

1 Introduction

Turbulent transitions into the 21st century

*Mohammad-Mahmoud Ould Mohamedou and
Timothy D. Sisk*

The early decades of the twenty-first century will be remembered as a critical period in the long-term trend, characteristic of the twentieth century, towards the increasing spread of democracy worldwide. From the Arab Spring countries of Tunisia, Egypt, Libya and Yemen to the turbulent yet progressing transition from military rule in Myanmar, social mobilisation against autocratic, corrupt or military regimes has precipitated political transitions that are characteristic of transitions from authoritarian rule, or ‘democratisation’.¹ As in the previous century’s experiences of countries transitioning from authoritarian rule toward presumably more inclusive democracy, the 2000s’ sweeping political and social change is turbulent, unpredictable, fraught with violence and rife with crises, reversals and halting change as old orders are resistant and new social contracts between citizen and state often remain elusive. Not all transitions away from authoritarian rule lead automatically, or quickly, to democracy.

Like earlier ‘waves’ and country-specific processes of democratisation, such as the short-lived but critical Prague Spring in Czechoslovakia in 1968, the Revolution of the Carnations in Portugal in 1974, or the now celebrated (yet quite violent) transition from apartheid to democracy in South Africa in 1994, today’s transitions are perplexing. Are early twenty-first century countries-in-turmoil in a long and difficult but inexorable transition toward democracy, or are today’s experiences somehow unique and different and requiring of new explanations and theories?

A body of scholarly literature and practitioner reflection known as ‘transitology’ – a literature that explores the factors that lead to *the demise of autocracy*, *the turbulent pathways of change* and *the choice for an eventual consolidation of democracy* – explores precisely these processes. However, its application to current cases seems at best uneasy.² Some have argued that the contemporary transitions are not moving in the direction of democracy and that civil war or reversion to authoritarianism is likely across the board, that the ‘door is closing’³ on even the latest moment of democratisation. In our view, in examining political liberalisation attempts that have been taking place in recent years – notably those leading up to and in the wake of the Arab Spring – dominant perspectives have exhibited a conspicuous absence of the literature on transitions to democracy over the past forty or so years. The combined effect of the emphasis on

narrow regional narratives and immediate political dynamics has stripped the understanding of a new generation of political transitions of a deeper background of transitology which carries much relevance, albeit one in need of updating in the light of recent cases.

This book features contributions by scholars of democracy and democratisation processes from around the world that reopen, and revive, transitology theory and its related debates. The chapters in these pages, written by political liberalisation specialists, tackle the series of questions raised by a body of literature that remains highly useful to understanding contemporary political turbulence and transformation. Together, they seek to take the debate on transition into the next generation by establishing a link with past experiences and analyses.

Against the background of the first phase of transitology, a number of interrogations arise today. Can democratisation processes be studied regardless of whether they actually arrive at a consolidated democracy as an outcome? Can political and socio-economic transitions be systematised beyond their own contexts and specificities? What are the implications for international democracy-building assistance? Are transitions universal or area specific? Where do transitions fit in the overall picture of political transformation?

The turbulence that followed the Arab Spring of late 2010 and early 2011 marked a new phase of socio-economic and political transformation in the Middle East and North Africa. The notion of an ‘Arab Spring’⁴ harkened back both to the 1848 People’s Spring and to the Prague Spring reform movement of 1968 – the latter an ultimately ill-fated attempt to use social movement protests to topple an authoritarian regime. The Prague Spring, it should be recalled, was indeed a period of short-lived liberalisation and not full democratisation. Soviet forces invaded to halt the reforms in August 1968 and democracy, now seemingly consolidated, did not fully come to the Czech and Slovak republics until the early 1990s.⁵

The collapse in 2011 of long-standing authoritarian regimes in Tunisia, Egypt and Libya, together with social movements, protest and rebellion in Yemen, Bahrain and Syria, further reflected a *zeitgeist* of actual or prospective transitions to democracy in the region. These rapid and largely unanticipated transitions reflected a ‘punctuated equilibrium’ from the decades of ‘neo-patrimonial authoritarianism’ that had long characterised regimes in the Middle East and North Africa region. Further from the epicentre of the new transitions in the area, countries such as Guinea, Maldives, Nepal and Zimbabwe have all seen troubled transitions in recent years as autocracies collapse, teeter or endure in the face of uprisings aimed at ending decades of military, traditional and repressive rule.

