Abstract

This article presents a new framework for understanding the role of international factors in post-Cold War regime change. We treat the postCold War international environment as operating along two dimensions: western leverage, or governments' vulnerability to external pressure, and linkage to the West, or the density of a country's ties to the U.S., the European Union, and Western-led multilateral institutions. Both leverage and linkage raised the cost of authoritarianism during the postCold War period. However, mechanisms of leverage such as diplomatic pressure, or conditionality were--by themselves--rarely sufficient to democratize postCold War autocracies. Rather, the more subtle and diffuse effects of linkage contributed more consistently to democratization. The impact of linkage and leverage are examined in the context of postCold War hybrid or competitive authoritarian regimes.
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The end of the Cold War posed an unprecedented challenge to authoritarian regimes around the world. The collapse of the Soviet Union and the consequent drying up of aid to Soviet and U.S. client states, the military and economic ascendance of Western democracies, and the virtual disappearance of legitimate regime alternatives created powerful incentives for developing-world elites to adopt formal democratic institutions. As a result, overtly authoritarian regimes disappeared from much of the globe, giving way in most cases to regimes based on multiparty elections. Many of these emerging electoral regimes, however, were not democracies. During the 1990s, in countries as diverse as Belarus, Cambodia, Croatia, Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico, Peru, Russia, Serbia, Slovakia, Ukraine, Zambia, and Zimbabwe, competitive elections coexisted with substantial abuses of democratic procedure. We call these competitive authoritarian regimes.

These are civilian regimes in which democratic institutions exist and permit meaningful competition for power, but where the political playing field is so heavily tilted in favor of incumbents that the regime cannot be labeled democratic. Many of these regimes were initially viewed as “in transition” to democracy; this, it has become clear, was not the case. Although some competitive authoritarian regimes democratized during the post–Cold War period (Croatia, Mexico, Peru, Slovakia, Taiwan), others remained stable and authoritarian (Cambodia, Cameroon, Malaysia, Russia, Zimbabwe). Other cases managed to oust autocratic governments but nevertheless failed to democratize (Belarus, Malawi, Ukraine in 1994, Zambia in 1991).
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