

# **„Unlike Twins?! Comparing Democracies and Autocracies. Insights, Developments and Challenges in Comparative Politics“. Tagung der DVPW Sektion Vergleichende Politikwissenschaft vom 15. bis 17. März 2017 in Tübingen**

*Michael Zlotnicki, Christoph Mohamad-Klotzbach<sup>1</sup>*

## **Introduction**

Modern comparative politics main feature is a clear tendency towards pluralism. The co-existence of different theoretical approaches and multifaceted empirical methods applied by different researchers is an indicator of this trend. The differentiation and fragmentation of the discipline – which comes along with problems like conceptual stretching, concept traveling and even parochialism – endangers the leitmotiv of comparative politics: the identification, classification, and comparison of different political systems. Notably, even the disciplines core categories of democracy and autocracy – which are often treated like “unlike twins” – are empirically contested terms. Not long since the clear focus of comparative politics lay on democracies. Even though the discipline has overcome its tendency to eschew the study of authoritarian regimes and is nowadays better equipped to provide a more nuanced picture of autocratic regimes, it is worthwhile to ask: How to compare the “unlike twins” of democracy and autocracy? Is it fruitful to step back to general theories of comparative politics such as David Easton’s “system analysis of political life” or is this backward orientation not advisable, because we buy in a multiplicity of problems such as a lack of explanatory and prognostic power and too abstract analytical levels? Given the necessity of systematic comparisons of democracy and autocracy in times of authoritarian resilience and authoritarian shifts inside and outside the European Union, the conference “Unlike Twins?! Comparing Autocracies and Democracies” pleads for deliberating about foundations, approaches, methods and basic concepts which are necessary for a comparative analysis of democracies and autocracies. During the conference – which was held at the University of Tübingen from 15 to 17th March 2017 – twelve panels addressed various aspects of comparing regime types. The various panels were accompanied by a keynote lecture on “Bridging the Divide: Building and Testing Theories across Regime Types” by Andreas Schedler (CIDE Mexico City) and a Public Panel discussion on “How to deal with autocrats” with practitioners and scientists. The report at hands gives an overview of the events, contributions, and discussions during the conference.

---

<sup>1</sup> Michael Zlotnicki, Universität Duisburg-Essen, Email: M.Zlotnicki@gmx.de  
Christoph Mohamad-Klotzbach, Universität Würzburg, Email: ch.mohamad@uni-wuerzburg.de

Michael Hein (HU Berlin, Spokesperson Section Comparative Politics) and Rolf Frankenberger (University of Tübingen, Local Organizing Team) emphasized in their introduction – the importance and actuality of the systematic comparison of democracy and autocracy. The international conference with over 100 participants should serve as a platform to capture the status of the disciplines. Moreover, the challenges when comparing different political regimes, such as autocracy and democracy, should be assessed by the scholars. Many topics can be described as contemporary politics apart from books.

### **Description of the Panels**

Panel 1, organized by Esther Somfalvy (IFSH Hamburg), contains in-depth coverage of Parliamentary Representation in non-democratic regimes. Despite the fact that multi-party parliaments have become the norm in even non-democratic countries, there is a noticeable research gap concerning the inner workings of parliaments. The scientific input provides inside into different aspects of parliamentary representation in non-democratic regimes: the development of parliamentary representation in different kinds of non-democratic regimes; the role of the legislative transition as the detector of change; the electoral competitiveness and turnout in autocracies, and the effects of regime change on the representation of women.

Daniel Stockemer (University of Ottawa) analyzes the influence of democratic transitions on women's representation in parliament. His theoretical consideration is that political change offers windows of opportunities for active minorities, such as women groups. The empirical picture, however, differs from that theoretical assumptions: Even if women might be strongly involved in individual areas in the process of democratic transitions, they cannot transfer their public agitation into increased representation in positions of political powers in parliament. In conclusion, the research indicates that the presence of women in parliaments tends to decrease than to increase in the first elections after the transition. This result applies to both democracies and autocracies and is the most pronounced for transitions from communism to democracy.

Irene Weipert-Fenner (Peace Research Institute Frankfurt) scientific exploration relates to the the autocratic parliament in Egypt as both an indicator of change as well as its agent. Weipert-Fenner emphasizes that there is a gap in the knowledge on how these institutions operate. Based on her study of Egypt's parliamentary history, the researcher develops a theoretical model with the prevailing idea that these institutions work by the logic to ensure regime stability as they were designed for by the ruling elite. From this perspective, the autocratic parliament needs to be studied as the center of a web of relations. All the elements (constituencies, government, public and head of state) are interconnected, the relations

between these are mutually shaped. On the whole, her approach shows a way to escape the trap of only using democracy as a benchmark for analyzing autocratic regimes. The researcher stresses the importance, why the legislature and parliamentarians matter in a political regime in which power is concentrated in the head of the state and its closest allies and answers that the parliament matters because its members are relevant to the core elite, and thus belong to the circle of the ruling elite.

Esther Somfalvy (IFSH) presents a study of parliamentary representation in Kazakhstan and the Kyrgyz Republic. The comparison of the two non-democratic regimes deals with the question: if different kinds of regimes represent their citizens differently? The two cases share historical and cultural ties and have a similar closed-list proportional electoral system with one single electoral district. On the other hand, the two cases display a difference: Kazakhstan has a party system that is dominated by one well-institutionalized party, whereas Kyrgyzstan has a volatile, fragmented system with a large number of weak institutionalized parties. Somfalvy uses a concept, associated to Pitikins concept of representation (1967), to work out to what degree the “electoral connection” is compromised as a determinant for parliamentary representation. The researcher differentiates between formalistic, descriptive and substantive representation. The analysis of these three forms of representation reveals that distinct forms and practices of representation emerge in different non-democratic settings. The differences between the countries are pronounced and influenced by the dispersion of power or its concentration in the hand of one party. Furthermore, the instruments to engender representation or limitations are specific to the kind of regime, what means that constitutional reforms are ineffective if they are not backed up by sufficient use of resources. Kristin Eichhorn (Technical University Chemnitz) addresses the question, whether the effects of competitiveness on electoral turnout in electoral autocracies are different from the effects in democracies? In addition, she considers the question if these effects are conditioned by the operationalization of competitiveness? A panel regression model that includes data of parliamentary elections in democracies and electoral autocracies between 1975 and 2012 was introduced to test these effects. Electoral turnout in democracies is largely determined by socio-economic, institutional and political factors, whereas research on electoral turnout in nominally democratic elections in autocracies is to great extent unexplored. Eichhorn considers the applicability of the ex-post measure as questionable in autocratic elections due to the uneven playing field and finds robust evidence for the superiority of ex-ante measures of competitiveness not only in autocracies but also in democracies. Basically, increased

competitiveness increases the turnout in democracies, where the effect remains reversed in autocracies.