Reviving transitology

The collective argument of this book is that it is time to bring ‘transitology’ back in; that is, to reassert, review and revise, and develop further theories, concepts

and approaches to understanding turbulent transitions in countries seeking to emerge from autocracy. The Arab Spring cases are of course each unique, as are the pathways countries such as Tunisia, Morocco, Egypt, Yemen, Libya or Syria followed in the last few years. This was true of earlier waves of democratisation as well; each pathway is unique while at the same time generalisable patterns can be seen. These and other contemporary transitions nonetheless reflect four enduring aspects of *transitology*, or the study of transitions from one regime to the next, and in particular from authoritarian rule to inclusive democracy. Transitology focuses on the common or generalisable attributes of the democratisation process across a wide variety of experiences, including insights about the conditions under which authoritarian regimes are vulnerable to popular challenge, patterns of mass mobilisation and elite pact-making, pivotal or choice moments often stimulated by crises, electoral processes and experiences of rewriting the rules of the political game through constitution-making. Further, generalisations can be found about understandings around the uncertainty, turbulence and volatility of regime-to-regime transitions, which often bring trade-offs between conflict management, transitional justice and democratisation as such. There is also a set of findings that grapple with the centrality of the transnational aspects of these changes, or the strong effects of international–domestic interactions in which outsiders have strong, internal influences in what are mostly endogenous or domestic processes. Finally, there are new dimensions of the transitology debates, particularly the changing role of political communication and participation, largely through social media.

Our objectives in reviving transitology in this book are multiple: we seek to reintroduce and restate findings from comparative politics on political regime transformation, relate this prior work to the contemporary cases, describe how today's transitions differ from or resemble previous experiences and how they present new challenges. Ultimately, the chapters in this book – and particularly the final chapter by esteemed transitology scholar Philippe Schmitter – offer some initial policy-related recommendations and new directions for the study of transitions across regime types.

Policy analysis to assess the nature and lasting consequences of several current waves of social and political upheaval is, in particular, lacking a firm framework of guidance. As a result, the understanding of momentous transformations is impressionistic, formulaic, short-term and unscientific. Moreover, there are – in our view – premature claims that, for instance, the Arab Spring has ‘failed’. While area studies scholars have provided insights into the dynamics of these cases, such analysis has been typically devoid of efforts to build broader generalisations that are useful to policymakers seeking to see beyond the day-to-day headlines. Often, improvised analogies or culturalised (‘Arabellions’⁶) political jargon categories, such as ‘regime change’, are resorted to unhelpfully to analyse complex, multifaceted and usually long-term exit strategies from authoritarianism.

Analyses of the Arab Spring have tended to be minimally historical and have often lacked a comparative dimension. In examining political liberalisation

attempts taking place in the early twenty-first century, notably those leading up to and in the wake of the Arab Spring, dominant perspectives have exhibited a conspicuous absence of the literature on transitions to democracy over the past forty or so years. For all its insights and shortcomings, the language of transitology – our term for a body of literature that has comparatively and through case-study analysis examined common patterns, sequences, crises and outcomes of transitional periods – has been largely eschewed.⁷ Accordingly, the uprisings, revolts and revolutions that emanate from the Middle East and North Africa region now seem in some ways unrelated to initial efforts aimed at bringing to an end an authoritarian system of rule and renegotiating a new, democratic social contract. Perhaps only Tunisia, where four civil society groups were collectively awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 2015, has been recognised as having clearly progressed through the various stages of transition and is now possibly embarking on a path to a process of ‘consolidology’, to use Schmitter’s term.

