

## APPLICATION FORM FOR PROSPECTIVE WORKSHOP DIRECTORS

If you wish to apply to direct a workshop at the Joint Sessions in Münster, Germany during 22-27 March 2010, please first see the explanatory notes, then complete this form, which will serve as the **cover sheet** for your workshop proposal. This form should be sent with your **workshop proposal** to the ECPR Central Services. You can do this by emailing both documents as an attached file (in word format .doc or rich text format .rtf) to the ECPR Central Services at [ecpr@essex.ac.uk](mailto:ecpr@essex.ac.uk). **The deadline for applications is Sunday, 01 February 2009.**

**Title of proposed workshop:**

Comparing autocracies: Theoretical issues and empirical analyses of input/output dimensions

**Subject area:**

Autocracies, authoritarian regimes, comparative politics.

**Abstract of proposed workshop.**

Recent years have seen a renewed academic interest in autocracies. Particular attention has been devoted to the role that formal institutions can play in terms of supporting authoritarian rule. New typologies of authoritarian regimes have been developed and the links between different types of such regimes and their longevity have been analysed. Game-theoretical models have been used to illuminate the political economy and internal dynamics of dictatorships. Notably, European contributions to this new debate on authoritarianism have so far been scarce. Moreover, a number of research questions remain yet to be tackled.

The workshop aims at bringing European (and other) political scientists working on autocracies together and at filling some of the lacunae in the debate. In the first part of the workshop, papers should either delineate new theoretical, conceptual, and/or methodological approaches or critically revisit older approaches to explaining and understanding the durability, dynamics, and eventual demise of autocracies. The second part of the workshop will focus on empirical analyses of the 'input' and 'output' dimensions of authoritarian rule. With respect to the first dimension, papers are sought which either build on recent institutional explanations of authoritarian durability or focus on other, more neglected pillars/mechanisms/sources of the reproduction of autocracies. With respect to the 'output dimension', papers are sought which either examine the performance or behaviour of autocracies per se in given (policy) areas or which explain the varying performance of autocracies in a given area.

**Name of workshop directors:**

PD Dr Steffen Kailitz, HAIT, Dresden/Germany

PD Dr Patrick Koellner, GIGA, Hamburg/Germany

**Name and address of institutions:**

Hannah Arendt Institute for Research on Totalitarianism  
Helmholtzstrasse 4  
01060 Dresden  
Germany

GIGA German Institute of Global and Area Studies  
Institute of Asian Studies  
Rothenbaumchaussee 32  
20148 Hamburg  
Germany

**Telephone numbers:**

0049-351-46334390 (Kailitz)

0049-40-22887417 (Koellner)

**Fax number/s:**

0049-351-463 360 79 (Kailitz)

0049-40-410 79 45 (Koellner)

**e-mail addresses:**

kailitz@hait.tu-dresden.de, steffen.kailitz@phil.tu-chemnitz.de

koellner@giga-hamburg.de

**Outline of the topic and relation to existing research**

The so-called third wave of democratisation constitutes in many ways a success story. But it has not led to an extinction of autocracies. While the past thirty-five years have witnessed numerous democratic transitions leading to fully-fledged liberal or, more often, electoral democracies, many countries continue to be governed autocratically. According to Freedom House (2008), a quarter of all nation states and territories, encompassing a third of the world's population, can be judged 'not free'. The still substantial number of autocracies and palpable authoritarian tendencies in some 'hybrid regimes' have recently led to more subdued if not outright pessimistic assessments concerning the worldwide future of democracy. Diamond (2008), for example, expresses concern about a 'rollback of democracy' and a related rise of 'predatory states'. At the same time, neo-realists such as Gat (2007) discuss the possible implications of the (renewed) rise of 'authoritarian great powers', in particular China and – to a lesser degree – also Russia.