The contributions of the Panel: “*Same, same but different*”. *Comparing the international promotion of democracy and autocracy*, organized by Julia Leininger (DIE-German Development Institute) and Anna Lührmann (University of Gothenburg), aimed at bridging the gap between the strands of literature on the promotion of democracy and autocracy. For this specific purpose the discussion was focused upon three topics:

1. the comparison of strategies and the implementation of democracy and autocracy promotion as well as the interaction of their effects.
2. identification of civic education and its effects on political attitudes.
3. analysis of the potential of functional cooperation for promoting democracy and/or autocracy.

Christoph H. Stefes and Betsy Jose (both University of Colorado, Denver) present a case study, which acts upon Russia's ideational justifications for its incursion into Ukraine and, specifically, its annexation of Crimea. Their research starts with the premise that it is plausible that powerful autocratic regimes might effectively contest and shape existing international norms as well as introduce new norms. The two researchers track the global discourse among top government officials in Russia and two-dozen other countries and international organizations between the time of President Yanukovich's ouster to Crimea's annexation, using qualitative data analysis (QDA). The preliminary QDA suggests that Russia has pursued a normative agenda in its foreign policy and sends the message that the rules of the game in Russia's „Near Abroad“ are different from international humanitarian intervention norms. Today's autocracies have taken notice of the link between norms and material interests, and they now challenge the normative hegemony of the West. The two researchers believe that this new dimension of autocracy promotion has been neglected by scholars of the international dimensions of autocratic rule so far.

Agnes Cornell (Aarhus University) and Anna Lührmann (University of Gothenburg) illuminates the question of how far the political context of the recipient influences the allocation of democracy aid? Inspired by the lack of studies on the allocation of democracy aid, both researchers use three methods to answer this question: A Large- N regression with 123 developing countries; seven expert interviews with donors, and document analysis of donor statements. The theoretical basis shows that democracy aid is different from other aid and is most likely to be allocated in the middle of the regime spectrum. Political context

matters for the allocation of democracy aid, the expenditures grow, when the interests of donor and recipient coincide. The notable fact is, that very authoritarian regimes still receive democracy aid, what is caused for example by general aid packages that limit the role of political context and furthermore, donors want to keep a foot in the door even in the most repressive contexts.

Pavel Satra (Leuphana University, Lüneburg) presents the question; under what conditions do autocracies prefer to delegate authority in comparison to international human rights organizations? Satra observes a research gap in the explanation of the delegation preferences, vice versa autocracies to monitoring bureaucracies. Obviously, there is a theoretical puzzle because autocracies would not be expected to support these institutions, but in fact, some autocracies support even the highest form of authority delegation. Based on his preliminary research design the researcher examines the relationship of “Monitoring Targeting“ as also “Autocracies' Authority Delegation Preferences“. Satra, argues that if autocracies have managed to impose monitoring missions on their rival states, then autocracies should prefer to delegate authority to monitor bureaucracies. Initial findings suggest that autocracies learned how to advance own international agenda by utilizing international organizations.

Julia Bader (University of Amsterdam) and Christine Hackenesch analyze the Chinese Communist Party's (CCP) relations to political parties in Sub-Saharan Africa. Their theoretical expectations assume, that Chinese economic and foreign policy interests lead to closer contact with African parties. The other influences that lead to the Party Interaction are ideological closeness and historical ties as well as similar organizational structures. The two researchers frame into the period of 2002 to 2015 and utilize a sample with 68 parties in 44 Sub-Saharan countries by binary time-series cross-section observations. The analysis shows that parties with roots in socialist ideology have a 22% higher chance of meeting at least one CCP party delegation per year. The same applies to 20% for socialist parties with historical ties to the CCP and for dominant parties to 22%. This directs to the conclusion that ideology seems to trump political and or material interests and the engagement is strategically focused on dominant ruling parties.

Panel 3 on *Concept Formation and Explorative Methods: What and how can methods contribute to regime classification in comparative politics?* (Chairs: Rolf Frankenberger and Toralf Stark) addressed very different approaches and subjects. The first two papers followed a much more conceptual approach, whereas the second two papers focused more on methodological aspects. Ani Sarkissian (Michigan State University) presented a paper, co-

authored by Karrie Koesel (University of Notre Dame), which discussed the use of the so-called authoritarian toolkit on religious actors, i.e. how the authoritarian elite restrict or regulate religion and religious groups so that they don't become a challenge for the regime. Their findings show that autocrats use both repression and co-optation to manage religious groups, repression being the more common strategy; and that autocrats use different co-optation types, where formal strategies (legal and institutional co-optation) decreased repression and informal strategies (patronage, rent-sharing) increases it. Seraphine F. Maerz (CEU Budapest) used fuzzy-set QCA as a new strategy to classify authoritarian regimes. Therefore, she looked at the varying conditions of persisting authoritarian regimes and presented a new theoretical framework - the hexagon of authoritarian persistence - which enables her to find five types of authoritarian regimes: hegemonic, performance dependent, rigid, kleptocratic and adaptive authoritarian regimes. Shifting from (more) qualitative to quantitative research designs. Oliver Schlenkrich and Christoph Mohamad-Klotzbach (both University of Würzburg) focused on the cross-cultural measurement of trust in the state, and results show that degrees of democratic-ness and corruption can explain a certain amount of this global no invariance of trust in the state. The last presentation by Sebastian Ziaja (Heidelberg University), presented a co-authored paper by Martin Elff (ZU Friedrichshafen) on method factors in democracy indicators. Using Confirmatory Factor Analysis, they looked at the dimensionality of democracy by projecting sub-indicators of democracy of different data sets (Polity, Freedom House, V-Dem) on several theoretical specified latent dimensions of democracy. First findings suggest that there might be a method bias in the V-Dem data compared to the other two sources.