Similarly, when explicitly referred to in this current debate, the notion of ‘transition’ has been used in relation to short-term political developments, often ongoing,⁸ or collapsed into larger development-oriented roadmaps.⁹ The wider public and external policy-makers, fearing instability and uncertainty, seek quick solutions and simple outcomes – what some have termed ‘instant democracy’.¹⁰ Whereas the process of transition is a lengthy one, in contemporary policy parlance ‘transition’ is, in effect, being increasingly misleadingly equated with a different sequence, namely that shorter period between the fall of the dictator and a free (or merely trouble-free) election. For example, in seeking to reformulate US policy in the wake of the Egyptian (mostly endogenous) social uprising against the longstanding US-allied regime of President Hosni Mubarak, US President Barack Obama acknowledged it with a rather shorted-sighted perspective on the transition: ‘It is my belief that an orderly transition must be meaningful, it must be peaceful, and it must begin now’.¹¹ Similarly, in May 2013 French President François Hollande demanded (‘I insist ... these elections must take place’)¹² that elections be held in Mali by July of that year following France’s military intervention in that country. The combined effect of the emphasis on regional narratives, external interference and immediate political dynamics has stripped the understanding of a new generation of political transitions of a deeper background of transitology which carries much relevance for the contemporary cases.

The neglect of, or resistance to embrace, the transition paradigm in the context of the Arab Spring debate is arresting. Above and beyond the question of whether there exists a universal or even common pattern to the process of transition to democracy, the challenges facing societies undergoing transition have undeniably some commonalities – across time, space and cultures. To be certain, the *process to* (the transition) must be distinguished from the *pursued aim*, namely democracy, which is a value that can everywhere be desired, pursued, resisted, contested, redefined, possibly achieved and then secured, consolidated, hijacked, broken down or reconstructed. Democracy is ultimately elusive and subject to various definitions (and assessments of its ‘quality’¹³), a debate which

this book will not be concerned with. Democratisation processes can be studied regardless of whether they actually arrive at a consolidated democracy as an outcome, especially given the difficulty of the consolidation concept in terms of its empirical validity and the reality that ‘consolidation’ itself is more of a spectrum than a condition as such.¹⁴ Indeed, much can be learned about the conditions for successful transitions from those that are aborted or hijacked.

Notably absent in the analysis of these new transitions has been a close and systematic look at whether the concepts and findings from earlier studies of regime-type transition, ostensibly in the direction of democracy as today’s dominant regime-type, can be usefully applied to understanding the often wrenching, convoluted and in some instances violent dynamics of the Middle Eastern and North African early twenty-first century transitions. Can political and socio-economic transitions be systematised beyond their own contexts and specificities?

About this book

The literature on previous waves of democratisation can indeed shed light on contemporary contexts; thus, a close look at how prior research has addressed key questions is essential. This is particularly the case since significant amounts of political change continue to occur around the world but the ongoing era of political change has no dominant directionality.¹⁵ This book explores these questions. Under what conditions do long-standing autocracies collapse, and survive, when there are massive social movements aimed at toppling their rule? What are the conditions under which transitions may be ‘hijacked’ by capable and wily incumbent elites through the suppression of social movements and the stifling of political opposition? When and why do incumbent and opposition elites agree to a ‘pacted transition’, by which the vital interests of these regimes and their challengers are addressed in tacit or explicit negotiations of the new rules of the political road? What do we know of the efficacy, and weaknesses, of interim governments and transitional power-sharing outcomes in smoothing the turbulence of transitions? Do transitions stimulate, enable or exacerbate ethnic and religious mobilisation and conflict? What role do various turning points play on the transition road, such as electoral moments, constitutional crises and violent incidents? When, if ever, can new democracies be said to be ‘consolidated’?

