

PEACEFUL TRANSFER OF POWER AND DEMOCRATIC RESILIENCE: GLOBAL AND INDIAN PERSPECTIVES

Y. P. Singh

Government Polytechnic College, Sagar (MP), India

ABSTRACT

The peaceful transfer of power demonstrates positive effect on public trust, democratic resilience, institutional stability, development and constitutional continuity across different countries. Based on case studies and research published between 1990 and 2025, the paper compares examples of peaceful and disrupted transfers across North and South America, Europe, Africa, Asia and Oceania. Rather than focusing only on the functioning of democracies, the study also examines how institutions operate, how leaders respond to electoral outcomes and whether election results are accepted or rejected. These outcomes suggest that peaceful transfers are not determined solely by economic development or social cohesion, but by the strength of electoral management bodies, independent judiciary, constitutional constraints and adherence to democratic norms.

KEYWORDS

Peaceful Transfer of Power; Democracy, Democratic Resilience; Electoral Integrity; Constitutional Institutions; Democratic Norms; India and Global Democracies

1. INTRODUCTION

The peaceful transfer of power is widely recognized as the most visible and decisive sign of a strong and mature democracy. A peaceful transition is the process by which power shift from one government or party leadership to another without the use of violence or force. This idea is important in understanding how democracies progress and stabilize, as it allows for the continuation of governance and respect for democratic norms. The ability to have a peaceful transition is a sign of a healthy and seasoned political system and an important part of successful democracy (Snidal, 2024).

Elections grant citizens the right to choose their government. According to democratic norms, the outgoing government must accept the defeat and transfer the power to winning party, this peaceful transition is fundamental to democracy. (Przeworski, 2015). In other words, democracy is not merely about voting, but also about respecting the people's decision and ensuring that power resides in an institution, not in an individual (Diamond, 2020).

An analysis shows that different countries have demonstrated both success and failure in the transfer of power. For example, the United States set an early precedent for the peaceful transfer of power in 1801, when Thomas Jefferson assumed office after John Adams (Miller, 2025). Similarly, countries like Canada, Australia and Western countries (UK, Germany and France), also display mature democracy as there have shown peaceful transfers of power. Similarly, in recent years, Taiwan and the African nations of Botswana and Zambia have also set an example

of peaceful transitions of power, showcasing this hallmark of mature democracies around the world (Sishuwa, 2025). History also provides several examples where elections were disputed, as a result such countries had to face political violence or military interventions. In some countries, power was even seized by the military. In such situations, citizens' faith in the electoral system and in democracy declined significantly (Carothers, 2024). Therefore, it can be said that the tradition of peaceful transfer of power is not automatic; rather, it depends on effective institutions, constitutional safeguards, political commitment and the capacity & effectiveness of civil society.

India's democratic tradition is an example for the world. India has regularly and successfully conducted large-scale elections for its complex and diverse population, since first general election in 1951-52. Also, since then the country has consistently demonstrated peaceful transfers of power at both the central and state levels (Yadav, 2024). Overcoming challenges such as political polarization, geographical disparities and social diversity, the country has consistently upheld electoral norms, thereby sustaining public trust in the democratic system (Kohli, 2020). India's example illustrates how democratic resilience—the capacity of political systems to withstand pressures, embrace competition and continue functioning smoothly—matures over time through the trust of all political parties and citizens in the constitution, strong institutions, transparent processes and the peaceful acceptance of electoral outcomes (Levitsky and Ziblatt, 2018).