Panel 4, organized by Patrick Köllner (GIGA Hamburg) and Andreas Mehler (Arnold Bergsträsser Institute and University of Freiburg), bridges Comparative Politics and Area Studies. Selected contributors have the claim to present Comparative Area Studies (CAS) as a distinct analytical approach connecting deep area knowledge with comparative perspectives. Patrick Köllner, Ariel Ahram (Virginia Tech) and Rudra Sil (University of Pennsylvania) opened the panel with an overview on contours and critiques levelled at area studies: 1. Emerge and contributions of CAS, 2. conceptual methodological challenges of the cross-regional comparison component and possible future avenues for CAS. The term "CAS" itself is not new, but there has not been yet systematic effort to define the term or to develop it into research strategy. Köllner argues that many scholars in different countries have apparently been speaking the CAS language without even knowing it, caused by the understanding of the

two efforts as different kinds of research strategies or knowledge claims. The researchers underline that CAS is flexible when it comes to methodology, seeking to leverage both the value of area-specific scholarly discourse and the logic of the comparative method as applied to more than one locale, county or region. The researchers consider that CAS contributes to a rejuvenated and re-configured area studies enterprise in conjunction to other possible approaches. One way of demonstrating the relevance of important concepts, theories and interpretations might soon highlight parallels and collisions between scholarly discourses and encourage the summary of insights.

Christian von Soest (GIGA, Hamburg) and Alexander Stroh (University of Bayreuth) touch on the assets and pitfalls when comparing across world regions. Their aim is to show a possible way to overcome the so-called ‘restricted horizon problem’, when comparing cross-regionally. The two researches advocate to deliberately cross conventional world regions and areas to solve this problem. Cross-regional CAS is considered in this paper as comparative analysis with area sensitivity. In the following, distinct advantages of Cross-Area Cooperation are emphasized-such as: 1. Overcoming the over-regionalization of social science. 2. testing explanatory power of concepts for other world regions and providing new insights about the relevance of geographical regions and functional areas. However, methodological challenges remain for future research, but CAS appears to be particularly suitable for answering research questions that do not lend themselves to the data optimization in large cross-sectional quantitative analyses, as well as for those that seek more general insights than traditional area studies.

André Banks’ (GIGA Hamburg) contribution monitors the impact of the Arab Uprisings that politically transformed the Middle East (ME), as also the study of Comparative Politics and authoritarianism of the region. Banks, points out that interesting cross-regional comparisons have emerged in recent years, while intra-regional comparisons remain mainstay. Simultaneously Bank underlines, overlooking the momentary development in science, that “truly” inter-regional comparisons are very rare – even if these have provided crucial insights into the Arab uprisings and its aftermath. Finally, Banks stresses the importance of CAS as an organizing rubric to turn cross-regional comparison into an established and recognized mode of research. Therefore, careful case selection and definition of scope conditions must also be considered, in alignment to the work of research teams with different and deep area expertise, where it is important, to avoid studies becoming ‘flat’ and to also avoid the risk of overly simplifying complex contextual conditions.

Sophia Schubert (FU Berlin) and Alexander Weiß (HSU Hamburg) present a plea for “global-transcultural” democracy research that bridges political theory, comparative politics and area studies. The research aim of this scientific work is to establish a new, integrated field of research, based on democracy- conceptualization beyond the West, and to develop a new, “global-transcultural” approach to democracy research. To achieve this, the two researchers propose to use the term: ‘Western’ as a heuristic and abstract working definition of “democracy” as “self-government by free and equal humans”. This concept could contribute to overcome the attested crisis of Western democratic theory by reformulating democracy against the background of non-Western concepts of democracy. The intended global-transcultural concept of democracy, might be a central element of a future global democratic theory, which is not based on idealizations of the Western context or positivist theoretical constructions by the scholars, but rather on global experiences.

The fifth Panel of the Conference was chaired by Mirjam Edel and Rolf Frankenberger (both University of Tübingen), while Kressen Thyen (also Tübingen) served as a discussant. Michael Hein (Humboldt University, Berlin) looked at the codification of constitutional entrenchment clauses in contemporary constitutions. After presenting a typology of entrenchment clauses he then tried to find out, if the character of political regimes (democratic vs autocratic) and regime changes have an influence on the codification variance of entrenchment clauses in contemporary constitutions. Based on a new dataset on constitutional entrenchment clauses, Hein could identify, within the period of 1975 to 2015 that both the character of political regimes and political transformations have almost no considerable influence on the decision for or against entrenchment clauses. The second paper was presented by Jörn Knobloch (University of Potsdam), who looked at the practical foundations of authoritarian regimes and the impact of law. Thereby he tried to understand the absence of the rule of law and reasons for the manipulation of law. His main argument lies in the assumption, that the rule of law can be understood as an expression of a local limited political practice. David Andersen and Agnes Cornell (both Aarhus University) presented a paper on the relationship of political regimes and bureaucratic quality. With data based upon the V-Dem project they tried to test the contested hypothesis that the degree of bureaucratic quality is higher in democracies than in autocracies. Their preliminary findings show that both instance and degree of free and fair elections are related to higher levels of bureaucratic quality and that there is no u-shaped relationship between both variables. Finally, Mirjam Edel, contributed with findings on how and why repression is juristically implemented into



authoritarian regimes. She presented a thoughtful conceptualization on juridical repression in which she distinguished between juridical vs extra-juridical repression on the one hand and between constraining vs incapacitating repression on the other hand.