In answering these questions, the authors in this book present three principal, integrated arguments. First, *there is arguably a common and now increasingly recognisable pattern of democratic transition*, i.e. a sequence that transcends the local set of values beyond cultural idiosyncrasies, contrary to the arguments of some that have portended the ‘end’ of the transition paradigm. Second, *common patterns, crises and sequences across cases are identifiable but are in need of updating* as recent waves of transitions are expanding the field of study and policy practice. Finally, *the challenges facing the societies, institutions and individuals during these phases can be addressed successfully* as the difficulties of a transition process rest to a large extent on internal leadership, coalition-making

and negotiation and external assistance. Such support can be effective through advocacy of global norms, technical assistance and by way of broader capacity-development engagements in countries experiencing transition. In many cases, there is also a role for much greater involvement by international actors (to both progressive and ill effect), which then must engage in constructive dialogue with national actors about the nature, sequencing, timing and process of decision-making related to the management of transitions.

In [Chapter 2](#), we argue in greater depth that it is time to ‘bring transitology back’. That is, we contend that in the present context it is important to restate, re-examine and enrich further theories, concepts and approaches to understanding turbulent transitions in countries seeking to emerge from autocracy. Focusing on the common attributes of the democratisation process across a wide variety of experiences, the transitology perspective emerged from analysis of the transitions that have occurred since 1974 and broadened more extensively in the post-Cold War period. The literature addresses the pathways of transition, including likely triggering events, collective action in social movements and patterns of revolt, regime repression and escalating political violence.

Democratisation theory emphasises the importance of strategic interactions between elites and citizens in complex processes that involve revisiting the basic rules of the political game. The current 2010s post-globalisation wave of transition has introduced new and important qualitative aspects to the transition cycle, in particular the transnational dimension, which must be accounted for more fully in the next phase of conceptual development in transitology studies. Bringing transitology back in to the debates on the Arab Spring, and more broadly in other contexts, focuses attention on fostering more peaceful and enduring transitions to democracy and it offers the possibility of articulating more historically-informed analyses of socio-political and security change.

In [Chapter 3](#), Kateryna Pishchikova and Richard Youngs find that recent years have seen a growing number of partial transitions, in which moments of apparent democratic breakthrough lead not to full consolidation but to hybrid regimes. Many scholars argue that hybrid regimes are a fairly stable regime type in their own right. They are not regimes halfway towards democracy but regimes that have found a way to maintain stability through only a partial degree of political liberalisation. This chapter investigates whether recent evidence from Ukraine and Egypt reinforces or questions this well-established position. Ukraine squandered the potential of the 2004 Orange Revolution and apparently settled into a hybrid status. It may next be on the verge of reinitiating reforms towards better quality democratic transition. Egypt made an apparent breakthrough in 2011, but its putative transition was subsequently aborted. It remains unclear whether the country is en route to wholesale autocracy or to being a more stable hybrid regime. In the light of these events, this chapter asks whether the Ukrainian and Egyptian cases in fact demonstrate that hybrid transitions may not be so enduring – or whether, more subtly, they tell us that hybrid regimes may indeed be both enduring *and* unstable at the same time. In short, by drawing on the two cases of Ukraine and Egypt, Pishchikova and Youngs show how improving our

understanding of the hybrid nature of political transformations can provide a valuable addition to democratic transition theory.

Chapter 4 focuses on the electoral moment, a key turning point in all transitions. Pippa Norris argues that contemporary interest in the issue of elections as a mode of transition has been revived during the post-Cold War era by the expansion in the use of elections as a standard part of peace-building and state-building initiatives by the international community, as well as by the contention that, at least in Africa, repeated experience of successive elections (irrespective of their quality) has played an important role in strengthening processes of democratisation, civil liberties and political rights. The applicability of this mix to other world regions, such as Latin America, has been strongly critiqued. Scholars have suggested that what matters in this process are the timing and sequencing of elections, and the design of electoral systems. The debate about the role of elections in achieving stable states and democratic transitions continues within the international community. The core aspect of the debate examined by this chapter is whether it is the *repeated experience* of electoral contests which is critical in processes of transition from absolute autocracy and processes of democratisation, or whether what matters is the *quality of elections* and, in particular, levels of ‘contentious’ elections. The chapter concludes that the problems of contentious elections can be observed to rise with the transition from absolute autocracy, peaking in hybrid regimes, before falling again in mature democracies.

