic as of 2008 because it held autocratic presidential elections in 1998 and 2003. The 2008 election was mixed. Hence, the period after 2008 was coded as autocratic with uncertainty (code “11” for uncertainty). The coding did not change after another mixed election was held in 2013. However, if the 2018 election is democratic, the period 2008-18 will be recoded to democratic with past uncertainty. Yet, if the 2018 election is autocratic, the period 2008-18 will remain coded as autocratic with past uncertainty. To give another example, Iliescu’s regime in Romania had autocratic legacy as of 1992 because it held autocratic-leaning presidential elections in 1990. It subsequently held democratic-leaning election in 1992. Hence, the period 1990-1992 was recoded to democratic with past uncertainty because of the signal sent in 1992.

Armenia 2008-2013 (still 11 as of 2013)
Nigeria 2011-2013 (still 11 as of 2013)
Mauritania 2009-13 (still 11 as of 2013)
Togo 2007-13 (still 11 as of 2013)
Romania 1990-1992 (coded as 2, democratic)
South Korea 1963-67 (coded as 2, autocratic)
Pakistan 2004-08 (coded as 2, democratic)
Georgia 2004-12 (coded as 2, democratic)
Sri Lanka 1988-94 (coded as 2, democratic)

Rule 12
If an autocratic regime organizes democratic-leaning elections, such a regime is recoded to democratic with uncertainty (code “12”). If such a regime subsequently holds another democratic-leaning election, the coding does not change. If such a regime subsequently holds democratic election, the period between the last democratic-leaning election and democratic election is coded as lacking uncertainty. If such a regime subsequently holds autocratic or autocratic-leaning election, the period between the last democratic-leaning election and the autocratic election is recoded to autocratic with no uncertainty regarding alternation.

For example, Compaoré’s regime in Burkina Faso had autocratic legacy as of 2005 because it held autocratic-leaning presidential elections in 1991 and 1998. The 2005 election was democratic-leaning. Hence, the period after 2005 was coded as democratic with uncertainty (code “12”). This situation did not change as of 2013 because another democratic-leaning election was held in 2010. If the 2015 election is democratic, the period 2005-15 will remain coded as democratic with no uncertainty. However, if the 2015 election is autocratic or autocratic-leaning, the period 2005-15 will be recoded to autocratic with no uncertainty.

Similarly, Diouf’s regime in Senegal had an autocratic legacy as of 2000 because it held autocratic presidential elections in 1983 and 1988. The 1993 election was democratic-leaning, while the 2000 election was democratic because Diouf lost. Hence, the period 1993-2000 was coded as democratic with past uncertainty. However, if the 2000 election had been autocratic, the period 1993-2000 would be coded as autocratic with past uncertainty. In an opposite development, Fujimori’s regime in Peru had autocratic legacy as of 1995 because it conducted an executive coup in 1992. The 1995 election was democratic-leaning, while the 2000 election autocratic. Hence, the period 1993-2000 in Peru was coded as autocratic with past uncertainty. However, if the 2000 election in Peru had been democratic, the period 1995-2000 would be coded as democratic with past uncertainty.

Burkina Faso after 2005 (still 12).
Senegal 1993-2000 (coded as 2, democratic)
Tanzania after 1995 (still 12)
Ghana 1992-96 (coded as 2, democratic)
Montenegro 1990-98 (coded as 2, democratic)
Peru 1995-2000 (coded as 2, autocratic)

Rule 13
If a democratic regime organizes mixed elections, such a regime continues to be coded as democratic with uncertainty (code “13”). If such a regime subsequently holds another mixed election, the coding does not change. If such a regime subsequently holds democratic election, the period between the last mixed election and the democratic election is coded as lacking uncertainty. If such a regime subsequently holds autocratic election, the period between the last mixed election and the autocratic election is recoded as autocratic with no uncertainty.

For example, ARENA regime in El Salvador had democratic legacy as of 1994 because it came to power as a result of open-outcome 1989 presidential election. The regime subsequently held mixed presidential election in 1994 and a democratic election in 1999. Hence, the period 1994-
99 was coded as democratic with past uncertainty. However, if ARENA had held autocratic or autocratic-leaning elections in 1999, the period 1994-99 would be coded as autocratic with no uncertainty.

In another development, FRELIMO regime in Mozambique had democratic legacy as of 1999 because it originated from open-outcome 1994 elections. Subsequently, it held mixed elections in 1999, 2004 and 2009. Hence, the period after 1999 is coded as democratic with uncertainty (code “13”). If the 2014 election sends autocratic or autocratic-leaning signal, the period 1999-2014 will be recoded to autocratic with past uncertainty. If the election 2014 is democratic or democratic-leaning, the period 1999-2014 will keep democratic coding with past uncertainty. If another mixed signal is sent in 2014, the coding will stay the same.

Croatia 1995-2000 (coded as 2, democratic)
El Salvador 1994-1999 (coded as 2, democratic)
Mozambique after 1999 (remains 13)
Malawi after 2004 (remains 13)
Sri Lanka after 2010 (remains 13)

Rule 14
If a democratic regime organizes autocratic-leaning elections, such a regime is recoded to autocratic with uncertainty (coded “14”). If such a regime subsequently holds another autocratic-leaning or mixed election, the coding does not change. If such a regime subsequently holds a democratic or democratic-leaning election, the period between the last autocratic-leaning election and democratic or democratic-leaning election is recoded to democratic with no uncertainty. If such a regime subsequently (i.e. after the autocratic-leaning election) holds autocratic election or another autocratic-leaning election, the period between the last autocratic-leaning election and the subsequent autocratic or autocratic-leaning election continues to be coded as autocratic, but with no uncertainty. If the regime coded as 14 for uncertainty is terminated by a discontinuity or an executive coup, it continues to be coded as autocratic for the period before the discontinuity/executive coup while uncertainty is recoded to 2.

As of 2013, no regimes remain in the uncertain zone regarding possibility of alternation under the rule 14, yet several regimes were in this situation. For example, the regime of Democratic Party in Turkey came to power in 1950 as a result of open-outcome elections (the government lost). It held democratic-leaning election in 1954, autocratic-leaning elections in 1957 and was abolished in a coup in 1960. Hence, the period 1950-57 in Turkey was coded as democratic and the period 1957-60 as autocratic with past uncertainty. If there had been no coup in 1960 and an election had been held in Turkey in 1961 under Democratic Party rule, the character of this election would have decided the coding of the period 1957-61. A democratic-leaning or a democratic election in 1961 would have resulted in a recode of the period 1957-61 to democratic with past uncertainty, and an autocratic-leaning or mixed election in 1961 would have kept the autocratic coding of this period but would have resulted in its recode to no uncertainty.

