



Asociación Española
de Ciencia Política y de
la Administración

XVII CONGRESO ESPAÑOL DE
CIENCIA POLÍTICA
Y DE LA ADMINISTRACIÓN

LA DEMOCRACIA ANTE LOS DESAFÍOS
MULTINIVEL

22-24 DE JULIO DE 2024
UNIVERSIDAD DE BURGOS

Autocratización y resiliencia del autoritarismo en el mundo árabe: anclajes sociales e institucionales

Francisco Javier Robles Sánchez

javierrobles@correo.ugr.es



ugr

Universidad
de Granada

Planteamiento: problematización

- Problematización
 - Tendencia a la autocratización a nivel mundial
 - Tendencia a su investigación a través de los estudios de caso en lugar de los estudios globales o de área
 - A su vez vacío de investigación en la región que conocemos como MENA
 - Además, tendencia a no plantear la autocratización como un proceso propio sino como continuo en una línea de regímenes que va desde la democratización hasta la autocratización
- En su lugar se propone el estudio de la autocratización como un proceso para así estudiar la multidimensionalidad de factores que dan lugar a ella y en un área regional concreta, los países MENA
- Se divide entre factores endógenos o exógenos diferenciando entre si la causa proviene de dentro del sistema o de fuera (Gerschewski, 2021) y para este trabajo me centro en los factores endógenos
- Y a su vez dentro de los factores endógenos se divide entre institucionales y sociales

Planteamiento: objetivos

- Objetivos:
 - Medición de la autocratización institucional y social a partir de la creación de dos índices de medición de actitudes autoritarias en instituciones estatales y en la sociedad
 - De esta manera describir y medir ambas evoluciones atendiendo a los tiempos y a las distintas dimensiones de la autocratización (Modelo de Levitsky y Ziblatt).
 - Contrastar ambas evoluciones y estudiar si son fenómenos paralelos (H1), si uno de los dos precede a otro y podría ser su explicación causal (H2: autocratización institucional precede a la social y H3: autocratización social precede a la institucional), o sino están relacionados (H4).

Marco teórico

01

Conceptualización autocratización y literatura sobre el fenómeno en los países MENA

02

Debate sobre cómo enfocar el estudio del fenómeno y su medición (V-Dem y EMV)

Diferenciación entre factores **endógenos** y **exógenos** y entre **institucionales** y **sociales**

03

Planteamiento del modelo de Levitsky y Ziblatt basado en Linz como el más adecuado para permitir la operativización de una medición multidimensional y a lo largo del tiempo

Metodología

Selección de la muestra

- Países escogidos
- Período de tiempo observado

Propuesta metodológica para el análisis

- V-Dem para el análisis y la medición de los factores institucionales
- EMV para el análisis y la medición de los factores sociales

Metodología

Tabla de Codificación: análisis institucional (V-Dem)

INDICADORES DE COMPORTAMIENTO AUTORITARIO (LEVITSKY Y ZIBLATT BASÁNDOSE EN LINZ)	DIMENSIONES DESAGREGADAS	VARIABLE V-DEM	OPCIONES DE RESPUESTA
<p>1. Rejection of (or weak commitment to) democratic rules of the game</p>	<p>Do they reject the Constitution or express a willingness to violate it?</p>	<p>Usamos estos dos indicadores como proxy para toda la dimensión:</p>	
	<p>Do they suggest a need for antidemocratic measures, such as <u>canceling</u> elections, violating or suspending the Constitution, banning certain organizations, or restricting basic civil or political rights?</p>	<p>Executive respects constitution (C) (v2exrescon)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Do members of the executive (the head of state, the head of government, and cabinet ministers) respect the constitution? 	<p>0: Members of the executive violate the constitution whenever they want to, without legal consequences. 1: Members of the executive violate most provisions of the constitution without legal consequences, but still must respect certain provisions. 2: Somewhere in between (1) and (3). Members of the executive would face legal consequences for violating most provisions of the constitution, but can disregard some provisions without any legal consequences. 3: Members of the executive rarely violate the constitution, and when it happens they face legal charges. 4: Members of the executive never violate the constitution.</p>
	<p>Do they seek to use (or endorse the use of) extraconstitutional means to change the government, such as military coups, violent insurrections, or mass protests aimed at forcing a change in the <u>government</u>?</p>	<p>Election losers accept results (C) (v2elaccept)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Did losing parties and candidates accept the result of this national election within three months? 	<p>0: None. None of the losing parties or candidates accepted the results the election, or all opposition was banned. 1: A few. Some but not all losing parties or candidates accepted the results but those who constituted the main opposition force did not. 2: Some. Some but not all opposition parties or candidates accepted the <u>results</u> but it is unclear whether they constituted a major opposition force or were relatively insignificant. 3: Most. Many but not all opposition parties or candidates accepted the results and those who did not had little electoral support. 4: All. All parties and candidates accepted the results.</p>
	<p>Do they attempt to undermine the legitimacy of elections, for example, by refusing to accept credible electoral results?</p>		