In Chapter 5, Benjamin Reilly evaluates three distinctive dimensions of East Asia’s democratic experience that stand out when analysed from a comparative viewpoint. The first is its mode of democratic transitions, particularly the contrast between the ‘pacted’ regime transitions advocated in the scholarly literature and the mostly ‘people power’ revolutions that have prevailed in Southeast Asia in particular. Second is the way in which institutional reforms have played a key part in Asia’s democratic evolution experience – leading to a distinctive ‘Asian model’ which privileges some dimensions of democracy (e.g. concentrated power and majority rule) over others (e.g. broader representation and minority rights). The third touches on issues of geopolitics: the region’s genuine democratic transitions have all been concentrated in maritime rather than mainland Asia – the result, it is argued, of a range of international factors centred on the competing spheres of influence of the US and China in the Asia-Pacific region.

When do ‘transitions’ end and normal democratic politics begin? In Chapter 6 André Liebich finds that the fall of Communist regimes in Central and Eastern Europe was so unexpected and so sudden that little thought was given, there or elsewhere, to what would follow. As the only default option, former Communist states eagerly adopted capitalist economic models, Western security structures and, superficially, universal values. A quarter of a century later, however, these countries display striking divergences from the norms to which they appeared to adhere thus raising the question of whether the ills they suffer can really be attributed to the discomforts of transition. To move from totalitarianism to democracy one has to change both the grammar and the vocabulary but to move

from totalitarianism to nationalism one only has to change the vocabulary. This has proved to be the easy way out of Communism, with repercussions even in the domain of privatisation and, of course, electoral politics. As the former communist countries have gradually been admitted into the European Union (EU), their political culture has affected that of the EU more than the EU has succeeded in transforming the political culture of its new members.

Since 1989, the political landscape of Sub-Saharan Africa has shifted radically. While multi-party regimes were the exception during the Cold War, few closed authoritarian regimes survived the turn of the twenty-first century. Julien Morency-Laflamme observes in [Chapter 7](#) that a number of electoral democracies in Africa were born before the turn of the century. All transition processes on the continent highlight certain dynamics which allow reconsideration of ‘transitology’ in regard to the African cases – namely, the extensive impact of the actors’ actions on outcomes. Successful democratisation stories in the sub-continent all share a number of characteristics associated with formal and informal pacts, namely restraint in the demands and actions of the main political forces. Inversely, failed transition processes and regressions to authoritarianism were regularly the result of particular actors’ attempts to monopolise state resources. Reviewing the ‘democratic wave’ of the 1990s in order to pinpoint the factors behind the ‘success stories’ and cases of authoritarian reversals, the chapter analyses contemporary examples of democratic improvements and breakdowns in the light of these older undercurrents.

It has been thirty years since the critical wave of democratisation and ‘re-democratisation’ in the Americas. Diego Abente-Brun and Ignacio González-Bozzolasco start, in [Chapter 8](#), from the premise that the ‘Southern Cone’ cases in Latin America proffer lessons learned in a historical-structural framework. Their analysis focuses on three distinct stages or *moments*, each with its own logic: the nature of the authoritarian regimes that preceded the transition process; the transitions processes *stricto sensu* and the characteristics of the democratic regimes engendered by them. Transitions from what? The first moment has to do with the nature of the authoritarian regimes but also with the nature of the socio-economic and political cleavages they sought to suppress or overcome. Transitions why? Hence, the second moment, the transitions per se, must be looked at not only in terms of forms, tactics or paths but also of how the democratising forces sought to overcome the very same cleavages that led to the emergence of the authoritarian regimes in the first place. Transitions to what? Finally, the third moment leads us to analyse both the type of democratic regimes that the transitions led to and the new challenges that they generated.