The continued, if not rising, importance of authoritarian regimes contrasts with the long-time visible neglect of their analysis in mainstream political science. At least up until recently, only very few political scientists followed up on the groundbreaking work of Linz on such regimes (see in particular Linz 1964, 1975). Inspired to a substantial degree by Barbara Geddes' seminal article on the durability and internal dynamics of different subtypes of

authoritarian regimes (Geddes 1999), recent years have seen a burst of new studies on autocracies, mainly by a younger generation of scholars based in the United States. Reflecting the neo-institutional bent of much political-science writing over the past few decades, particular attention has been devoted to analysing the role of formal institutions such as the state apparatus, elections, parties, and legislatures in supporting authoritarian rule (e.g. Brownlee 2007; Gandhi 2008a; Greene 2007; Magaloni 2006, 2008; Slater 2007; Smith 2005). New typologies of authoritarian regimes (and new large-N data sets) have been developed in this context and the links between subtypes of such regimes and their longevity have been analysed (see also Hadenius/Teorell 2007). Other strands of analysis have focussed on the connections between rents from resource endowments and the sustainability of authoritarian rule (e.g. Smith 2004; Ulfelder 2007) or have applied game-theoretical models to illuminate the behaviour of dictators, the political economy and the internal dynamics of autocracies (e.g. Acemoglu/Robinson 2006; Pepinsky 2007; Svobik 2007; see also Wintrobe 2007).

While we thus witness a revitalisation of research on autocracies, we can also note that a) European contributions to the debate remain scarce and b) that a number of relevant research questions remain to be (re-)tackled. The proposed workshop aims at bringing European (and selected non-European) political scientists working on autocracies together and at filling some of the lacunae, which are spelt out in the following.

### **Participants and desired foci/types of papers**

The proposed workshop seeks to assemble political scientists doing research on autocracies, who address the topic from a more theoretical and conceptual perspective or are engaged in empirical analyses of contemporary autocracies. The workshop should be particularly relevant to comparativists focussing on political regimes more generally or non-democracies in particular. The workshop should however also draw the attention of both international relations and political economy specialists interested in the role of autocracies in global affairs and in the policy consequences of different types of political regimes, respectively. The workshop co-directors are especially looking for papers providing comparative analyses of the pillars and performance of autocracies, ranging from intra- and cross-regional small and medium-N comparisons to large-N cross-national studies. Single-case studies are of particular interest if they promise to generate new testable hypotheses or apply original new models. Paper proposals will be sought for the following issue areas:

*Theories, concepts of and methods for analysing authoritarian regimes: New insights, knowledge accumulation or just reinventing the wheel?*

Papers presented in this part of the workshop should either delineate new theoretical, conceptual, and/or methodological approaches or critically revisit older approaches to explaining and understanding the durability, dynamics, and demise of autocracies. What new insights can, for example, game theoretic and other formal models provide in this respect? Theoretical insights and empirical analyses might be linked to explain the massive shifts, which have occurred in the 'landscape' of autocracies over the past few decades (i.e. the relative demise of single-party and military regimes and the rise of electoral autocracies, cf. Schedler 2006). Other questions which merit attention include: Do we need different typologies of autocracies for different kinds of research questions and what are the (relative) merits of existing typologies? Are the subtypes proposed by Linz (1975, 2000) still useful for analyses of contemporary autocracies? Should ideocracies (*Weltanschauungsregime*) remain part of the canon of basic types of autocracies or should they be subsumed under other generic subtypes? More methodologically oriented questions include: Can authoritarianism fruitfully be measured, e.g. by drawing on approaches for measuring democracies? Where can the line between, on the one hand, illiberal (and other diminished subtypes of) democracies and, on the other hand, 'electoral autocracies' be drawn?