In another development, democratic-legacy regime of the Liberal Party in the Philippines held autocratic-leaning election in 1949. Yet, the subsequent election, held in 1953, was democratic as the Liberals lost. If the 1953 election had been autocratic-leaning or autocratic instead, the period 1949-53 would be coded as autocratic with no uncertainty. Instead, it was coded as democratic with past uncertainty.
Kenya 2007-13 (coded as 2, democratic)
Nigeria 1965-66 (coded as 2, autocratic)
Turkey 1957-60 (coded as 2, autocratic)
Lebanon 1947-51 (coded as 2, democratic)
The Philippines 1949-53 (coded as 2, democratic)

Rule 15
A regime originating from unsuccessfully stolen election is considered autocratic with uncertainty coding of 15 unless it subsequently holds democratic-leaning or democratic elections. If such elections are held, the period between the unsuccessfully stolen election and the democratic-leaning or democratic election is recoded to democratic (for example, the Philippines in 1986-92). If the first elections held by a regime originating from unsuccessfully stolen election are mixed, autocratic-leaning or autocratic, the period between the unsuccessfully stolen election and the elections with mixed, autocratic-leaning or autocratic signal remains coded as autocratic, but with past uncertainty (for example, Ivory Coast 2000-02). Unsuccessfully stolen elections are elections lost by the incumbent which adequately reflected the will of the voters, and which the incumbent subsequently tried to cancel or alter the outcome through evident falsification of results, but was prevented from doing so through a coup and/or popular uprising, as a result of which the true winner came to power. This rule does not encompass the cases when the election was actually repeated under free and fair conditions as a result of a coup or popular uprising, as in Ukraine in 2006.

Ivory Coast 2000-02 (coded as 2, autocratic)
Ivory Coast 2011-13 (remains 15)
Madagascar 2001-06 (coded as 2, democratic)
Yugoslavia, 2000-03 (coded as 2, democratic)
The Philippines 1986-92 (coded as 2, democratic)
Panama 1989-94 (coded as 2, democratic)
Costa Rica 1949-53 (coded as 2, democratic)

20. Suffrage
This variable is applicable if pluralism=1. It codes for approximate percentage of enfranchised adults older than the minimal voting age. If there are differences in the scope of suffrage based on gender, "m" or "w" indicates the percentage of enfranchisement within particular genders. The level of enfranchisement considers citizens, if there was heavy presence of disenfranchised foreigners the information about that situation is given in the notes. Coding for this variable is crucial if one wants to understand development of modern democracy. In contemporary times all countries that organize elections have universal franchise, but historically this had not been the case. Until the early 20th century restrictions of franchise were relatively common. Most of these took the form of property and literacy suffrage requirements; the former being more common in Europe and the latter in Latin America. As well, few women were granted the right to vote before the end of WWI. In addition, some countries practiced universal (male) but unequal suffrage through curial systems (Prussia, Austria, Belgium in 1894-
1919). In those cases I calculated the scope of effective suffrage on the basis of how many votes were cast “unfairly” in comparison to a hypothetical situation of universal (male) suffrage.\(^5\) Admittedly, one could also measure the scope of suffrage within one-party regimes, but I would consider such an exercise rather hollow, also because such regimes emerged en masse only after WWI and nearly all of them permitted “universal” but mostly meaningless suffrage.

21. Uncertainty regarding scope of suffrage
If uncertainty regarding the scope of suffrage=1, it indicates presence of uncertainty regarding the true scope of suffrage due to lack of sufficient information, or objective uncertainty (i.e. a situation when even the government did not know how many people were exactly entitled to vote). If uncertainty regarding the scope of suffrage=0, it indicates that the scope of enfranchisement was estimated with relative precision.

22. Restrictions on participation of political organizations (restricted)
This variable is applicable if pluralism=1. If restricted=1, it indicates restricted scope of participation of political organizations in elections, that is, a situation when some relevant political organizations are banned from electoral participation. By “relevant” I mean organizations which could collect at least app. 10-20% of the vote in an open-outcome legislative election. Restricted=1 also if the number of political organizations allowed to participate in elections is legally specified, or if all political organizations are banned de jure but not de facto. This also applies if such banned organizations are allowed to field independent candidates in elections. If restricted=0, it indicates unrestricted participation.

For example, Senegal was coded as restricted in the period 1978-83 because the number of opposition parties was limited to two. Those parties, however, formed “real” opposition and electoral results (but not outcomes) were not predetermined in advance. Argentina was a restricted democracy in 1958-62 because one of the most popular parties, the Justicialist Party, was legally banned.

23. Limitations on the scope of power of elected authorities (limited)
This variable is applicable if completeness=1, confederacy=0, and sovereign de facto=1 (i.e. it is not applicable regarding non-sovereign polities because the powers of their elected authorities were limited as a matter of fact). If limited=1, it indicates that unelected powers, such as the military or the monarch, severely limit the powers of the elected executive, but still possess less powers than the elected executive. If an elected executive wields less power than an unelected executive authority, such a regime is coded as incomplete with unelected executive (as in contemporary Morocco, where the power of the elected prime minister is apparently smaller than the power of the unelected monarch).

The power of elected executive was limited, for example, in Denmark in 1901-20. Although the prime minister was ultimately responsible to the legislature, the monarch frequently interfered in the affairs of the state, influenced the choice of prime minister, and could also dismiss him (but subsequently, the new PM had to be accepted by the parliament). As well, the United Kingdom was a limited democracy in 1884-1911 because the unelected House of Lords had the right to

---

\(^5\) For example, the Prussian electorate was divided into three curiae electing the equal number of representatives. The curiae consisted of 5%, 13% and 82% of the population, respectively. In this system app. 60% of the votes cast were unfair.
veto legislation. Democracy was also limited in Guatemala in 1986-1999 because of the interference of the army in political affairs. Security issues were to a large extent off limits to elected politicians in this period.6

24. Legislature, type of (if not elected in pluralist elections) [BETA, work in progress]
This variable applicable if pluralism in legislative elections=0. It codes for type of legislature, if not elected in pluralist elections.
0 - There is no legislature - e.g. Morocco in 1965-77.
1 - Legislature is elected in single-party elections without candidate or party list choice, or it is nominated by a single political organization i.e. in conditions of lack of pluralism - e.g. in Soviet Union until 1989. 12 - Subtype: there is a non-pluralist legislature with pluralist legacy - once elected in pluralist elections, but subsequently all parties were forced to merge into a single party or regime front (e.g. Poland in 1948-52). 13 - Subtype: there is a legacy pluralist legislature i.e. pluralistically-elected legislature whose term was unconstitutionally extended (e.g. Pakistan in 1951-54).
2 - Legislature is elected in elections allowing choice among many candidates from one political organization, or in conditions when the candidates are required to support the government (e.g. Kenya in 1969-92 or Jordan in 1957-74). 21 - Subtype: such a legislature exists, but its consent is not necessary to adopt legislation (e.g. Oman 1991-2013).
3 - Legislature is elected in pluralist elections, but less than 50% members are elected in such elections (only one case: Poland in 1989-91).
4 - There is an elected pluralist legislature, but its consent is not necessary to adopt legislation (again only one case: Serbia in 1858-68).
5 - Legislature is appointed, but it has representatives from numerous political organizations (it is appointed in conditions of non-electoral pluralism (e.g. Indonesia in 1949-56)).
6 - There is a pre-modern estate legislature whose consent is necessary to adopt legislation (e.g. Sweden in 1809-66).