Metodología

Tabla de Codificación: análisis institucional (V-Dem)

<p>2. Denial of the legitimacy of political opponents</p>	<p>Do they describe their rivals as subversive, or opposed to the existing constitutional order?</p> <p>Do they claim that their rivals constitute an existential threat, either to national security or to the prevailing way of life?</p> <p>Do they baselessly describe their partisan rivals as criminals, whose supposed violation of the law (or potential to do so) disqualifies them from full participation in the political arena?</p> <p>Do they baselessly suggest that their rivals are foreign agents, in that they are secretly working in alliance with (or the employ of) a foreign government—usually an enemy one?</p>	<p>Usamos este índice como proxy para toda la dimensión:</p> <p>Freedom of association thick index (D) (v2x_frassoc_thick)</p> <p>Question: To what extent are parties, including opposition parties, allowed to form and to participate in elections, and to what extent are civil society organizations able to form and to operate freely?</p> <p>Scale: Interval, from low to high (0-1).</p>	
<p>3. Toleration or encouragement of violence</p>	<p>Do they have any ties to armed gangs, paramilitary forces, militias, guerrillas, or other organizations that engage in illicit violence?</p> <p>Have they or their partisan allies sponsored or encouraged mob attacks on opponents?</p> <p>Have they tacitly endorsed violence by their supporters by refusing to unambiguously condemn it and punish it?</p> <p>Have they praised (or refused to condemn) other significant acts of political violence, either in the past or elsewhere in the world?</p>	<p>Usamos este indicador como proxy para toda la dimensión:</p> <p>Election government intimidation (C) (v2elintim)</p> <p>➤ In this national election, were opposition candidates/parties/campaign workers subjected to repression, intimidation, violence, or harassment by the government, the ruling party, or their agents?</p>	<p>0: Yes. The repression and intimidation by the government or its agents was so strong that the entire period was quiet.</p> <p>1: Yes, frequent: There was systematic, frequent and violent harassment and intimidation of the opposition by the government or its agents during the election period.</p> <p>2: Yes, some. There was periodic, not systematic, but possibly centrally coordinated — harassment and intimidation of the opposition by the government or its agents.</p> <p>3: Restrained. There were sporadic instances of violent harassment and intimidation by the government or its agents, in at least one part of the country, and directed at only one or two local branches of opposition groups.</p> <p>4: None. There was no harassment or intimidation of opposition by the government or its agents, during the election campaign period and polling day.</p>

Metodología

Tabla de Codificación: análisis institucional (V-Dem)

4. Readiness to curtail civil liberties of opponents, including media	Have they supported laws or policies that restrict civil liberties, such as expanded libel or defamation laws, or laws restricting protest, criticism of the government, or certain civic or political organizations?	Usamos este índice como proxy para toda la dimensión: Freedom of Expression and Alternative Sources of Information index (D) (v2x_freexp_altinf) To what extent does government respect press and media freedom, the freedom of ordinary people to discuss political matters at home and in the public sphere, as well as the freedom of academic and cultural expression? Scale: Interval, from low to high (0-1).
	Have they threatened to take legal or other punitive action against critics in rival parties, civil society, or the media?	
	Have they praised repressive measures taken by other governments, either in the past or elsewhere in the world?	

Metodología

Tabla de Codificación: análisis social (EMV)

INDICADORES DE COMPORTAMIENTO AUTORITARIO (LEVITSKY Y ZIBLATT BASÁNDOSE EN LINZ)	DIMENSIONES DESAGREGADAS	PREGUNTA CUESTIONARIO	RESPUESTA
<p>1. Rejection of (or weak commitment to) democratic rules of the game</p>	<p>Do they reject the Constitution or express a willingness to violate it?</p>	<p>CONSIDERAR ESTAS TRES PREGUNTAS COMO PROXY PARA TODA LA DIMENSIÓN</p>	
	<p>Do they suggest a need for antidemocratic measures, such as <u>canceling</u> elections, violating or suspending the Constitution, banning certain organizations, or restricting basic civil or political rights?</p>	<p>I'm going to describe various types of political systems and ask what you think about each as a way of governing this country. For each one, would you say it is a very good, <u>fairly good</u>, fairly bad or very bad way of governing this country? (Read out and code one answer for each):</p>	<p>Very good 1 Fairly good 2 Fairly bad 3 Very bad 4</p>
	<p>Do they seek to use (or endorse the use of) extraconstitutional means to change the government, such as military coups, violent insurrections, or mass protests aimed at forcing a change in the <u>government</u>?</p>	<p>V.126 (W6) Q235 (W7) Having a strong leader who does not have to bother with parliament and elections</p> <p>V.127 (W6) Q236 (W7) Having experts, not government, make decisions according to what they think is best for the country</p> <p>V.129 (W6) Q237 (W7) Having the army rule</p> <p>V. 130 (W6) Q238 (W7) Having a democratic political system</p>	