### *The input dimension of authoritarian rule: Examining the pillars of autocracies*

Papers presented in this part of the workshop, whether comparative in nature or focussing on single cases, should either build on more recent institutional explanations of authoritarian durability or focus on other – particularly in political science in the US – more neglected pillars/mechanisms/sources of the reproduction of autocracies. Relevant questions include: Under what circumstances do formal institutions and organisations such as elections, parliaments, parties, the judiciary (cf. Solomon 2007), and institutional settings aimed at co-opting groups within society help to maintain authoritarian rule and when to do they contribute to the demise of autocracies? Under what circumstances are other well-known means of reproducing autocracies such as repression, the allocation of material rewards, and state/hegemonial party-centred legitimacy discourses successful? What factors accounts for the mix of strategies pursued by autocracies to sustain their rule?

### *The output dimension of authoritarian rule: How autocracies behave and perform*

While the 'input dimension' of authoritarian rule has recently received new scholarly attention, the equally important 'output dimension' of such rule remains under-explored. For this section of the workshop papers are thus desired, which either build on or critically examine the explanatory scope of the few existing large-N studies examining the performance or behaviour of different regime types (democracies versus autocracies) in terms of generating prosperity and social inclusion, maintaining order, and engaging in external conflicts (e.g. Przeworski et al. 2000; Peceny et al. 2002; Lai/Slater 2006). The high level of aggregation of such studies can however cover significant differences between regimes of one type (here: autocracies). Comparative papers explaining (in institutional terms or otherwise) the varying performance of autocracies in a given policy area (see e.g. Abrami et al. 2008; Gandhi 2008b) are thus also welcome.

Three political party foundations in Germany, with whom the workshop's co-directors have worked before, will be approached for supplementary funding for this workshop.

## **References**

- Abrami, Regina, Edmund Malesky und Yu Zheng. 2008. Accountability and Inequality in Single-Party Regimes: A Comparative Analysis of Vietnam and China. Working Paper 2008-0130. Weatherhead Center for International Affairs, Harvard University.
- Acemoglu, Daron and James A. Robinson. 2006. *Economic Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Brownlee, Jason. 2007. *Authoritarianism in Age of Democratization*. Cambridge University Press.
- Diamond, Larry. 2008. The Democratic Rollback. *Foreign Affairs*, March/April 2008. 36-48.
- Freedom House. 2008. Freedom in the World 2008. Selected Data from Freedom House's Annual Global Survey of Political Rights and Civil Liberties. Freedom House.
- Gandhi, Jennifer. 2008a. *Political Institutions under Dictatorship*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gandhi, Jennifer. 2008b. Dictatorial Institutions and their Impact on Growth. *European Journal of Sociology* (49). 1-30.
- Gat, Azar. 2007. The Return of Authoritarian Great Powers. *Foreign Affairs*, July/August 2007. 59-69.
- Geddes, Barbara. 1999. What Do We Know About Democratization After Twenty Years? *Annual Review of Political Science* (2). 115-144.
- Greene, Kenneth F. 2007. *Why Dominant Parties Lose: Mexico's Democratization in Comparative Perspective*. Cambridge University Press.