25. Executive recruitment, type of (if not through open-outcome election)
This variable is applicable if (alternation in executive elections=0 or pluralism=0) and confederacy =0 or 12. In case of polities which were not sovereign de facto, I coded this variable if the polity was characterized by completeness or if it was sovereign de jure at the time of being not sovereign de facto.
1 - Personal regime with hereditary succession on monarchical principle – e.g. Russia before 1905. 12 - Subtype: the executive power is shared between a hereditary monarch and a chief executive, whose appointment by the monarch is consulted with the ruling group/selectorate (e.g. Germany in 1871-1918).
2 - Personal regime without hereditary succession – e.g. Italy in 1922-43. 21 - Subtype: personal regime with hereditary succession on non-monarchical principle (e.g. Nicaragua in 1956-79).
3 – Institutionalized rule of periodic succession within one political organization (e.g. Mexico under PRI in 1920-2000).

---

6 The concept of the variables “restricted” and “limited” comes from Mainwaring et al. (2001, 44-45) who argued that certain polities, even if they hold elections of uncertain outcome, cannot be classified as democracies because of the influence of unelected actors over policies or because some popular political actors are banned from contesting elections.
4 – Institutionalized rule of periodic succession between two or more political organizations (e.g. Colombia under National Pact in 1958-74). 41 - Subtype: the same as 4, but hereditary head of state provides for an arbiter between the ruling political organizations (e.g. Spain in 1881-1923).

5 - No institutionalized rules of succession, but the chief executive is responsible to and might be recalled by his selectorate/ruling group (e.g. Soviet Union after 1956). 51 - Subtype: the same as 5, but with hereditary monarch serving as an arbiter regarding the process of head executive choice (e.g. Italy under transformismo in 1860-1919). 52 - Subtype: transitional regime (e.g. Serbia in 2000-01).

6 - The chief executive is de facto appointed by a foreign country and may be recalled at any time (e.g. Mongolia in 1921-53).

26. Transitions in executive authority
This variable is applicable if confederacy=0 and sovereign de facto=1. Yet, if sovereignty de facto=0, it was also coded if completeness=1 (e.g. Jamaica 1944-62) or if sovereign de jure=1 (e.g. Poland 1945-88). This variable codes for transitions in executive authority not effectuated by force or the threat of force. The following types are identified:

1 - Executive coup, or forceful regime change effectuated by the chief executive himself (e.g. in Peru in 1992 or in the Philippines in 1972).

2 - Death or incapacitation of head executive not resulting in a regime transition (e.g. United States in 1963 or Turkey in 1939).

3 - Transition to a different head executive within the same regime; includes voluntary resignations not resulting in a regime transition or situations when chief executive is recalled by his ruling group (e.g. Malaysia in 2009). If alternation in executive elections=1, it codes for situations when a head executive from the same party or the same ruling coalition takes over; the ruling coalition is considered to be the same as the previous ruling coalition if less than 50% of coalition party membership changed during the transition (e.g. Japan in 2011). 31 - Subtype: alternation under type-4 or type-5 regime (e.g. between conservatives and liberals in Spain in the period 1876-1917), 32 - subtype: situations during which in type-3 regime the head executive switches the ruling political organization (three cases only, e.g. Colombia in 1880).

4 - Alternation as a result of open-outcome executive election. Includes situations when incumbent or incumbent-supported candidate loses, or there is no incumbent or incumbent-supported candidate participating; situations in which after elections in parliamentary regimes a different government comes to power in which at least 50% of party membership in the ruling coalition is altered.

5 - Other instances of non-discontinuity transitions: resignations or deaths resulting in a regime transition (e.g. Argentina 2001 or Malawi 2012), impeachments (e.g. Madagascar 1996), or alternations under closed-outcome elections (e.g. Nigeria 1999). If alternation in executive elections=1, it indicates government reshuffle occurring without elections which results in a formation of a government in which at least 50% of party membership in the ruling coalition is altered (e.g. Poland in 1992).

6 - Removal of a leader by a foreign power; applicable if sovereignty de facto=0 (e.g. Hungary in 1947).

I do not code for changes in head executive resulting from temporary leaves of absence.

27. Regime discontinuities
This variable is applicable if sovereignty de facto = 1 AND if confederacy=0. In case of polities which were not sovereign de facto, I coded this variable if the polity was characterized by completeness and if it was not a confederacy, or if it was sovereign de jure while being not sovereign de facto. It codes for transitions in executive authority effectuated by force or the threat of force. The following types are identified:

1 – Military: formation of a new regime as a result of a coup by a country’s armed forces (e.g. Egypt 2013), or armed uprising by non-official forces (e.g. Nicaragua 1979); includes civil war victories. 12 - Subtype: palace coup: forceful removal of the chief executive as a result of which the executive power remains in the hands of the same ruling group, military faction, dynasty, or political organization (e.g. Burma 1988, Tunisia 1987 or Qatar 1995).

2 – Popular uprising: regime change as a result of mostly unarmed mass civilian demonstrations (e.g. Ukraine 2004).

3 - Monarchical coup, or forceful removal of the chief executive by the reigning monarch (e.g. Nepal 2002).

