To Democracy Through Anocracy

Josep M. Colomer
David Banerjea, Georgetown University
Fernando B. de Mello, Georgetown University
Democratization has been associated with relatively short "transitions" from autocratic regimes. Yet 40 out of 89 currently existing democracies have not been established by means of a direct or short transition from an autocratic regime, but by a process of opening from a long-lasting intermediate or "hybrid" regime, also called "anocracy" or "partly free" regime in the literature. This type of regime typically involves significant freedom together with either limited suffrage rights, restrictions on electoral competition or constrained accountability of elected rulers. An anocracy is not a brief transitional situation, but a type of regime that tends to be as long living as democracies or autocratic dictatorships.

Intrigued by this finding against the odds of conventional wisdom, we revisit the classic topic of regime types and regime changes. Based on well-grounded conceptual discussion, we use a trichotomous classification of regime types, including the intermediate anocratic category between democracy and autocracy, and the subsequent six-fold typology of regime changes.
We have analyzed 581 political regimes having lasted for at least five years and 414 political regime changes in 167 countries (all countries of the world with more than half a million inhabitants) from 1800 to 2013. This is the longest time span of a trichotomous measure of political regimes and regime changes currently available, which should be of critical value for further empirical studies.*

From this platform, we confirm, first, that anocracy is a type of regime different from both democracy and autocracy and not only a situation or transitional stage of relatively brief duration between the other two types. More innovatively, we observe that the diffusion of regimes of anocratic type is not only a recent development produced by incomplete democratization attempts in the last few decades, but a category that can enlighten numerous cases of traditionally called "mixed" or "hybrid" regimes in the nineteenth century and until the mid-twentieth century.

Second, we revise the number of regime changes between each pair of the three categories since late eighteenth century, in order to see whether a general tendency towards democratization holds when the intermediate type is included and how the three-fold categorization can affect the magnitude of the tendency. While we confirm a general tendency towards increasing democratization, we also note the high number of countries in which anocratic or intermediate regimes have preceded complete openings to full democracy. This observation holds both for the "third wave" of democratization during the last 40 years and for the previous historical period.

Classifying Regime Types

Typologies of political regimes based on quantitative measurements are typically supported by scales of democracy, autocracy, political freedom or similar variables. However, the concept of political regime requires disjunct categories. When change is measured only by change in scores in continuous scales, the concept of political regime vanishes. If democracy were only a matter of degree, it might be difficult to agree on whether democracy began to exist in any country at any particular moment.

Most of the available regime typologies are either dichotomous or trichotomous. Dichotomous classifications consider only democracy and dictatorship whereas trichotomous classifications include an intermediate type between democracy and dictatorship. The annual reports of Freedom House provide a seven-point measure of political and civil rights, from which three types are distinguished: free, partly free, and not free countries (respectively corresponding to scales 1 to 2.5, 3 to 5, and 5.5 to 7) since 1972. The Polity project provides scales of democracy and of autocracy from +10 to -10, which are the basis for a threefold classification of regimes in democracies, anocracies and autocracies (respectively based on scales +6 to +10, -5 to +5, and -10 to -6), for the period since 18004.

An alternative for a long period also starting in the nineteenth century is the Political Regime Database. However, we have at least two caveats that incline us not to prefer this database: first, it includes a "Transition" category which, paradoxically, in many cases does not lead to a different type of regime, and second, in spite of having the "transitional" category it codes many experiences that have lasted for only one, two or other short periods of a few years as regimes and not as transitions.

While taking into account that the classifications obtained from most of the above-mentioned data-sources are strongly correlated, we base our analyses on the Polity project because it is the most encompassing one, especially for the inclusion of the three types of regime and for the length of the period covered.6

Identifying "Hybrid" Regimes

The relevance of changes from autocracies that stopped short of full democratization was observed already by Samuel Huntington with his distinction between democratization and liberalization. He conceived the latter as the "partial opening" of an autocratic system short of choosing government leaders through freely competitive elections. Dealing also with forms of regime change, Josep Colomer characterized "a moderate reform of authoritarian institutions, which generally leads to a limited democracy" as a stage involving political party elections by broad suffrage, but also "restrictions on the activity of certain parties, an electoral system that deviates representation in their...

...a halfway category of political regime, which was called "semi-democracy", "hybrid" regime and other names, was envisaged as the result of numerous processes of "liberalization" or "reform" in Eastern Europe, Latin America and Africa in the 1990s and early 2000s.