- Hadenius, Axel and Jan Teorell. 2007. Pathways from Authoritarianism. *Journal of Democracy* (18). 143-156.
- Lai, Brian and Dan Slater 2006. Institutions of the Offensive: Domestic Sources of Dispute Initiation in Authoritarian Regimes, 1950–1992. *American Journal of Political Science* 50, 1. 113-126
- Linz, Juan J. 1964. An Authoritarian Regime: The Case of Spain. In: Erik Allardt and Irgo Littunen (eds.). *Cleavages, Ideologies, and Party Systems: Contributions to Comparative Political Sociology*. Transactions of the Westermarck Society. 291-342.
- Linz, Juan J. 1975. Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes. In: Fred I. Greenstein and Nelson W. Polby (eds.) *Handbook of Political Science, Vol. 3*. Johns Hopkins University Press. 175-357.
- Linz, Juan J. 2000. *Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes*. Lynne Rienner.
- Magaloni, Beatriz. 2006. *Voting for Autocracy: Hegemonic Party Survival and Its Demise in Mexico*. Cambridge University Press.
- Magaloni, Beatriz. 2008. Credible Power-Sharing and the Longevity of Authoritarian Rule. *Comparative Political Studies* (41). 715-741.
- Peceny, Mark, Caroline Beer and Shannon Sanchez-Terry. 2002. Dictatorial Peace. *American Political Science Review* (96). 15-26.
- Pepinsky, Thomas. 2007. Durable Authoritarianism as a Self-Enforcing Coalition. Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Political Science Association, 30 August – 2 September 2007. Chicago.
- Przeworski, Adam, Michael E. Alvarez, José Antonio Cheibub and Fernando Limongi. 2000. *Democracy and Development: Political Institutions and Well-Being in the World, 1950-1990*. Cambridge University Press.
- Schedler, Andreas (ed.). 2006. *Electoral Authoritarianism*. Lynne Rienner.
- Slater, Daniel. 2006. The Architecture of Authoritarianism: Southeast Asia and the Regeneration of Democratization Theory. *Taiwan Journal of Democracy* (2). 1-22
- Smith, Benjamin. 2004. Oil Wealth and Regime Survival in the Developing World, 1960-1999. *American Journal of Political Science* (48). 232-246.
- Smith, Benjamin. 2005. Life of the Party. The Origins of Regime Breakdown and Persistence under Single-Party Rule. *World Politics* (57). 421-451.
- Solomon, Jr., Peter H. 2007. Courts and Judges in Authoritarian Regimes. *World Politics* (60). 122-145
- Svolik, Milan. 2007. Power-sharing and Leadership Dynamics in Authoritarian Regimes. Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Political Science Association, 30 August – 2 September 2007. Chicago.
- Ulfelder, Jay. 2007. Natural-Resource Wealth and the Survival of Autocracy. *Comparative Political Studies* (40). 995-1018.
- Wintrobe, Ronald. 2007. Dictatorship: Analytic Approaches. In: Charles Boix and Susan Stokes (eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*. Oxford University Press. 363-394.

### Biographical notes

*Steffen Kailitz*

Current research interests and projects:

- Autocracies in comparative perspective
- Survival and breakdown of democracies 1900 to present.
- (De)consolidation of post-communist democracies
- Mapping hybrid regimes

Recent publications:

- Stand und Perspektiven der Diktaturforschung. HAIT Working Paper 2009.
- (ed.) Schlüsselwerke der Politikwissenschaft. VS Verlag 2007.
- Die nationalsozialistische Ideologie der NPD. In: Uwe Backes/Henrik Steglich (eds.). Die NPD. Erfolgsbedingungen einer rechtsextremistischen Partei. Nomos 2007. 337-354.

Academic affiliation:

Hannah Arendt Institute for Research on Totalitarianism. Senior research fellow.

Academic status:

Ph.D. (1999) and Habilitation (2004) in political science.

*Patrick Koellner*

Current research interests and projects:

- Authoritarian regimes in comparative perspective
- Parties and elections in Japan

Recent publications:

- Japanese Lower House Campaigns in Transition: Manifest Changes or Fleeting Fads?, *Journal of East Asian Studies* 9 (2009). 121-149.
- (co-author) Nordkorea und kein Ende? Zum Wandel innenpolitischer Legitimation und externer Stützung der DVRK, in: Hanns W. Maull/Martin Wagener (eds.), *Ostasien in der Globalisierung*. Nomos 2009. 167-188.
- Autoritäre Regime – Ein Überblick über die jüngere Literatur, *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Politikwissenschaft. Comparative Governance and Politics* 2 (2008). 351-368.
- (co-editor) *Korea Yearbook 2008*. Brill 2008.

Academic affiliation:

GIGA German Institute of Global and Area Studies. Head of research programme 1. Acting director, Institute of Asian Studies.

Academic status:

Ph.D. (1998) and Habilitation (2005) in political science.