4 - foreign-organized aka exogenous discontinuity (e.g. Belgium 1914). Note this type of discontinuity is not treated as democratic breakdown.
### Table B-1. Logistic regression models predicting occurrence of breakdown of democracies (models 1, 2, 3) and democracies and competitive oligarchies (4, 5, 6) applying 20-year time horizon for measurement of legacy variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1 (Dem.)</th>
<th>Model 2 (Dem.)</th>
<th>Model 3 (Dem.)</th>
<th>Model 4 (D+CO)</th>
<th>Model 5 (D+CO)</th>
<th>Model 6 (D+CO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open-outcome elections (years)</td>
<td>-0.017**</td>
<td>-0.061***</td>
<td>-0.068***</td>
<td>-0.02**</td>
<td>-0.063***</td>
<td>-0.075***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinuity</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>-0.321</td>
<td>-0.258</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>-0.328</td>
<td>-0.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.-outcome elections x disc.</td>
<td>0.064***</td>
<td>0.062***</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.055**</td>
<td>0.056*</td>
<td>0.062**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial disenfranchisement (yrs.)</td>
<td>0.055**</td>
<td>0.058**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP income per capita (thous. 2000 US$)</td>
<td>-0.238***</td>
<td>-0.253***</td>
<td>-0.247***</td>
<td>-0.24***</td>
<td>-0.262***</td>
<td>-0.254***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-democratic international environment</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>-0.129</td>
<td>-0.872***</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td>-0.794***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-democratic international environment</td>
<td>1.317***</td>
<td>1.299***</td>
<td>0.673**</td>
<td>1.066***</td>
<td>1.043***</td>
<td>0.635**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British colony</td>
<td>-1.358***</td>
<td>-1.342**</td>
<td>-0.92**</td>
<td>-1.079**</td>
<td>-1.027</td>
<td>-0.789**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent democratic (and comp. oligarchy)</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.062*</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.371</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>-0.368</td>
<td>-0.159</td>
<td>-0.939</td>
<td>-1.36*</td>
<td>-1.646**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffrage (% male adults)</td>
<td>1.807*</td>
<td>1.241</td>
<td>0.805*</td>
<td>0.694*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s suffrage</td>
<td>-0.474</td>
<td>-0.496</td>
<td>-0.342</td>
<td>-0.375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French colony</td>
<td>-0.256</td>
<td>-0.463</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>-0.139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US colony</td>
<td>-0.343</td>
<td>-0.418</td>
<td>-0.258</td>
<td>-0.276</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other colony</td>
<td>-1.003</td>
<td>-1.163</td>
<td>-0.801</td>
<td>-0.934</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French background</td>
<td>-0.152</td>
<td>-0.124</td>
<td>-0.203</td>
<td>-0.215</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British background</td>
<td>-0.648</td>
<td>-0.689*</td>
<td>-0.684*</td>
<td>-0.734*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish background</td>
<td>-0.238</td>
<td>-0.418</td>
<td>-0.235</td>
<td>-0.388</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other background</td>
<td>-0.337</td>
<td>-0.686</td>
<td>-0.491</td>
<td>-0.829</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic attempts</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.193</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1 (Dem.)</th>
<th>Model 2 (Dem.)</th>
<th>Model 3 (Dem.)</th>
<th>Model 4 (D+CO)</th>
<th>Model 5 (D+CO)</th>
<th>Model 6 (D+CO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic attempts</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>-0.038</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(squared)</td>
<td>(0.033)</td>
<td>(0.033)</td>
<td>(0.033)</td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive coups</td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.230)</td>
<td>(0.235)</td>
<td>(0.210)</td>
<td>(0.209)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral fraud</td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td>0.455*</td>
<td>0.462*</td>
<td>0.51*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.216)</td>
<td>(0.215)</td>
<td>(0.208)</td>
<td>(0.206)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single party elections</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.258)</td>
<td>(0.264)</td>
<td>(0.255)</td>
<td>(0.259)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluralism (years)</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>-0.039*</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>-0.032*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completeness (years)</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squared time</td>
<td>-0.003*</td>
<td>-0.003*</td>
<td>-0.002*</td>
<td>-0.002*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubed time</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR Chi2</td>
<td>394.88</td>
<td>418.42</td>
<td>382.67</td>
<td>428.81</td>
<td>455.79</td>
<td>416.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>5400</td>
<td>5400</td>
<td>5400</td>
<td>6025</td>
<td>6025</td>
<td>6025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic episodes</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R2</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Logit regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses. Models predicting occurrence of breakdown of democracies (models 1, 2, 3) and democracies and competitive oligarchies (4, 5, 6). The dependent variable is dummy for democratic breakdown in a given year. Models with BDD measure of democracy with 20-year time horizon for measurement of legacy variables. Models 2 and 5 add interaction terms to Models 1 and 4, while Models 3 and 6 retain only the variables which were shown to improve the fit with BIC statistic.

* p|z| < 0.05. ** p|z| < 0.01. *** p|z| < 0.001.
Table B-2. Logistic regression models predicting occurrence of breakdown of democracies with inclusion only of unlimited and unrestricted periods of democracy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open-outcome elections (years)</td>
<td>-0.025**</td>
<td>-0.076***</td>
<td>-0.075***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinuity</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>-0.152</td>
<td>-0.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.-outcome elections x disc.</td>
<td>(0.234)</td>
<td>(0.256)</td>
<td>(0.211)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial disenfranchisement (yrs.)</td>
<td>0.066***</td>
<td>0.062***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP income per capita (thous. 2000 US$)</td>
<td>-0.254***</td>
<td>-0.262***</td>
<td>-0.223***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-democratic international environment</td>
<td>-0.241</td>
<td>-0.285</td>
<td>-0.945***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-democratic international environment</td>
<td>1.389***</td>
<td>1.418***</td>
<td>0.775***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British colony</td>
<td>-1.546***</td>
<td>-1.561***</td>
<td>-0.946***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent democratic (and comp. oligarchy)</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.071*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>-0.341</td>
<td>-0.113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffrage (% male adults)</td>
<td>2.178*</td>
<td>1.442</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s suffrage</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-0.521</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French colony</td>
<td>-0.221</td>
<td>-0.423</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US colony</td>
<td>-0.303</td>
<td>-0.355</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other colony</td>
<td>-1.213</td>
<td>-1.375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French background</td>
<td>-0.317</td>
<td>-0.299</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British background</td>
<td>-0.693</td>
<td>-0.758*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish background</td>
<td>-0.429</td>
<td>-0.632+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other background</td>
<td>-0.336</td>
<td>-0.613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic attempts</td>
<td>-0.069</td>
<td>-0.195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>Model 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic attempts (squared)</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.046)</td>
<td>(0.045)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive coups</td>
<td>0.483</td>
<td>0.429</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.273)</td>
<td>(0.277)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral fraud</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>0.429</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.243)</td>
<td>(0.245)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single party elections</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.289)</td>
<td>(0.294)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluralism (years)</td>
<td>-0.043*</td>
<td>-0.054**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.019)</td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completeness (years)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squared time</td>
<td>-0.003*</td>
<td>-0.003*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubed time</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR Chi2</td>
<td>353.67</td>
<td>372.88</td>
<td>346.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>5018</td>
<td>5018</td>
<td>5018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic episodes</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R2</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Logit regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses. The dependent variable is dummy for democratic breakdown in a given year. Models with BDD measure of democracy with 20-year time horizon for measurement of legacy variables and unrestricted and unlimited democracies only (i.e. those with executive whose power was not limited by an unelected authority, and those with unrestricted participation of political organizations). Model 2 adds interaction terms to Model 1, while Model 3 retains only the variables which were shown to improve the fit with BIC statistic.