(incumbents’) favor, the continuity of certain institutions, and the absence of the settling of accounts and reprisals against authoritarians”8.

Subsequently, a halfway category of political regime, which was called "semi-democracy", "hybrid" regime and other names, was envisaged as the result of numerous processes of "liberalization" or "reform" in Eastern Europe, Latin America and Africa in the 1990s and early 2000s. Terry Karl introduced the notion of "hybrid" regime,
which was defined as a combination of democratic and authoritarian elements, while Larry Diamond coined the expression "electoral authoritarianism". This category includes both regimes with non-competitive elections (due to limited franchise, restricted entrance or skewed incumbent advantage) and regimes with competitive and open elections but no government’s electoral accountability because the effective power of elected officials is heavily limited. Further on, Andreas Schedler and his collaborators have broadly studied electoral authoritarian regimes. Along similar lines, Steven Levitsky and Lucan A. Way characterize such a type of regime as those "that are sufficiently competitive to guarantee real uncertainty (and even turnover) but which fall short of democracy". Looking at the beast from the other side, other authors coined the expression "defective democracy" for regimes holding elections with insufficient degrees of franchise and participation rights, political freedom or government accountability. Alternative proposals to deal with the same phenomenon include labels such as "illiberal democracy", "semi-authoritarianism", "semi-dictatorship" and others.9

Matthijs Bogaards proposed to combine into a single category "two of the most systematic recent approaches, centered on the concepts of 'defective democracy' and 'electoral authoritarianism'": which was to be operationalized as for those regimes having moderate negative values and moderate positive values in the Polity scale of authoritarianism and democracy. We share the conclusion that "hybrid regimes are neither a subtype of autocracies nor of democracies, but a regime type of their own", which "are not to be confused with regimes in transition" or with transitional phases 10.

In order to distinguish durable anocratic regimes from processes of change, we discard as regimes those situations having lasted for less than five years, as this seems to be a common period for regime change. As change generally develops over several variables (electoral competitiveness, participation, constitutional constraints on rulers, etc.), all changes not always occur in unison and a new full regime may require a few years to be established. In particular, a democracy or an anocracy lasting for at least five years usually includes at least two elections, which may imply a minimum appreciable degree of institutional stability 11.

Our calculations for regime type duration from 1800 to 2013 are shown in Table 1. In particular, we observe that the average duration of the all the 301 cases coded as anocracy is about 19 years. However, in many cases anocracy lasts for only a few years and is followed by further regime change. By discarding all transitional situations with a short duration of less than five years, we find 185 cases of nontransitional anocratic regimes with an average duration of 30 years. These values made durable anocracies comparable to the values of durable autocracies and democracies (as also counted for those having lasted for at least five years), which are 262 cases with an average duration of 35 years and 134 cases with an average duration of 34 years, respectively. This permits us to confirm that long-lasting anocracy is a distinctive type of regime which deserves to be included as such, together with autocracy and democracy, in analyses of regime duration, change, and relationships with other variables.

In light of the high number of electoral authoritarian regimes during the last few decades, Larry Diamond hypothesized that "this type of regime, which is now so common, is very much a product of the contemporary world". Similar observations have placed "the emergence" of hybrid regimes at the end of the Cold War and in the wake of the "third wave" of democratization 12. However, the category of hybrid regime or anocracy turns out to also be very helpful to comprehend many historical experiences of traditionally called "mixed" regimes in the nineteenth century and until the mid-twentieth century in several continents.

Table 1: Regime type duration (in years), 1800 -2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For all cases</th>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Average Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Past</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocracy</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anocracy</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For cases with duration ≥ 5 years</th>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Average Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Past</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors' calculations with data from Polity IV project.
wealthy, propertied individuals. Its members participated with commendable frequency in elections whenever the possibilities of such participation were open to them”; control of elections by local elites became difficult and most elections were open to innovative candidates and uncertain results. Following an ‘anocratic’ experience of about 150 years, the United Kingdom evolved to democracy after a sequence of enlargements of suffrage rights, which included up to a majority of adult men by 1886.