The ‘Arab Spring’ took many by surprise even as some observers had long contended that there was a gap between the aspirations of an educated, mostly middle-class citizenry and old-style autocratic, Arab nationalist regimes. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) had pointed out in a series of *Arab Human Development* reports beginning in 2002 that there were structural imbalances between society and its needs and political orders in the region.¹⁶ Is this another example of the difficulty of forecasting in social analysis, or does it

rather reflect deeper problems about the conceptual geography of Middle East and North African (MENA) studies? In [Chapter 9](#), Bahgat Korany assesses the question of whether the Arab Spring does in fact constitute a regional wave of transitions to democracy, or are the conditions so unusual that there are no historical or regional comparisons to be made? He argues that Middle East and North Africa scholarly studies specifically need to rethink their unit/level of analysis and analytical lenses. Rather than singularising authoritarian durability, MENA experts need to look also at authoritarian fragility. Similarly, instead of over-emphasising ‘politics from above’, ‘politics from below’ and street parliaments have to be brought in. Bahgat Korany notes that an emerging polarisation between *deep state* and *deep society* may deviate democratic transition from its objectives of an inclusionary process and coalition-building. The time for a paradigm shift has therefore come. Such a shift not only needs to account for the decline of ‘Arab exceptionalism’, but also has to address the challenges of transition and the continuing revolutionary process. What are the dynamics of the different groups, their assets and liabilities? How far are issues of religion/identity impacting on the character and evolution of the transition process? To answer these questions and others, conceptual and empirical challenges have to be addressed. Conceptually, though social movement theory is now presented as a relevant alternative lens, its applicability has to be assessed critically and supplemented (rather than supplanted). Empirically, countries of the ‘Arab Spring’ have also to be classified so that it no longer continues to be perceived as one uniform pattern, a monolithic transition.

The book concludes with a forward-looking chapter from one of the founding scholars of transitology. Philippe Schmitter – a scion of earlier transition work – contends in [Chapter 10](#) that, at least since Plato and Aristotle, political theorists have sought to explain why, under the kaleidoscopic surface of events, stable patterns of authority and privilege manage to survive. While they have rarely devoted much explicit attention to the choices and processes that brought about such institutions in the first place – this would be, strictly speaking, the substantive domain of what we have called *consolidology* – they have accumulated veritable libraries of data and findings about how regimes, especially democratic ones, manage to ‘change and yet remain the same’. The apprentice ‘consolidologist’, therefore, has a lot of ‘orthodox’ theoretical assumptions and widely accepted empirical material to draw upon when studying the likelihood of the success or failure of ‘newly-existing democracies’. On the one hand, the likelihood that practitioners of this embryonic (and possibly pseudo) science can draw more confidently from previous scholarly work should be comforting. On the other hand, there still remains a great deal of work to do before we can understand how the behaviour of political actors can become more predictable: how the rules of democracy can be made more mutually acceptable and how the interactions of power and influence can settle into more stable patterns. This closing chapter explores what might be the fundamental assumptions of this new science. On the basis of what has happened so far in more than sixty countries since April 1974, it advances a number of reflections on this tortuous process of

regime transformation with the hope that such a foray will be useful in orienting future research – and equally in guiding the practice of policy-makers.

In sum, transitology has long contended with the fact that democracy as such is a highly contingent outcome in such processes – as the Prague Spring metaphor evidences – and that there may well be contextualised transition outcomes without significant or lasting democratic advances. Contemporary research also sees this as essentially a separate, yet equally engaging, problem.¹⁷ In sum, the authors in this book argue that bringing transitology back in to the debates on fostering more peaceful and enduring transitions to democracy militates against the exceptionalism erroneously associated with the new transformations, and that such a perspective offers the possibility of articulating more historically-informed analyses of socio-political and security change. In turn, this may offer some insights into formulating improved policy at international, regional and local levels.