Panel 6, organized by Gert Pickel (University of Leipzig) and Oliver Hidalgo (University of Münster), asks whether religion makes political systems autocratic. At the heart of these debates is the compatibility of religion and democracy. The theoretical and empirical contributions of the panel shed light on these issues and asks, in how far religion is a source for processes of democratization and the maintenance of democracies. Vice versa it is debatable if religion can endanger democracies and contributes to authoritarian downward trends.

Oliver Hidalgo opened the discussions of the panel with an overview of theoretical positions concerning the relationship of religion and democracy. Hidalgo points out that the history and development of democracy in Western Europe was mainly accompanied by theoretical positions (for example Hobbes, Spinoza and Diderot), which claim that there is an obvious antithesis between religious truth and democratic politics. There might be positive contributions of religion as well. Putnam for example argues that religion can be a source of social capital, which has the potential to foster the maintenance of democracy. Religion develops illiberal tendencies, when religious groups and authorities seek for a hegemonic role of religion in society. Evidently, democracies need an arrangement between religious and secular groups. Stephan's twin toleration thesis posits that religious groups are forced to accept the authority of elected officials. On the other hand, state authorities are obliged to guarantee private worship and the democratic participation of religious groups in civil society. Additionally, democracies demand a common collective identity beyond all religious affiliations.

Christoph Trinns and Thomas Wencker (both University of Heidelberg) look upon the highly timely topic of religious violence. They argue that there is a lack of a good conceptualization of religious conflict and knowledge about the risk factors underlying the occurrence of religious violence. Based on the Heidelberg approach (which pleads for a multidimensional assessment of conflict intensities) the two researchers distinguish between five intensity levels of conflict: non-violent dispute, non-violent crisis, violent crisis, limited war and war. Their empirical investigation of the Disaggregated Conflict Dataset (DISCON) which has its focus on states in Asia and Oceania shows that 32 out of 122 intrastate conflicts had religious connotations. The empirical patterns display that conflicts with religious topoi are more prone

to highly violent escalations. The question arises, which risk factors contribute to the occurrence of religious conflict? For this aim the two researchers use the predictive model by Rustad et al. (2011) which comprises six subnational risk indicators (the population size, socio-economic status, ethno-political exclusion, the conflict history, neighboring conflicts as well as geographic location). The optimum level of performance attainable with this predictive model when applied to religious conflicts is at a Matthews correlation coefficient of 0.63. The two researchers underline that even a refined risk assessment is not able to offer an exact prediction of conflicts, because the occurrence of violence seems to be governed by complex societal dynamics.

Marlene Mauk (University of Mainz) expounds the problems of macro-level findings, which investigates the relationship of religion and democracy. Today the “common knowledge” is that religions can differ in their affinity (for example Protestantism) or aversions (for example Islam) towards democracy and that highly religious societies may be an obstacle for the chances of democratization. These findings provide no resourceful evidence: Are followers of certain religious traditions and religious people less supportive of democratic values? Such a perspective is based on the assumptions that religions are the bearer of societal values and that individuals internalize these values, which can have a pro- or anti-democratic effect. Based on global and different regional surveys and using multi-level-analysis technique Mauk shows that the political values of adherents of Protestantism do not differ significantly from other religious traditions. On the other hand, Muslims are less supportive of certain democratic values, notably when they are less religious. Taking everything into account Mauk pledges to rethink the “common knowledge”, because religiosity and denominational identities show only modest effects on democratic values.

Cemal Öztürk and Toralf Stark (University of Duisburg-Essen) present a case study of Turkey. Turkey was long hailed as “role model for the Muslim world” and was seen a “most likely case” for the compatibility of Islam and democracy. Given the latest authoritarian tendencies under the conservative ruling party AKP the two researchers discuss, whether religious individuals can be considered as “genuine democrats”? In the tradition of classical political culture research genuine democratic orientations include cognitive, affective and evaluative orientations towards democracy as a general system. Religiosity, on the other hand, comprises values, beliefs, participation, knowledge and a dimension of religious consequences. Based on the latest World Values Survey conducted in Turkey and applying logistic regression analysis the two researchers show that the dimension of religious consequences – which captures a dogmatic form of religiosity – is at odds with genuine

democratic orientations. Thus, a dogmatized form of Islamic religiosity, which displays a characteristic of AKP voters, can be considered as a source of recent authoritarian downward trends in Turkey.

Jörg Baudners' (University of Osnabrück) contribution "From religious to populist party (and back)? Why the making of 'Muslim Democrats' in Turkey failed" deals with Turkey's regression of democracy as well. Turkey's decline of democracy under the auspices of a religious party was not inevitable. On the contrary, during the first years in power the agenda of the AKP was quite comparable to Western European Christian democrats. The question then is: Why did the AKP abandon its former democratic credentials? Baudner argues that the reasons behind the AKPs authoritarian turn are multi-causal and can hardly be attributed to religious ideology. Above all the open rejection of its bid for EU membership, attacks from the Kemalist state elites and internal party dynamics (such as a lack of party democracy and an increasing leader-orientation within the party) contributed to Turkey's authoritarian transformation.

Fabian Poetke (Ludwig-Maximilian University of Munich) deals with the question, in how far the state can contribute to a commitment of liberal democracy among religious actors. Under the assumption that the religious elites' hostility towards democracy may jeopardize a democratization process, Poetke analyzes interactions between religious elites and political authorities in Western Germany between 1945 and 1965 in the context of educational policies. Potential reservations of religious elites towards democracy based on theological reasons can be overcome by practical and positive experience vis a vis politician and the legal system. A religion-friendly form of governance provides a fertile condition for the political integration of religious communities into an emerging democracy.

Panel 7, organized by Thomas Richter and Christian von Soest (both GIGA Hamburg), is a double Panel that compares the patterns of resource management in democracies and autocracies. The debates focus on state spending, revenue and taxation in both political systems. Under the assumption that the recent comparative literature does not provide adequate answers to the research gaps, the papers presented in the panel address one or more aspects of these topics.