In France, an anocratic constitutional monarchy followed by a brief second republic covered the period 1814-1851 in between the two autocratic empires headed by the two Napoleons. Three constitutional monarchies and a short-lived republic also existed in Spain in 1836-1858 and in 1868-1899. Regular elections were held, although with restrictions to participation and competition, before universal male suffrage and open entry to non-dynastic parties were introduced in 1890. In Germany, universal male suffrage for the Imperial Bundestag was introduced in 1875. In Colombia, restricted-suffrage but relatively open elections were regularly held in the period 1832-1866, with “a record of outward stability superior to that of most of Latin America: which was followed by a period of more conflictive democratization, and again since 1886, in "the longest period of internal political stability of [the country’s] independent history" so that "by the 1930s Colombia was on the edge of being acclaimed as an exemplary Latin American democracy"; achievement that was more clearly reached only in 1956. In Brazil, the Republic established in 1889 introduced direct elections with restricted suffrage and competition, which initiated the longest period of political regime stability and absence of major violent conflicts in Latin America until 1931. In Chile an extremely long period of high political stability, which was sustained upon low electoral participation, extended from 1822 to 1963, when a democratic regime was established.

Other major anocratic experiences, according to Polity’s codes, include Japan, where a constitutional monarchy was established during the Meji period, initiated in the 1860s, by introducing the election of a legislative assembly with limited franchise, while the cabinet was responsible only to the emperor, in a comparable way to late nineteenth century Germany. Democracy was established in Japan after the Second World War. In China, a republic replacing the traditional Empire in 1911 became an anocratic experience that was ended by military invasion by Japan in 1936. The monarchy of Egypt, which declared independence from the British protectorate in 1922, also held constitutional elections until the military coup d’etat in 1951. Liberia established an independent republic based on the principles denoted in the United States constitution in 1847, although with political competition constrained within America-Liberians, which lasted until the so-called “invisible protectorate” adopted by the U.S. in 1908.

The data show that diversely labeled intermediate "anocracies", "partly free" or "hybrid" regimes have been a broadly diffused experience at least since traditional absolutist monarchies and colonial empires were shaken up in a few countries during the eighteenth century. Our data confirm the importance of this type of regime during the third wave of democratization started in the 1970s, especially in Asia, Africa and the Arab region. The longest-lasting, currently existing anocratic regimes include Singapore since 1959 and Malaysia since 1969.

In light of the high number of electoral authoritarian regimes during the last few decades, Larry Diamond hypothesized that 'this type of regime, which is now so common, is very much a product of the contemporary world'
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We consider only changes between different types of regime, not within each type, thus we do not count as a regime change the replacement of a dictator with another, limited institutional reforms in an anocratic regime, or a constitutional revision in democracy. Regarding "transitions": we include not only relatively peaceful processes mostly led by fractionalized elites by way of negotiations and pacts, as was typical at the beginnings of the "third wave": but also other relatively fast experiences of democratization from autocracy involving stronger mass mobilizations or significant violence, as was more frequent in previous periods, and particularly at the end of the Second World War. The independence of colonies and the creation of new countries are counted as changes from autocracy, even if the metropolis was democratic, as for the autocratic condition of colonial domination, such as, for instance, in the case of the process in India from the United Kingdom in 1947-50. The numbers for each type of regime change are given in Table 2.

We find much higher numbers of changes in the direction towards democratization than in the reverse direction during more than two hundred years (293 vs. 121 changes). In particular, regarding the intermediate category of anocracy, we confirm and expand on the observation for electoral authoritarianism that it "has not spread primarily at the expense of democracy, but of non-electoral autocracies" (Schedler 2013: 3). There are nowadays two and a half times more anocracies which were established from autocracies than from democracies (36 and 14, respectively). Cases include former Soviet republics after the dissolution of the USSR in 1991, including Armenia, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan, as well as Georgia which eventually evolved to democracy in 2003. In the Arab region, anocratic regimes with limited albeit positive degrees of political freedom have existed in Tunisia since 1987, Jordan since 1989, Algeria since 1995, as well as, in spite of enormous challenges, in Egypt and Iraq for some short periods since 2005. A most recent case of anocracy by semi-opening is the monarchy of Bhutan, which began to be opened to parties and elections since 2008 when it adopted its first modern constitution.

All this illustrates the liberalizing character of most anocracies, in contrast to those that imply a reversal of a previous democratization. However, the rate of success has been double for those who have attempted to close an existing democratic regime than for those who have attempted to open an autocratic regime. While more than half of the attempts at partially closing a democracy have led to currently existing anocracies (14 of 24 cases), only less than one fourth of the attempts to open an autocracy have led to currently existing anocracies (36 of 159 cases).

Regarding democracy, of the 89 currently existing democratic regimes in countries with more than half a million population, 49 were established from autocracies by means of relatively short processes of transition of less than five years of duration, and 40 were established from previously existing anocracies having lasted in average for about 34 years. Both the way of transition from an autocratic regime and the way of opening from an intermediate anocracy have produced rates of about two-thirds of success. Specifically, 49 of the 75 attempted transitions and 40 of the 59 attempted complete openings have led to currently existing democracies.