Notes

- 1 For the latest data analysis of long-term trends in governance and regime type, including forecasting models and projects to 2050, see Hughes *et al.*, *Strengthening Governance Globally*, p. 8. Forecasts based on futures modelling of core indicators of security, capacity and inclusion in governance lead to estimates of more countries experiencing transitions away from partial regimes (anocracy) and autocracy as putative underlying causal drivers of democratisation, particularly education and incomes, rise around the world.
- 2 See, for example, the debate in the January 2014 edition of the *Journal of Democracy* (Volume 25, 1), Diamond *et al.*, ‘Reconsidering the “Transition Paradigm”’, and that in the January 2015 edition of the same journal (Volume 26, 1), Plattner, ‘Is Democracy in Decline?’, as examples of the issues (‘decline’, ‘recession’, ‘poor performance’, ‘splintering’, ‘waning’, ‘decay’) in the current debate.
- 3 Masoud, ‘Has the Door Closed on Arab Democracy?’.
- 4 Several terms have been used to refer to the series of regional uprisings in the Middle East and North Africa that followed the popular movement initiated against President Zine Abidine Ben Ali in Tunisia in December 2010 in the wake of the self-immolation of street vendor Mohamed Bouazizi: i.e. ‘Arab Spring’, ‘Arab Awakening’, ‘Arab Uprisings’, ‘Arab Renaissance’ and ‘Arab Revolutions’. Each term is imperfect and carries limits in its analogy or imagery. Avoiding this semantic discussion, this book will use the common term ‘Arab Spring’ while taking note of important reservations concerning its use.
- 5 Olson, ‘Democratisation and Political Participation’.
- 6 Börzel *et al.*, ‘Responses to the “Arabellions”’.
- 7 Exceptions include Brookings Doha Centre, *The Beginnings of Transition*; Liu, *Transition Challenges in the Arab World*; Aly and Elkady, *The Good, the Bad and the Ugly*; Hachemaoui, *La Tunisie à la Croisée des Chemins*; Najšlová, *Foreign Democracy Assistance in the Czech and Slovak Transitions*; and Foran, ‘Beyond Insurgency to Radical Social Change’.
- 8 See, for instance, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), ‘Arab States Transitions Must be Locally Led and Driven, Says UNDP Chief’, 22 June 2011.
- 9 For example, United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), ‘*Feuille de Route: Démocratie et Renouveau dans le Monde Arabe – L’UNESCO accompagne les Transitions vers la Démocratie*’, report on a roundtable, 21 June 2011.

- 10 See W. Pal Sidhu, 'The Perils of Instant Democracy', *Mint* (Delhi), 30 July 2013.
- 11 Barack H. Obama, 'Remarks by the President on the Situation in Egypt', White House, Office of the Press Secretary, 1 February 2011.
- 12 François Hollande, 'Point de Presse Conjoint du Président de la République et de Mahamadou Issoufou, Président de la République du Niger', Élysée Présidence de la République, 10 May 2013.
- 13 See Diamond and Morlino, *Assessing the Quality of Democracy* and the 'State of Democracy' approach employed by the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA), www.idea.int/sod.
- 14 Schedler, 'What is Democratic Consolidation?'
- 15 Carothers and Samet-Marram, 'The New Global Marketplace', p. 6. See also Carothers and Youngs, 'The Complexities of Global Protest'.
- 16 See the summary of the evolution of these reports, and links to them, at www.arab-hdr.org/about/intro.aspx.
- 17 In their analysis of international–domestic transitions to democracy Stoner *et al.* also argue that 'the domestic and international causes of successful [democracy] ... are often different than those of the initial time of transition'. See Kathryn Stoner, Larry Diamond, Desha Girod and Michael McFaul, 'Transitional Successes and Failures: The International-Domestic Nexus', in Stoner and McFaul, eds., *Transitions to Democracy*, p. 5.