Christian von Haldenwang (DIE- German Development Institute, Bonn) opened the panel with a contribution that investigates the impact of regime durability on public revenue collection subject of discussion. The researcher provides evidence that full autocracies and full democracies fare better in tax collection than 'hybrid' or 'anocratic' regimes do. Is the

relationship of political durability and taxation robust, controlling for alternative factors and are there patterns that would enable us to say something about the time dimension of such a relationship? Von Haldenwang uses a dataset with 144 countries between 1990 and 2008 and a panel regression shows that regime durability has a positive effect on taxation, but this effect is driven above all by autocratic regimes. Consequentially, the story of tax collection is closely linked to regime durability in autocracies, whereby durability seems to be less relevant for tax collection in democracies, where other factors like governance, public service delivery and distribution play a decisive role.

Ane Karoline Bak Foged (Aarhus University) presents a theoretical framework that deals with the mechanisms of taxation and accountability in the context of developing countries. Foged, notes that there is a theoretical gap when it comes to describing the specific mechanisms through which taxation can lead to accountability, although the literature has seen vast amounts of evidence for expansions in accountability through taxation in developing countries. The scientific work of Prichard (2015) is taken as a reference point, but the causal mechanisms presented by him remain sketchy. Foged's framework unfolds the possible actions of the two main actors in the bargaining situation, the citizens and the state, as well as the arenas in which accountability processes take place. By focusing on the mechanisms, the framework enables the examination of state-society interactions that are themselves manifestations of accountability between state and citizens.

The contribution of Anne Mette Kjaer and Marianne Ulriksen (both Aarhus University) starts with the observation that revenue composition has changed in many African low-income countries. Motivated by the lack of micro-foundations in the literature and the scrutiny of changing policies priorities, the researchers ask how revenue bargaining processes evolve, who their stakeholders are, and what can be said about the outcomes? In addition, the question arises how revenue providers do affect governments' policy priorities? The development of a framework serves to capture of micro-foundation in bargains and a political settlement (PS) approach is used at this point in addition to fiscal contract theory to response to these questions. PS approach adds for example an interest group perspective to the rather broad and macro-oriented fiscal contract theories. Policy interests seem to derive mainly from position in economy. Next step for the researchers will be a series of in depth qualitative case studies of instances of bargaining. The developed framework will help to examine the dynamics and policy outcomes of bargaining processes.

Thomas Richter's (GIGA, Hamburg) paper asks whether and how taxation and the distribution of state resources impacts institutional change? Richter formulates three

preliminary hypotheses, which he wants to prove with the help of a dataset on their correctness. A novel data compilation providing state budget data for 161 countries between 1946 and 2006 (GSRE 1.0 dataset) forms the fundament for new data on state revenues and spending in this period. A first analysis shows that state hydrocarbon rents' general influence upon institutional change seems to be less relevant than continuously assumed by existing literature. Further findings suggest that regimes which spend more do not need to expand participatory rules and even shrink existing participatory space, while declining state spending leads to a higher likelihood of widening participatory institutions. A widely held conviction that rising taxation might be associated with a similar rise of institutional accountability cannot be confirmed.

The second session of the panel begins with a paper, where Rachel Beach (Aarhus University) explores the political efficiency dimension in the hunt for revenues in a poor state. Beach introduces a revenue efficiency model to frame how revenue actors perceive potential sources of revenue and assess these for a possible 'politically efficient' mobilization. The researcher defines as a revenue actor any state official that is involved in the revenue system and argues that these revenue actors must make strategic choices about the most politically and administratively efficient types of revenue due to limited resources. Beach identifies in the political efficiency dimension factors that could render a revenue source politically inefficient, for example, weak state capacity; weak legitimacy and high degrees of decentralization; revenue competition and a specific type of corruption that supports the political order.

Christian von Haldenwang's (DIE-German Development Institute, Bonn) second contribution deals with the question whether the political resource course affects public finance? The researcher uses data from 178 countries, covering the period from 1980 to 2010 from the ICTD Government Revenue data set to evaluate the assorted characteristics of vulnerability, volatility and the influence of external shocks on tax revenue in resource rich countries. The data analysis shows that revenues in these countries are more volatile and that they face more volatile terms of trade shocks. Revenue collection seems to be far more affected by regime type in richer countries than in low-and lower-middle-income countries, which means that there is limited evidence pointing to a "political resource" that affects public finance.

Solveig Richter (University of Erfurt) introduces the concept of "state capture", which shall help to systematically explore hybrid regimes with limited political competition. Richter summarizes core attributes of state capture to define the term as "a form of governance in which informal networks hijack formal institutions to influence the political decision-making

process to their own private advantage”. The researcher underlines that the paper enables to analyze, through a theory-driven concept, high-level political corruption, because it focuses on three points: First, elected and nominated politicians and their own benefits and early stages of decision-making are at the center of the framework. Second, it investigates horizontal networks instead of the more hierarchical form of governance in corrupt states. Third, it enables researchers to identify reasons for high level of stability in captured states with simultaneous very low legitimacy of state institutions.

The Panel on *Disentangling the State-Regime Nexus* was chaired by Thomas Altmppen and Mirjam Edel and continued discussions on this issue which started in June 2016 during a workshop and which had been published in the APSA Comparative Democratization Newsletter in February 2017 on “New Perspectives on the Relationship Between States and Regimes”. The panel included six paper presentations with associated discussants: André Bank (GIGA Hamburg) and Dan Slater (University of Chicago). Steven L. Wilson and Rachel Sigman (both V-Dem fellows) used a dependency & sequencing analysis to understand what kind of types of state capacity are needed to develop a polyarchy. To support their findings, both sourced data from the V-Dem Project and the Hanson/Sigman State Capacity Dataset aligned to the period 1960 to 2010. Dan Slater explored the contribution and the degree in how war can contribute to state- and regime-building by focusing on Asian examples, such as Vietnam, Malaysia, Burma, and Indonesia. Julia Leininger (DIE Bonn) looked at the role of religious actors in the transition processes after 1989, especially on determinants of their influence in these processes. David Andersen (Aarhus University) directed his attention in presenting the relationship of administrative capacity and democratic stability and introduced the concept of bureaucratic responsiveness as a third dimension next to meritocracy and territorial penetration. Alexander Schmotz (Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin) engaged with first thoughts and discussed the different revolutionary failings. He identified three possible outcomes: 1. regime resilience, 2. state failure, 3. armed conflict. He further discussed some possible causes of these different revolutionary failures. The last presentation was by Matilde Thorsen (Aarhus University), who introduced a paper on the relationship of democracy and state capacity, which she had written with her Aarhus-colleagues Alexander T. Grundhold and David Ulrichsen. In their paper, the three scholars posed the hypothesis, that democracy and state capacity are not substitutes but complements for the process of human development. Their findings evaluated that at higher levels of administrative capacity, democracy seems increasingly to enhance human development. Both the discussants engaged in critical and