Metodología

Tabla de Codificación: análisis social (EMV)

		<p>V.140 (W6) Q.250 (W7) How important is it for you to live in a country that is governed democratically? On this scale where 1 means it is "not at all important" and 10 means "absolutely important" what position would you choose? (Code one number):</p> <p>Many things are desirable, but not all of them are essential characteristics of democracy. Please tell me for each of the following things how essential you think it is as a characteristic of democracy. Use this scale where 1 means "not at all an essential characteristic of democracy" and 10 means it <u>definitely is</u> "an essential characteristic of democracy" (readout and code one answer for each):</p> <p>V.135 (W6) Q245 (W7) The army takes over when the government is incompetent</p>	<p><u>Not at all important</u> 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 <u>Absolutely important</u></p> <p><u>Not an essential characteristic of democracy</u> 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 <u>An essential characteristic of democracy</u></p>
	<p>Do they attempt to undermine the legitimacy of elections, for example, by refusing to accept credible electoral results?</p>		

Metodología

Tabla de Codificación: análisis social (EMV)

<p>2. Denial of the legitimacy of political opponents</p>	<p>Do they describe their rivals as subversive, or opposed to the existing constitutional order?</p> <p>Do they claim that their rivals constitute an existential threat, either to national security or to the prevailing way of life?</p> <p>Do they baselessly describe their partisan rivals as criminals, whose supposed violation of the law (or potential to do so) disqualifies them from full participation in the political arena?</p> <p>Do they baselessly suggest that their rivals are foreign agents, in that they are secretly working in alliance with (or the employ of) a foreign government—usually an enemy one?</p>	<p>CONSIDERAR COMO PROXY PARA TODA LA DIMENSIÓN</p> <p>V62. If you had to <u>choose</u>, which one of the things on this card would you say is most important? (Code one answer only under “first choice”):</p> <p>V63. And which would be the next most important? (Code one answer only under “second choice”):</p> <p>Maintaining order in the nation Giving people more say in important government decisions Fighting rising prices Protecting freedom of speech</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>V 62 FIRST CHOICE</th> <th>V 62 SECOND CHOICE</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	V 62 FIRST CHOICE	V 62 SECOND CHOICE	1	1	2	2	3	3	4	4
V 62 FIRST CHOICE	V 62 SECOND CHOICE												
1	1												
2	2												
3	3												
4	4												
<p>3. Toleration or encouragement of violence</p>	<p>Do they have any ties to armed gangs, paramilitary forces, militias, guerrillas, or other organizations that engage in illicit violence?</p> <p>Have they or their partisan allies sponsored or encouraged mob attacks on opponents?</p> <p>Have they tacitly endorsed violence by their supporters by refusing to unambiguously condemn it and punish it?</p> <p>Have they praised (or refused to condemn) other significant acts of political violence, either in the past or elsewhere in the world?</p>	<p>CONSIDERAR ESTE INDICADOR COMO PROXY PARA TODA LA DIMENSIÓN</p> <p>Please tell me for each of the following actions whether you think it can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between, using this card. (Read out and code one answer for each statement):</p> <p>V210 (W6) Q191 (W7) Violence against other people (WAVES 6 Y 7)</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Never</u> justifiable</th> <th><u>Always</u> justifiable</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Never</u> justifiable	<u>Always</u> justifiable	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10							
<u>Never</u> justifiable	<u>Always</u> justifiable												
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10													

Metodología

Tabla de Codificación: análisis social (EMV)

4. Readiness to curtail civil liberties of opponents, including media	Have they supported laws or policies that restrict civil liberties, such as expanded libel or defamation laws, or laws restricting protest, criticism of the government, or certain civic or political organizations?	CONSIDERAR ESTE INDICADOR COMO PROXY PARA TODA LA DIMENSIÓN Many things are desirable, but not all of them are essential characteristics of democracy. Please tell me for each of the following things how essential you think it is as a characteristic of democracy. Use this scale where 1 means "not at all an essential characteristic of democracy" and 10 means it <u>definitely is</u> "an essential characteristic of democracy" (readout and code one answer for each): V. 136 Q. 246 (W7) Civil rights protect people from state oppression	Not an essential characteristic of democracy 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 <u>An essential characteristic of democracy</u>
	Have they threatened to take legal or other punitive action against critics in rival parties, civil society, or the media?		
	Have they praised repressive measures taken by other governments, either in the past or elsewhere in the world?		



WORK IN PROGRESS...