This research examines historical and contemporary experiences of peaceful and failed power transitions worldwide. The paper analytically compares the global trends with India's democratic journey and attempts to identify the factors that strengthen or weaken peaceful power transfers. Using qualitative comparative methods and drawing on research from 2024-2025, this paper aims to demonstrate why the ability to manage leadership transitions peacefully is crucial for maintaining democratic stability, legitimacy, sustainable development and resilience.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The peaceful transfer of power has always held a central place in democratic theory and comparative politics. Some classical scholars defined democratic stability around the acceptance of electoral uncertainty and the voluntary relinquishment of power. Dahl's has framed a hypothesis that said free electoral participation for all is necessary but insufficient for true democracy. A truly democratic system could only be sustained when political leaders were willing to accept the possibility of losing power through elections (Dahl, 1971). Huntington (1991) further developed this idea through his "two-turnover test," suggesting that a democracy will be considered strong and mature only when there have been at least two peaceful transfers of power between rival political forces.

Later thinkers further expanded this framework by emphasizing institutional and traditional aspects. Linz and Stepan state that democracy is strengthened when political leader does not attempt to seize power outside of constitutional provisions and when democratic processes are considered the only legitimate means of obtaining power (Linz and Stepan, 1996). In their work, they highlighted the role of constitutions, electoral management bodies and judicial independence in facilitating civilized transitions of power.

In recent decades, some philosophers have drawn attention to the decline of peaceful transfers of power. For strong democracy, mutual restraint and institutional tolerance is important as democracies are not destroyed by a sudden coup, but by the gradual weakening of constitutional provisions and rules, especially when those in power illegally undermine rivals or electoral

processes (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018). This thought becomes relevant in light of the contested elections and democratic backsliding observed around the world.

Recent researchers appraise peaceful transfers of power a pivotal component of democratic resilience. Democratic resilience is considered as the capacity of a democratic system to withstand shocks, adapt to political tensions and continue functioning without compromising democratic norms, even in times of crisis (Merkel, 2024; V-Dem Institute, 2024). While earlier studies were on the strength of democracy, current research emphasizes democratic resilience in the context of challenges such as polarization, misinformation and increasing pressure on institutions. Nevertheless, still there is few comparative studies between the relationship of peaceful transfers of power and democratic resilience across different regions.

Contemporary studies found that now, throughout the world there is trend among leaders in power, not to accept their defeat and not to peacefully transfer power. The V-Dem Institute's Democracy Report framed new term "electoral dictatorship," It means regular elections are held, but incumbent leaders do not accept their defeat and there is no transfer of power or in elections opponents are not allowed to contest elections. This leads to gradual weakening of democracy (V-Dem Institute, 2024). Similarly, Freedom House too found that, now a days, accepting electoral defeat is becoming less common in both new and established democracies, resulting in declining public trust in democratic processes and an increased risk of political instability (Freedom House, 2024).

Studies published in journals such as Electoral Studies and Democratization indicate that the peaceful transfer of power depends on several factors such as credible electoral system, an independent judiciary and the willingness of all groups to accept democratic process (Mainwaring, 2024; Norris, 2024). Studies on some countries from different regions found that the experiences in such countries are not uniform; while countries like Ghana, Chile and Indonesia have peaceful democratic transitions, others like Venezuela, Myanmar and Belarus was just opposite leading to authoritarianism, economic decline and social unrest (Corrales, 2024; Cheeseman, 2024).

Within the comparative democracy literature, India is frequently cited as an important case of democratic persistence in the post-colonial context, marked by regular competitive elections and a sustained record of peaceful transfers of political power (Austin, 1999; International IDEA, 2024). Scholars often place India alongside other large, socially heterogeneous democracies to examine how institutional design, electoral administration and party competition interact to support democratic continuity under challenging conditions. Comparative studies repeatedly point to the practical importance of independent election management bodies and courts in sustaining confidence in electoral processes, particularly where elections are large, closely contested and administratively demanding. These institutions are commonly discussed not only as formal safeguards, but as arenas where disputes are resolved and electoral norms are reinforced over time (Norris, 2024).

3. METHODOLOGY

This research paper adopts an analytical approach to the concept of democratic resilience and clarifies how the peaceful or failed transfer of power over time affects the institutional continuity of democracy, public trust and the capacity to maintain the constitutional order. Rather than measuring resilience solely through indices, this analysis interprets it based on institutional performance and political conduct during periods of leadership change.