Processes of complete opening to democracy from a previously existing anocratic regime have been almost as popular as direct transitions from autocracies in all "waves" of democratization, in particular before and after 1973. Among the 28 currently existing democracies that were established during the period from early nineteenth century to 1973, 13 were established from anocratic regimes while the other 15 were by short transitions. Specifically, democracy was the outcome of processes from previously existing anocratic regimes in cases such as the United States, the United Kingdom, Switzerland, Costa Rica and Canada during the nineteenth century. In contrast, short transitions led to democracy especially in former British colonies such as New Zealand, Australia and India, in Western Europe including France, Germany and Italy, and in Japan at the end of the Second World War.

Likewise, in the most recent period since 1974, in which most current democracies have been established, comparable numbers have been the result of transitions and of openings: 35 and 27, respectively. Short and mostly peaceful transitions developed in Southern Europe in the 1970s, Latin America

### Table 2. Regime type change, 1800-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regime Type Change</th>
<th>No. Countries</th>
<th>No. Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partial opening (from autocracy to anocracy)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete opening (from anocracy to democracy)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition (from autocracy to democracy)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial closing (from democracy to anocracy)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete closing (from anocracy to autocracy)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakdown (from democracy to autocracy)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: As every country has an initial political regime, the total number of regimes (581 as reported in Table 1) = number of countries (167) + number of regime changes (414).

Source: Authors’ calculations with data from Polity IV project.
in the 1980s and Eastern Europe in the late 1980s; well-known cases include the "carnation revolution" in Portugal in 1974, the negotiations and pacts in Spain in 1977-78, the Round Table in Poland in 1989, and the defeat and collapse of the military regime in Argentina in 1983. Though, no less robust democracies were established by relatively smooth evolutions of anocratic regimes in Latin America, East Asia and Africa since the 1980s, including in countries such as Brazil by means of a slow opening of military rule which was completed by 1985, Mexico after competitive elections called by the ruling party in 1996, South Korea after an open presidential election in 1987 by which a civilian government replaced military rule, and Taiwan through gradual reforms from a single-party regime.

In this light, disappointment of relatively recent expectations of democratization after failed openings in certain regions, such as in Asian republics of the former Soviet Union and in the Arab Spring, might be moderated. The current "modest harvest" collected in those and other cases should not necessarily produce stern pessimism regarding the prospects for democracy in those lands. We should bear in mind that nearly three fourths of the countries of the world have experienced durable anocratic regimes. Most countries with anocratic regimes eventually evolved into democracy. And, as we have just mentioned, nearly half of the democracies that exist in more than half of the countries of the world arrived to the current type of regime from previously existing intermediate, anocratic regimes, which have lasted on average for about two generations, rather than more directly by short democratic transitions from autocracy.

The average duration of past experiences of anocratic regimes was longer than that of failed democracies (34 vs. 19 years). Yet the currently existing anocracies have lasted, so far, much less than those in the past (20 years for those coded as such in 2013). This might suggest that currently existing anocracies could still last for a while, but also that they could follow further processes of "complete opening" to democracy in not too distant futures (perhaps one more generation, on average), as did their predecessors.

**Conclusion**

By using a trichotomous classification of regime types that includes the intermediate category of anocracy between democracy and autocracy, we have developed a new analysis of political regime types and regime changes in all countries of the world with more than half a million inhabitants from 1800 to 2013. We have been able to present a number of innovative insights:

We have confirmed, quantified and illustrated that anocracy or hybrid regime can be considered not a transitional situation between autocracy and democracy, but a long-living type of political regime. This intermediate category can enlighten the analysis of numerous cases of mixed monarchies and comparable institutional arrangements during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. A large majority of the current anocracies were established after processes of liberalization from autocracies, rather than from failed experiences of democratization. Non-transitional anocracies have had a similar duration to that of autocracies and democracies in modern times.

Attempts at democratization have been about equally successful when they have been tried from autocracies by means of a short transition as when they have been the result of a relatively smooth evolution from an intermediate or anocratic regime. During the "third wave" of democratization initiated in 1974, in which most currently existing democracies have been established, comparable numbers of them have resulted from transitions and from opening. These preliminary findings should trigger and help further innovative discussion and research.

**We find much higher numbers of changes in the direction towards democratization than in the reverse direction during more than two hundred years.**
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