* $p|z| < 0.05$. ** $p|z| < 0.01$. *** $p|z| < 0.001$. 
Table B-3. Logistic regression models predicting occurrence of breakdown of democracies (models 1, 2, 3) and democracies and competitive oligarchies (4, 5, 6) applying 10-year time horizon for measurement of legacy variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1 (Dem.)</th>
<th>Model 2 (Dem.)</th>
<th>Model 3 (Dem.)</th>
<th>Model 4 (D+CO)</th>
<th>Model 5 (D+CO)</th>
<th>Model 6 (D+CO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open-outcome elections (years)</td>
<td>-0.013*</td>
<td>-0.05***</td>
<td>-0.056***</td>
<td>-0.016**</td>
<td>-0.051***</td>
<td>-0.062***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinuity</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>-0.097</td>
<td>-0.179</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>-0.163</td>
<td>-0.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.-outcome elections x disc. (yrs.)</td>
<td>0.067***</td>
<td>0.066***</td>
<td>0.067***</td>
<td>0.067***</td>
<td>0.067***</td>
<td>0.071***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial disenfranchisement</td>
<td>0.045*</td>
<td>0.047*</td>
<td>0.046*</td>
<td>0.046*</td>
<td>0.051*</td>
<td>0.051*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP income per capita (thous. 2000 US$)</td>
<td>-0.247***</td>
<td>-0.251***</td>
<td>-0.277***</td>
<td>-0.249***</td>
<td>-0.253***</td>
<td>-0.28***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-democratic international environment</td>
<td>-0.101</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>-0.138</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>-0.683***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-democratic international environment</td>
<td>1.233***</td>
<td>1.296***</td>
<td>0.796***</td>
<td>0.998***</td>
<td>1.07***</td>
<td>0.718***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British colony</td>
<td>-1.181**</td>
<td>-1.077**</td>
<td>-0.905**</td>
<td>-0.941*</td>
<td>-0.817*</td>
<td>-0.791**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent democratic (and comp. oligarchy)</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>-0.785</td>
<td>-0.252</td>
<td>-0.897</td>
<td>-1.023</td>
<td>-1.449**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffrage (% male adults)</td>
<td>2.24*</td>
<td>2.104*</td>
<td>0.867*</td>
<td>0.75*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s suffrage</td>
<td>-0.482</td>
<td>-0.511</td>
<td>-0.352</td>
<td>-0.382</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French colony</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>-0.093</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US colony</td>
<td>-0.177</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>-0.176</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other colony</td>
<td>-0.841</td>
<td>-0.893</td>
<td>-0.679</td>
<td>-0.722</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French background</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British background</td>
<td>-0.489</td>
<td>-0.455</td>
<td>-0.556</td>
<td>-0.508</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish background</td>
<td>-0.224</td>
<td>-0.295</td>
<td>-0.188</td>
<td>-0.234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other background</td>
<td>-0.375</td>
<td>-0.362</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>-0.507</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic attempts (squared)</td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
<td>(0.033)</td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B-3. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1 (Dem.)</th>
<th>Model 2 (Dem.)</th>
<th>Model 3 (Dem.)</th>
<th>Model 4 (D+CO)</th>
<th>Model 5 (D+CO)</th>
<th>Model 6 (D+CO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive coups</td>
<td>0.517*</td>
<td>0.524*</td>
<td>0.347</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.252)</td>
<td>(0.254)</td>
<td>(0.226)</td>
<td>(0.225)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral fraud</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.210)</td>
<td>(0.211)</td>
<td>(0.196)</td>
<td>(0.197)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single party elections</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.253)</td>
<td>(0.262)</td>
<td>(0.248)</td>
<td>(0.256)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluralism (years)</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completeness (years)</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squared time</td>
<td>-0.003*</td>
<td>-0.003*</td>
<td>-0.002*</td>
<td>-0.002*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubed time</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR Chi2</td>
<td>393.73</td>
<td>420.90</td>
<td>378.57</td>
<td>424.29</td>
<td>452.85</td>
<td>409.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>5400</td>
<td>5400</td>
<td>5400</td>
<td>6025</td>
<td>6025</td>
<td>6025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic episodes</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R2</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Logit regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses. Models predicting occurrence of breakdown of democracies (models 1, 2, 3) and democracies and competitive oligarchies (4, 5, 6). The dependent variable is dummy for democratic breakdown in a given year. Models with BDD measure of democracy with 20-year time horizon for measurement of legacy variables. Models 2 and 5 add interaction terms to Models 1 and 4, while Models 3 and 6 retain only the variables which were shown to improve the fit with BIC statistic.

* p|z| < 0.05. ** p|z| < 0.01. *** p|z| < 0.001.
Table B-4. Logistic regression models predicting occurrence of breakdown of democracies (models 1, 2, 3) and democracies and competitive oligarchies (4, 5, 6) with inclusion of economic growth as a predictor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1 (Dem.)</th>
<th>Model 2 (Dem.)</th>
<th>Model 3 (Dem.)</th>
<th>Model 4 (D+CO)</th>
<th>Model 5 (D+CO)</th>
<th>Model 6 (D+CO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open-outcome elections (years)</td>
<td>-0.025**</td>
<td>-0.081***</td>
<td>-0.075***</td>
<td>-0.022**</td>
<td>-0.073***</td>
<td>-0.082***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinuity</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>-0.115</td>
<td>-0.123</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td>-0.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP income per capita (thous. 2000 US$)</td>
<td>-0.218***</td>
<td>-0.234***</td>
<td>-0.239***</td>
<td>-0.235***</td>
<td>-0.25***</td>
<td>-0.238***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP Growth</td>
<td>-0.05***</td>
<td>-0.048***</td>
<td>-0.048***</td>
<td>-0.05***</td>
<td>-0.049***</td>
<td>-0.049***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-democratic international environment</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td>-0.745**</td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>0.559</td>
<td>-0.568*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-democratic international environment</td>
<td>1.552***</td>
<td>1.526***</td>
<td>0.808**</td>
<td>1.438***</td>
<td>1.374**</td>
<td>0.87**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British colony</td>
<td>-1.393***</td>
<td>-1.465**</td>
<td>-0.743*</td>
<td>-1.179**</td>
<td>-1.158*</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent democratic (and comp. oligarchy)</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>-0.025*</td>
<td>-0.026*</td>
<td>-0.03*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.079*</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>-0.405</td>
<td>-0.181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffrage (% male adults)</td>
<td>0.565</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>1.931**</td>
<td>1.799**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s suffrage</td>
<td>-0.606</td>
<td>-0.647</td>
<td>-0.698*</td>
<td>-0.694*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French colony</td>
<td>-0.173</td>
<td>-0.478</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US colony</td>
<td>-0.568</td>
<td>-0.355</td>
<td>-0.074</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other colony</td>
<td>-1.125</td>
<td>-1.347*</td>
<td>-0.973</td>
<td>-1.097</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French background</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British background</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>-0.539</td>
<td>-0.625</td>
<td>-0.591</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish background</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other background</td>
<td>-0.236</td>
<td>-0.427</td>
<td>-0.326</td>
<td>-0.515</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic attempts</td>
<td>-0.236</td>
<td>-0.433</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B-4. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1 (Dem.)</th>
<th>Model 2 (Dem.)</th>
<th>Model 3 (Dem.)</th>
<th>Model 4 (D+CO)</th>
<th>Model 5 (D+CO)</th>
<th>Model 6 (D+CO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic attempts</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(squared)</td>
<td>(0.041)</td>
<td>(0.041)</td>
<td>(0.044)</td>
<td>(0.044)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive coups</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>0.449</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.306)</td>
<td>(0.322)</td>
<td>(0.291)</td>
<td>(0.295)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral fraud</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.266)</td>
<td>(0.262)</td>
<td>(0.262)</td>
<td>(0.259)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single party elections</td>
<td>-0.258</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>-0.307</td>
<td>-0.282</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.282)</td>
<td>(0.289)</td>
<td>(0.277)</td>
<td>(0.282)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluralism (years)</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.023)</td>
<td>(0.024)</td>
<td>(0.023)</td>
<td>(0.023)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completeness (years)</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squared time</td>
<td>-0.004*</td>
<td>-0.004*</td>
<td>-0.003*</td>
<td>-0.003*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubed time</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR Chi2</td>
<td>332.13</td>
<td>354.48</td>
<td>316.64</td>
<td>350.73</td>
<td>369.79</td>
<td>327.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>4999</td>
<td>4999</td>
<td>4999</td>
<td>5376</td>
<td>5376</td>
<td>5376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic episodes</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Logit regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses. Models predicting occurrence of breakdown of democracies (models 1, 2, 3) and democracies and competitive oligarchies (4, 5, 6). The dependent variable is dummy for democratic breakdown in a given year. Models with BDD measure of democracy with 20-year time horizon for measurement of legacy variables and inclusion of economic growth as predictor. Models 2 and 5 add interaction terms to Models 1 and 4, while Models 3 and 6 retain only the variables which were shown to improve the fit with BIC statistic.