helpful feedback towards all the presentations which lastly provided an apparent conclusion to their studies and with the result: Unfulfilling and lack of precision concerning what is really meant by the concepts of the state and the regime in the different papers, which makes it key to future research that the conceptual gap be discussed in deeper detail.

Panel 9, organized by Daniel Buhr and Markus Trämer (both University of Tübingen), compares different welfare state solutions and worlds of capitalism in democracies and autocracies. With their contributions the panel explore: production, welfare and regime type in a comparative perspective where all points up till now lack sufficient theoretical framework.

The first paper, presented by Markus Trämer, implements questions to what degree institutional complementarities underpin authoritarian economies and welfare systems in China, Vietnam and Laos? The combination of welfare state research and varieties of capitalism enables researchers to analyze the interplay between the production and distribution systems of societies. A relatively broad definition of institutions from the Sociological Institutionalists' variant of Neo-Institutionalism combined with North's dimension of the degree of formalism of institutions is used to identify informal institutions. Trämer argues, that state intervention and the way the party-states are intertwined with the economy lead to the conclusion that all three countries can be considered bureaucratic market economies. The institutional complementarities between the production system and the welfare state are, inter alia, weak trade unions that cannot press strong labor movement for a strong welfare state, but then again allow fluid labor markets, where human capital can be relocated.

Aline Grünewald (University of Bremen) analyzes the historical roots of old age pension systems regarding to a political regime perspective. Based on the researchers own PENLEG project, which entails data on the historical roots of old age pension schemes for all democratic and nondemocratic countries around the world, the paper focuses on the political motivations to implement old age pension schemes, with attention to the chosen policy design. The empirical findings reveal that the implementation of these schemes is equally important for both regime types. Democratic countries show much variety regarding their old age pension schemes, while more than 80 % of the nondemocratic leaders opted for a social insurance system. Grünewald emphasizes the relevance of this finding and considers that analyzing social policy designs will help to understand welfare politics of nondemocratic leaders for which they reflect different political motivations.

Daniel Buhr (University of Tübingen) presents a preliminary concept of clustering welfare and production regime. Starting point is the assumption that production regime and welfare regime have two sides of a coin due to the similarity in the term of coexistence of the logics of economic profit and human welfare. The researcher stresses the lack of systematic discussion of integrating research on welfare states and comparative capitalism and shows the need of using methodological pluralism for empirical research. The strategies of integrating theories and concepts are: search types on correspondence; to cover all dimensions of both concepts and to integrate linkage of gender and education. The clustering consists of a classification of different reproduction regime types, assigned in democratic and non-democratic. The aim in further research will be: getting more data, combining quantitative and qualitative research as well as mechanisms, phenotypes and the historical perspective.

The Double-Panel on Challenging the Churchill-Hypothesis: Policy-Performance in Democracies and Autocracies in Comparison (Chair: Stefan Wurster) discussed seven papers. In the first section, Henriette Müller (New York University, Abu Dhabi) looked at the impact of political leadership on economic growth across different regime types. Her approach introduced the threefold classification of regime types (strongly leader-centered democracies, strong single-party autocracies, dynastic monarchic autocracies) and argued on a theoretical base: that patterns of performance of democratic and nondemocratic leaders tend to converge in the realm of economic policy. Tobias Rommel (University of Zurich) asked why and to what extent do autocratic regimes liberalize foreign direct investment. He remarks, that as a side effect of foreign investment, civil societies can strengthen and help to establish new companies with (highly) skilled work force. The middle-class preference more economic liberalization, whereas autocratic regimes are less interested in developing more liberalization, with the concern this could endanger their power. The empirical findings suggest, that a strong civil society leads to fewer entry restrictions on foreign investment and strengthens the actual openness of the regime. Marlene Jugl (Hertie School of Governance, Berlin) looked at the relationship between actual country size and political regime type - especially with the comparison between democratic and monarchic regimes. In general, small countries are more stable and maintain their regime type for a longer time and may abide longer to their regime institutions, but also can be more open and capable of testing new institutions than larger countries. How has the internet diffused in different regime types? This was a question posed by Sebastian Stier (GESIS Köln) and viewed, that since 2012 there was no significant democracy advantage of internet diffusion, that autocracies adopt



politically sensitive technologies slower and in modified form, and that monarchies even outperform democracies.

The second section started with a presentation by Sebastian Ziaja (Heidelberg University), who provok's with a very straightforward question: How much does a variable explain? In order to provide the answer, he looks at the impact of GDP on civil war onset (dependent variable) as a baseline model and then adds different regime type variables (e.g. Geddes et al.; V-Dem) to predict the outcome variable. His findings suggest that regime typologies are better predictors than regime indexes. Romy Escher and Melanie Walter-Rogg (both Regensburg University) looked at the relationship between regime type and environmental performance. They asked what aspects of democracy are deciding for climate change mitigation performance and showed in their empirical analysis, that the use of disaggregated measures of democracy should be included in an empirical analysis because not all dimensions of democracy had an impact on the outcome. In the last presentation of the panel, Aron Buzogány (BOKU Vienna) compared clean energy transitions across different political regimes. His findings showed that the share of non-hydro renewable energy can be explained especially by state capacity and less by regime type.