* p|z| < 0.05. ** p|z| < 0.01. *** p|z| < 0.001.
Table B-5. Logistic regression models which distinguish between periods of open-outcome elections characterized by elected executive and other periods of open-outcome elections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1 (Dem.)</th>
<th>Model 2 (Dem.)</th>
<th>Model 3 (D+CO)</th>
<th>Model 4 (D+CO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAC (years)</td>
<td>-0.02**</td>
<td>-0.075**</td>
<td>-0.017*</td>
<td>-0.047*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinuity</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>-0.285</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>-0.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.165)</td>
<td>(0.190)</td>
<td>(0.156)</td>
<td>(0.175)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAC x discontinuity</td>
<td>0.077**</td>
<td>0.046*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.027)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAC x race</td>
<td>0.081*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.044)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAC x colony</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.035)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.036)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA (years)</td>
<td>-0.035***</td>
<td>-0.041*</td>
<td>-0.042***</td>
<td>-0.061***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td>(0.017)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA x discontinuity</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.049**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.018)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA x race</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.147)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA x colony</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.039)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.034)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP income per capita</td>
<td>-0.244***</td>
<td>-0.251***</td>
<td>-0.248***</td>
<td>-0.253***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(thous. 2000 US$)</td>
<td>(0.039)</td>
<td>(0.041)</td>
<td>(0.038)</td>
<td>(0.040)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-democratic</td>
<td>-0.822***</td>
<td>-0.846***</td>
<td>-0.64**</td>
<td>-0.631**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>international environment</td>
<td>(0.199)</td>
<td>(0.201)</td>
<td>(0.185)</td>
<td>(0.187)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-democratic</td>
<td>0.743***</td>
<td>0.745***</td>
<td>0.858***</td>
<td>0.846***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>international environment</td>
<td>(0.192)</td>
<td>(0.199)</td>
<td>(0.178)</td>
<td>(0.183)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British colony</td>
<td>-1.191***</td>
<td>-0.732*</td>
<td>-1.153***</td>
<td>-0.685*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.298)</td>
<td>(0.336)</td>
<td>(0.294)</td>
<td>(0.344)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR Chi2</td>
<td>359.42</td>
<td>389.76</td>
<td>377.78</td>
<td>399.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>5400</td>
<td>5400</td>
<td>6025</td>
<td>6025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic episodes</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R2</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Logit regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses. Models with BDD measure of democracy with 20-year time horizon for measurement of legacy variables. The dependent variable is dummy for democratic breakdown in a given year. These models distinguish between periods of open-outcome elections characterized by completeness, that is elected executive in addition to elected legislature (PAC) and other periods of open-outcome elections (PA), and add interaction term for periods of open-outcome elections experienced in countries democratized by a colonizer. Models 2 and 5 add interaction terms to Models 1 and 4, while Models 3 and 6 retain only the variables which were shown to improve the fit with BIC statistic (apart from the tested interactions). The models retain only the variables which were previously shown to improve the fit with BIC statistic.