The subject of discussion of panel 11, organized by Maria Josua (GIGA, Hamburg), is the justification of exclusion and repression in different regime contexts. Political actors in democratic and authoritarian regimes hence attempt to legitimize their course of action against domestic audiences and the international community. Attention will be paid, inter alia, to the theoretical relation between repression and legitimation as strategies of regime survival and to the mobilized narratives, which defend repression and exclusion.

Aurel Croissant, David Kuehn and Tanja Eschenauer (all three of University Heidelberg) present a paper that monitors military behavior in anti-incumbent mass protests. The so-called 'Dictator's endgame' is characterized by apolitical crisis in autocratic regime and a predominantly non-violent mass mobilization. In this situation, the dictator's political survival is dependent on military support. The researchers ask first when the military does defend the dictator and when it defects from the regime coalition? The question that builds on this is how different forms of defection can be explained? A model with systematic incorporation of explanatory variables is used to show the three different outcomes in the Dictator's endgame, namely repression, loyalty shift and coup. These theoretical considerations allow the study of the interactions between explanatory factors that current research evaluates as decisive.

Jonas Wolff (PRIF-Peace Research Institute Frankfurt) deals with the question, if the regime type does matter in the justification of civic space restrictions? Wolff's observation provides a strong increase of governments that have introduced or tightened restrictions on civil society organizations (CSOs). Comparative studies have rejected the assumption of some researchers that restrictions are only a problem of authoritarian governments and show that democracies are equally affected. The analysis of the preliminary paper suggests that the justifications of civic space restrictions offered by governments are not significantly different across varying regime types, but it can be assumed that the political practice of restricting civic does vary. Wolff argues that there is a broad consensus among different minded governments on the need of regulating CSOs in ways that are perceived as restrictive.

Holger Zapf (University of Göttingen) presents a case study on Tunisia. The subject of investigation is a qualitative discourse analysis of three speeches of members of the government that were used to legitimate the government and demobilize contenders as mass protests occurred in 1984, 2011 and 2016. To find an answer to the question, whether discursive strategies of demobilization and complementary regime legitimation in times of crisis differ across time and across political system, Zapf investigates the argumentative structure, framing (of political actors and events), topics and media coverage. The comparison of the three different instances of demobilization and government legitimation shows that these have much in common. All speeches show different strategies of blame shifting to legitimize the government. The patterns of delegitimizing protest also show similarities, since protesters with legitimate concerns are exploited by enemies of Tunisia and are designated as those who try to harm stability and security and to topple the government.

The paper of Ani Sarkissian (Michigan State University) is an examination of state-level offices devoted to religion that help governments to manage opposition and retain political power. The so-called bureaus of religion have three functions: Registration of their members; ensuring revenue and property and dissemination of theology as well as religious practice. How can these bureaus help governments to retain political power? Sarkissian argues, that state bureaus of religion use their powers of registration and other functions to define religion and to control religious groups. These activities and oversight mechanisms are justified by making a reference to "normal" religion, which is state defined and uniform with the aims of its leaders. All types of regimes have in common that they rely on a concept of "normal" religion and similar ways to justify restrictions on religion.

Two dimensions of authoritarian rule that remains understudied – namely how external factors can contribute to authoritarianism and its resilience and the interplay of statehood, identity formation and authoritarian politics in authoritarian setting – were the focal point of Panel 12, which was organized as double panel. Both sessions had been chaired by Andreas Schedler (CIDE, Mexico City). In the first session which deals with the international aspect of authoritarianism the three contributions were discussed by Rolf Frankenberg (University of Tübingen).

Marianne Kneuer (University of Hildesheim), Thomas Demmelhuber (University of Erlangen-Nürnberg), Natalia Afansyeva, Raphael Peresson (both University of Hildesheim) and Tobias Zumbärgel (University of Erlangen-Nürnberg) starting point is the observation that there is a strong tendency towards autocratization in today's world, because non-democratic regimes seek for cooperation and legitimation in their immediate neighborhood. Obviously regional organizations play a role for the phenomenon of authoritarian clustering in some parts of the world. Based on a cross-regional comparison of Saudi Arabia, Venezuela, and Kazakhstan and an examination of their actions in regional organizations (such as the Gulf Cooperation Council, the Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America and the Shanghai Cooperation Organization) the authors develop the theoretical concept of authoritarian gravity centers. Their case studies show that authoritarian gravity centers are using regional organizations for active autocracy promotion and authoritarian diffusion with the goal of strengthening their political stability and to gain a foothold in their “near abroad”. André Bank (GIGA Hamburg) contributed to the panel with a stocktaking of research activities in the field of authoritarian learning and transnational diffusion. The “Arab Spring” generated a new interest in authoritarian regime learning and diffusion processes because these events highlighted that authoritarian regimes making use of counter-revolutionary strategies draw lessons about political tactics from abroad. Even though the importance of authoritarian learning is generally acknowledged, there are certain limits to knowledge accumulation, because in many contributions the dependent variable remains unspecified, alternative explanations are not systematically tested and there exists a wide range of conceptualizations. Bank pleads that future research on regime learning should tackle these challenges by making use of a broader theoretical framework and by paying more attention on the diversity of data and its reliability.

Steven Heydemann (Smith College) points out that authoritarian regimes in the MENA region have entered a new stage to stabilize authoritarian rule. This change has manifested into a systematic shift in strategies of governance since the uprisings of the “Arab Spring”. The

MENA regimes are on their ways to institutionalize contingent conceptions of citizenship and try to redefine the state-society relations. In this new phase access to the rights and benefits of citizenship is explicitly linked to compliance towards authoritarian regimes. Three changes contributed to this governance shift: First, the Arab uprisings highlighted that attempts of “performing democracy” to bypass the pressure of democracy promotion was not capable of insulating the regimes from social pressure from below. Second, the globalization of counter-terrorism serves as symbolic-discursive resource that regimes can exploit to justify exclusionary practices in the name of national security. Third, the decline of support for democracy promotion in the West lowered the costs of repressive strategies of governance as means of coping with mobilized and alienated citizens.