* p|z| < 0.05. ** p|z| < 0.01. *** p|z| < 0.001.
Table B-6. Logistic regression models predicting occurrence of breakdown of democracies (models 1, 2) and democracies and competitive oligarchies (3, 4) which add interaction terms for the scope of suffrage and pre-democratization secession.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1 (Dem.)</th>
<th>Model 2 (Dem.)</th>
<th>Model 3 (D+CO)</th>
<th>Model 4 (D+CO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open-outcome elections (years)</td>
<td>-0.027***</td>
<td>-0.084***</td>
<td>-0.03***</td>
<td>-0.085***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.021)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinuity</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>-0.263</td>
<td>0.334*</td>
<td>-0.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.164)</td>
<td>(0.190)</td>
<td>(0.153)</td>
<td>(0.175)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-outcome elections x discontinuity</td>
<td>0.063***</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.055***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial</td>
<td>0.066**</td>
<td>0.063**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disenfranchisement (yrs.)</td>
<td>(0.022)</td>
<td>(0.024)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-outcome elections x suffrage</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.031*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-outcome elections x secession</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.038)</td>
<td>(0.033)</td>
<td>(0.033)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-outcome elections x time</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-outcome elections x squared time</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-outcome elections x cubed time</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP income per capita (thous. 2000 US$)</td>
<td>-0.244***</td>
<td>-0.242***</td>
<td>-0.25***</td>
<td>-0.245***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.038)</td>
<td>(0.041)</td>
<td>(0.038)</td>
<td>(0.040)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-democratic international environment</td>
<td>-0.819***</td>
<td>-0.89***</td>
<td>-0.622**</td>
<td>-0.698***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.199)</td>
<td>(0.201)</td>
<td>(0.185)</td>
<td>(0.187)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-democratic international environment</td>
<td>0.741***</td>
<td>0.665**</td>
<td>0.863***</td>
<td>0.767***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.193)</td>
<td>(0.198)</td>
<td>(0.178)</td>
<td>(0.182)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British colony</td>
<td>-1.13***</td>
<td>-0.891**</td>
<td>-1.003***</td>
<td>-0.767*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.293)</td>
<td>(0.309)</td>
<td>(0.286)</td>
<td>(0.304)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR Chi2</td>
<td>358.01</td>
<td>390.61</td>
<td>372.71</td>
<td>413.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>5400</td>
<td>5400</td>
<td>6025</td>
<td>6025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic episodes</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R2</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Logit regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses. Models predicting occurrence of breakdown of democracies (models 1, 2) and democracies and competitive oligarchies (3, 4). The dependent variable is dummy for democratic breakdown in a given year. These models add an interaction term between periods of Open-outcome elections and scope of suffrage experienced during such periods, and interaction term between periods Open-outcome elections and secession from another country experienced after such periods. Models with BDD measure of democracy with 20-year time horizon for measurement of legacy variables. The models retain only the variables which were previously shown to improve the fit with BIC statistic. * p|z| < 0.05. ** p|z| < 0.01. *** p|z| < 0.001.
Table B-7. Replication of quantitative models with Cox regression.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1 (Dem.)</th>
<th>Model 2 (Dem.)</th>
<th>Model 3 (Dem.)</th>
<th>Model 4 (D+CO)</th>
<th>Model 5 (D+CO)</th>
<th>Model 6 (D+CO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open-outcome elections (years)</td>
<td>-0.039***</td>
<td>-0.097***</td>
<td>-0.097***</td>
<td>-0.046***</td>
<td>-0.107***</td>
<td>-0.106***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinuity</td>
<td>-0.102</td>
<td>-0.574</td>
<td>-0.539*</td>
<td>-0.147</td>
<td>-0.675*</td>
<td>-0.547*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.-outcome elections x disc.</td>
<td>(0.278)</td>
<td>(0.306)</td>
<td>(0.270)</td>
<td>(0.257)</td>
<td>(0.278)</td>
<td>(0.251)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial disenfranchisement (yrs.)</td>
<td>0.096***</td>
<td>0.088***</td>
<td>0.088***</td>
<td>0.084***</td>
<td>0.08***</td>
<td>0.08***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP income per capita (thous. 2000 US$)</td>
<td>-0.41***</td>
<td>-0.415***</td>
<td>-0.386***</td>
<td>-0.434***</td>
<td>-0.444***</td>
<td>-0.403***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-democratic</td>
<td>-0.304</td>
<td>-0.297</td>
<td>-0.971**</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.872**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-democratic</td>
<td>1.33***</td>
<td>1.218***</td>
<td>0.998***</td>
<td>1.245***</td>
<td>1.064***</td>
<td>0.953***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British colony</td>
<td>-1.961***</td>
<td>-1.836**</td>
<td>-1.386**</td>
<td>-1.758**</td>
<td>-1.666**</td>
<td>-1.311**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent democratic (and comp. oligarchy)</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>-0.02+</td>
<td>-0.023*</td>
<td>-0.025*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-2.053*</td>
<td>-2.84***</td>
<td>-2.714***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffrage (% male adults)</td>
<td>2.292</td>
<td>1.741</td>
<td>1.025</td>
<td>1.077*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s suffrage</td>
<td>-0.431</td>
<td>-0.468</td>
<td>-0.248</td>
<td>-0.276</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French colony</td>
<td>-0.098</td>
<td>-0.396</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>-0.071</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US colony</td>
<td>-0.323</td>
<td>-0.225</td>
<td>-0.139</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other colony</td>
<td>-1.183</td>
<td>-1.352</td>
<td>-0.996</td>
<td>-1.136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French background</td>
<td>-0.323</td>
<td>-0.287</td>
<td>-0.487</td>
<td>-0.525</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British background</td>
<td>-0.779</td>
<td>-0.803</td>
<td>-0.938*</td>
<td>-0.988*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish background</td>
<td>-0.906*</td>
<td>-1.171**</td>
<td>-0.812*</td>
<td>-1.056***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other background</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>-0.639</td>
<td>-0.641</td>
<td>-1.203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic attempts</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>-0.125</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td>0.309</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic attempts (squared)</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>-0.069</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive coups</td>
<td>0.725*</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.659*</td>
<td>0.639</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral fraud</td>
<td>0.746*</td>
<td>0.679*</td>
<td>0.795*</td>
<td>0.76*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single party elections</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1 (Dem.)</th>
<th>Model 2 (Dem.)</th>
<th>Model 3 (Dem.)</th>
<th>Model 4 (D+CO)</th>
<th>Model 5 (D+CO)</th>
<th>Model 6 (D+CO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pluralism (years)</td>
<td>-0.074**</td>
<td>-0.092**</td>
<td>-0.057*</td>
<td>-0.074**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.027)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>(0.026)</td>
<td>(0.026)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completeness (years)</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wald Chi2</td>
<td>176.74</td>
<td>200.33</td>
<td>159.15</td>
<td>188.37</td>
<td>233.07</td>
<td>184.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>5400</td>
<td>5400</td>
<td>5400</td>
<td>6025</td>
<td>6025</td>
<td>6025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic episodes</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Logit regression coefficients (log hazard ratios) with robust standard errors clustered by democratic episodes in parentheses. The models are Cox regression models predicting occurrence of breakdown of democracies (models 1, 2, 3) and democracies and competitive oligarchies (4, 5, 6). Models with BDD measure of democracy with 20-year time horizon for measurement of legacy variables. Models 2 and 5 add interaction terms to Models 1 and 4, while Models 3 and 6 retain only the variables which were statistically significant at 0.01 level. The dependent variable is dummy for democratic breakdown in a given year. The proportionality of hazard tests with Schoenfeld residuals showed that the proportional hazard assumption was violated in case of these models (p|chi2|<0.001).

* p|z| < 0.05. ** p|z| < 0.01. *** p|z| < 0.001.
Table B-8. Replication of quantitative models with Polity IV measure of democracy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open-outcome elections (years)</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>-0.087**</td>
<td>-0.069**</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.038*</td>
<td>-0.033*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinuity</td>
<td>0.461</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
<td>-0.192</td>
<td>0.551</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>-0.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.-outcome elections x disc.</td>
<td>(0.307)</td>
<td>(0.330)</td>
<td>(0.294)</td>
<td>(0.355)</td>
<td>(0.382)</td>
<td>(0.333)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP income per capita (thous. 2000 US$)</td>
<td>-0.259***</td>
<td>-0.285***</td>
<td>-0.278***</td>
<td>-0.249***</td>
<td>-0.262***</td>
<td>-0.283***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>0.064*</td>
<td>0.1*</td>
<td>0.067*</td>
<td>0.078*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-dem. international environment</td>
<td>2.971***</td>
<td>2.943***</td>
<td>3.207***</td>
<td>3.993***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-democratic international env.</td>
<td>3.755***</td>
<td>3.718***</td>
<td>1.511***</td>
<td>3.994***</td>
<td>3.606***</td>
<td>1.363***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British colony</td>
<td>-0.878</td>
<td>-0.581</td>
<td>-0.686</td>
<td>-1.009*</td>
<td>-0.921</td>
<td>-0.842*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent democratic (and comp. oligarchy)</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffrage (% male adults)</td>
<td>-1.332</td>
<td>-2.783*</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
<td>-1.683</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s suffrage</td>
<td>-1.059</td>
<td>-0.974</td>
<td>-1.389*</td>
<td>-1.111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British background</td>
<td>0.549</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic attempts</td>
<td>-0.183</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic attempts (squared)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.073</td>
<td>-0.071</td>
<td>-0.134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive coups</td>
<td>-0.168</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>-0.311</td>
<td>-0.412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral fraud</td>
<td>0.324</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>0.548</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single party elections</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluralism (years)</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completeness (years)</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squared time</td>
<td>-0.002*</td>
<td>-0.002*</td>
<td>-0.002*</td>
<td>-0.002*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubed time</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR Chi2</td>
<td>158.78</td>
<td>180.75</td>
<td>153.83</td>
<td>160.48</td>
<td>170.28</td>
<td>143.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>4515</td>
<td>4515</td>
<td>4515</td>
<td>4515</td>
<td>4515</td>
<td>4515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic episodes</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R2</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Logit regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses. The models are logistic regression models predicting occurrence of breakdown of democracies with Polity IV measure of democracy. Models 1, 2 and 3 adopt 10-year time horizon for measurement of pre-democratization legacy variables while Models 4, 5 and 6 adopt 20-
year time horizon for measurement of pre-democratization legacy variables. Models 2 and 5 add interaction terms to Models 1 and 4, while Models 3 and 6 retain only the variables which were shown to improve the fit with BIC statistic. The dependent variable is dummy for democratic breakdown in a given year. Some of the predictors from models with BDD measures of democracy were excluded because otherwise the models would not converge. * $p|z| < 0.05$. ** $p|z| < 0.01$. *** $p|z| < 0.001$. 
Table B-9. Replication of quantitative models with measure of democracy by Przeworski et al. (2000).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open-outcome elections (years)</td>
<td>-0.023*</td>
<td>-0.056**</td>
<td>-0.052**</td>
<td>-0.022**</td>
<td>-0.059**</td>
<td>-0.051**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinuity</td>
<td>-0.385</td>
<td>-0.102</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>0.686</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.-outcome elections x disc.</td>
<td>(0.333)</td>
<td>(0.359)</td>
<td>(0.293)</td>
<td>(0.389)</td>
<td>(0.413)</td>
<td>(0.327)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP income per capita (thous. 2000 US$)</td>
<td>-0.255***</td>
<td>-0.277***</td>
<td>-0.253***</td>
<td>-0.254***</td>
<td>-0.282***</td>
<td>-0.232***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>0.083*</td>
<td>0.087*</td>
<td>0.089*</td>
<td>0.094*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-democratic international environment</td>
<td>1.536**</td>
<td>1.534**</td>
<td>1.518**</td>
<td>1.534**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-democratic international environment</td>
<td>2.219***</td>
<td>2.186***</td>
<td>1.222***</td>
<td>2.25***</td>
<td>2.196***</td>
<td>1.206***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British colony</td>
<td>-1.142*</td>
<td>-0.961</td>
<td>-1.039*</td>
<td>-0.906+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent democratic (and comp. oligarchy)</td>
<td>-0.032*</td>
<td>-0.037**</td>
<td>-0.034**</td>
<td>-0.039**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffrage (% male adults)</td>
<td>-0.422</td>
<td>-0.706</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>-0.518</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s suffrage</td>
<td>-0.849*</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>-1.174**</td>
<td>-0.995**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British background</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>-0.282</td>
<td>-0.332</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic attempts (squared)</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>-0.219</td>
<td>0.512</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive coups</td>
<td>-0.429</td>
<td>(0.444)</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>(0.457)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral fraud</td>
<td>-0.069</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single party elections</td>
<td>-0.349</td>
<td>-0.409</td>
<td>-0.349</td>
<td>-0.396</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluralism (years)</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-0.059*</td>
<td>-0.061*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completeness (years)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squared time</td>
<td>-0.003*</td>
<td>-0.003*</td>
<td>-0.003*</td>
<td>-0.003*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubed time</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR Chi2</td>
<td>155.39</td>
<td>166.86</td>
<td>142.75</td>
<td>163.38</td>
<td>171.34</td>
<td>142.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>4650</td>
<td>4650</td>
<td>4650</td>
<td>4650</td>
<td>4650</td>
<td>4650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic episodes</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R2</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Logit regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses. Logistic regression models predicting occurrence of breakdown of democracies with PACL (Przeworski et al. 2000) measure of democracy. Models 1, 2
and 3 adopt 10-year time horizon for measurement of pre-democratization legacy variables while Models 4, 5 and 6 adopt 20-year time horizon for measurement of pre-democratization legacy variables. Models 2 and 5 add interaction terms to Models 1 and 4, while Models 3 and 6 retain only the variables which were shown to improve the fit with BIC statistic. The dependent variable is dummy for democratic breakdown in a given half-year. Some of the predictors from models with BDD measures of democracy were excluded because otherwise the models would not converge.

* $p|z| < 0.05$. ** $p|z| < 0.01$. *** $p|z| < 0.001$. 
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Table B-10. Replication of quantitative models with measure of democracy by Bernhard et al. (2004).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open-outcome elections (years)</td>
<td>-0.029*</td>
<td>-0.056**</td>
<td>-0.054**</td>
<td>-0.03**</td>
<td>-0.056**</td>
<td>-0.047**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinuity</td>
<td>0.423</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.-outcome elections x disc.</td>
<td>0.056*</td>
<td>0.051*</td>
<td>-0.032**</td>
<td>0.042*</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP income per capita (thous. 2000 US$)</td>
<td>-0.349***</td>
<td>-0.365***</td>
<td>-0.315***</td>
<td>-0.332***</td>
<td>-0.348***</td>
<td>-0.3***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-democratic international environment</td>
<td>-0.194</td>
<td>-0.149</td>
<td>-0.186</td>
<td>-0.237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-democratic international env.</td>
<td>1.213</td>
<td>1.177</td>
<td>1.413***</td>
<td>0.346*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British colony</td>
<td>-1.16*</td>
<td>-1.031*</td>
<td>-1.206**</td>
<td>-1.122*</td>
<td>-1.005*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent democratic (and comp. oligarchy)</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffrage (% male adults)</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>1.104</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s suffrage</td>
<td>-0.489</td>
<td>-0.735</td>
<td>-1.213+</td>
<td>-1.342*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British background</td>
<td>-0.171</td>
<td>-0.156</td>
<td>-0.252</td>
<td>-0.292</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic attempts</td>
<td>-0.903</td>
<td>-0.678</td>
<td>-1.573</td>
<td>-1.581</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic attempts (squared)</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.358</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive coups</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td>1.084</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral fraud</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>0.98*</td>
<td>1.004*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single party elections</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.584</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluralism (years)</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>-0.091</td>
<td>-0.109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completeness (years)</td>
<td>-0.013*</td>
<td>-0.017*</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squared time</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubed time</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR Chi2</td>
<td>159.29</td>
<td>165.50</td>
<td>144.71</td>
<td>164.31</td>
<td>168.74</td>
<td>149.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3658</td>
<td>3658</td>
<td>3658</td>
<td>3658</td>
<td>3658</td>
<td>3658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic episodes</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R2</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: Logit regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses. Logistic regression models predicting occurrence of breakdown of democracies with Bernhard et al.’s 2004 measure of democracy. Models 1, 2 and 3 adopt 10-year time horizon for measurement of pre-democratization legacy variables while Models 4, 5 and 6 adopt 20-year time horizon for measurement of pre-democratization legacy variables. Models 2 and 5 add interaction terms to Models 1 and 4, while Models 3 and 6 retain only the variables which were shown to improve the fit with BIC statistic. The dependent variable is dummy for democratic breakdown in a given half-year. Some of the predictors from models with BDD measures of democracy were excluded because otherwise the models would not converge.

* $p|z| < 0.05$. ** $p|z| < 0.01$. *** $p|z| < 0.001$. 
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