The contributions of the second session with its focus on more endogenous processes, namely the Identity-State-Regime nexus, were discussed by Thomas Demmelhuber. Morten Valbjorn (Aarhus University) presents preliminary thoughts about sectarianism and asks what – if anything – is so sectarian about sectarian politics when it comes to authoritarianism in a ‘new sectarian Middle East’. The nexus of authoritarianism and identity politics enjoys anew attention since the Arab uprisings in 2011. Scholars have shown that authoritarian regimes can play the sectarian card in multiple ways. A blind spot of this research is the question whether sectarianism like the Shia/Sunni schism enjoys idiosyncratic qualities in comparison to other forms of identity politics. To tackle this issue Valbjorn plans to conduct a comparative study of different forms of identity politics in the wake of the Arab uprisings. Egypt, Jordan Bahrain and Saudi-Arabia are examples of authoritarian regimes using identity politics as a ruling strategy. These cases however differ concerning their identity cleavage, the magnitude of protests and in the ways the regimes responded to the uprisings. The fact that violence and exclusion was equally strong in Egypt and Bahrain – while only Bahrain is characterized by the Shia/Sunni schism – suggests that sectarianism is not per se associated with greater violence.

Ahmed Maati (University of Tübingen) argues that research on authoritarianism in the Arab world often lacks identity politics or uses this concept in a conceptually confused way, even though it has remarkable effects on authoritarian resilience, state collapse and mass societal upheaval. Identity itself is an elusive concept. Nevertheless, it is fruitful to distinguish between personal identity (ascriptive features of an individuum), societal identity (constructed boundaries between the collective included and the outside other) and state identity (the

identity the state represents symbolically). Disagreements regarding societal and state identity has the potential to weaken the statehood in the MENA-region and has negative effects on actor's willingness to resort to democracy. These rather theoretical considerations are part of a larger projects, which attempts to uncover the reasons behind identity dissensions and the role of different political and identity groups in such constellations.

Oliver Schlumberger's (University of Tübingen) contribution brings into focus a rather overlooked phenomenon in the research of authoritarianism in the MENA-region, namely several cases of breakdown of political order respectively "state failure" in the aftermath of the Arab uprisings of 2011. The breakdown of political order can be traced back to internal and external processes. Internally, the failure of several Arab states, is a product of the state-regime interplay (multiple structural failures in the economic realm, uninspired regime reactions to these challenges and the rise of exclusivist identarian politics). Externally, these challenges are accompanied by the death of the old regional order, which expresses itself in a rise of external interventions and violent cleavages among a wider range of different states and/or non-state actors. These observations, provokes Schlumberger to modestly correct the literature on authoritarian learning: Breakdowns of autocratic regimes in the MENA-region are more likely to result not in new democratic or autocratic regimes, but in state collapse respectively state fragility, especially if the prior sub-type of authoritarianism has been patrimonial. Neopatrimonialism leads in the long to an amalgamation of the regime and the state, until congruence is reached. In case of regime breakdown this feature of neopatrimonialism leaves little of a state left, which is a precondition of a new political order.

### **Keynote by Andreas Schedler & Public Panel**

The keynote on Wednesday evening was held by Andreas Schedler (CIDE, Mexiko City), who outlined several points for building theoretical bridges between democracies and autocracies. Schedler states on the one hand, that both regime types are no twins, because they base on contrasting principles. On the other hand, because both types of political regimes are inhabited by human beings, there should be one theory to explain how humans act on the micro level. Intense debates on quality of democracies have showed that there are similarities between autocracy and democracy- despite differences on the aggregate level. The development of a unified theory faces theoretical and methodological difficulties, although an essentially comparison is possible. The empirical research on authoritarian regimes faces big obstacles, caused by the lack of reliable data. Field research offers no solution to this problem, because it can be – to put the matter at its lowest – dangerous for the involved

people. Many scholars bypass these problems by keeping distance through desk research and in an engagement in rather superficial statistical analysis. Schedler advocates for more reflection, on security, ethics, methodology field work and collaboration with people within autocracies and that researchers only claim facts upon legitimate sound knowledge.

The public panel discussion on Thursday evening started with a quick introduction by Oliver Schlumberger in which he reflected the increase of right-wing populist and extremist movements in (even long-standing) democracies and the latest global trends of autocratization (e. g. Turkey, Hungary and Poland). The moderator Raphael Rauch discussed with Alice Thomas (ODHIR- OSCE); Steve Heydemann (Smith College/ United States Institute of Peace); Steffen Kailitz (Hannah Arendt Institute for totalitarianism research), and Andreas Schedler (CIDE, Mexico City) about these developments and asked them how they evaluate this situation in their countries and their main working areas. This poses the fundamental question – how to deal with autocrats – lead to a discourse among the panelists about norms, values and potential outcomes underlying the afore mentioned processes. One assumption, with which every panelist agreed, is the necessity to stay engaged in the communication with authoritarian regimes to defend democratic values. In the same time, the panelists acknowledged that communication with autocrats is a big challenge, because nowadays “enemies of democracy” do not agitate openly against “democracy”. Quite to the contrary they exploit the term of democracy to legitimize their authoritarian claim to power.

### **Final Remarks**

This conference was very inspiring and brought together a variety of national and international scholars who worked on those various topics presented in the Panel descriptions above. We can see that on the one hand, more and more scholars use a variety of interesting methods, and on the other hand, we find also a lot of conceptual work in the different research areas. Since Schedler argued that CP scholars should do again more research in countries and feel the political reality in different world regions instead of just using lots of aggregated data and construct maybe a different political reality, we can claim that the conference showed us both approaches. We need context experts, who understand countries and regions, to interpret the aggregated macro und micro data often used in a lot of comparative studies.

By looking at the topic of the conference, we can see that is very fruitful to compare both autocracies and democracies at the same time to see differences and similarities. Furthermore, it leads us to develop new questions that help to understand the political realities in those

different regime types. Not all the questions from the Panels could be answered, and many new questions additionally surfaced. This provides a highly interesting task for scholars in CP to answer these particular questions in the future.