The study adopts a qualitative comparative framework design based on historical-institutional analysis. It is based on secondary sources from peer-reviewed journal articles, democracy indices, election reports and institutional assessments published between 1990 and 2025 to understand trends in democracy.

Countries are selected on the basis of a deliberate comparative logic, with the goal of showing analytical diversity instead of statistical representativeness. At least one country from each continent is selected for the comparative study, where power was peacefully transferred and one country where this process failed or was interrupted. This method makes it easier to make meaningful comparisons between different types of institutions, governance systems and historical contexts. India is included as a case study because it has a long history of democracy, is large and is important in the global democratic system.

This study looks at three main areas. First, the capacity of institutions is evaluated by looking at the role of election management bodies, the existence and effectiveness of constitution and judicial oversight. Second, political behaviour is judged by how much political leaders accept or reject election results, follow the rule and tradition of power transfer and respect term of governance. Third, the consequence of unsuccessful power transfers are analysed regarding political instability, democratic decline, economic disturbances and social discord. Instead of mainly depending on numerical indicators, this study uses a comparative approach to understand cause and effect by looking at patterns that repeatedly appear across different cases. This qualitative approach is particularly useful for studying peaceful transfers of power, as such transitions are possible not only because of formal rules or traditions but also by political norms, elite conduct and everyday institutional practices—elements that numbers alone cannot fully capture (Przeworski, 2019).

India's experience is examined over time to show how the peaceful transfer of power has taken root as an established institutional practice. By contrast, cases in which transfer of power have broken down, are analyzed to uncover the structural barriers and political choices that stand in the way of democratic succession. By bringing together historical context and contemporary evidence, this approach offers a balanced assessment of both the strengths and vulnerabilities of democratic power transitions in the twenty-first century.

4. GLOBAL EXPERIENCE: PEACEFUL AND FAILED TRANSFERS ACROSS CONTINENTS

In North America, the United States stood as a model of peaceful democratic succession, dating back to the 1801 transfer of power between rival political parties. That record, however, was somewhat shocked after the 2020 presidential election, when some political leaders questioned the validity of the result. This rejection placed significant strain on democratic institutions resulted in a political violence, even though constitutional procedures ultimately held and enabled the transition to proceed (Levitsky et al., 2024).

Canada also continues to demonstrate a strong and consistent pattern of peaceful transfers of power, supported by broad acceptance of election outcomes across parties. On the other hand, Haiti does not show a pattern of peaceful transfers of power. Its political history has been marked by repeated coups, political assassinations and prolonged instability, which have weakened constitutional institutions and led to doubts over the legitimacy of election result (Freedom House, 2024).

In South America, Chile is a really good example of peaceful power transitions of power. After the military regime ended, the country managed to change governments peacefully time after time, which helped strengthen democracy and brought a good deal of economic stability (Mainwaring, 2024). Venezuela, on the other hand, is a clear negative example. There, power hasn't transferred in peaceful way and as a result the authoritarian regime just kept getting stronger, the economy collapsed and large numbers of people migrated to neighbour countries (Corrales, 2024).

In Europe, the United Kingdom and Germany are strong examples of peaceful power transitions that have become deeply ingrained thanks to their constitutional rules and political traditions. (Merkel, 2024). On the flip side, Belarus shows what happens when democratic transitions fail, where elections lacking credibility have resulted in repression, global isolation and persistent political unrest (Freedom House, 2024) Other European democracies further reinforce this pattern. In Spain and Portugal, decades of stable civilian control and well-established parliamentary or constitutional arrangements have made orderly changes of government a routine feature of political life following their democratic transitions. The Nordic countries likewise stand out for conflict-free alternation of power, supported by high levels of institutional trust and strong political norms (Lijphart, 2019; Møller & Skaaning, 2023). In Central and Eastern Europe, states such as the Czech Republic and Slovenia have, for the most part, preserved peaceful electoral turnovers despite wider regional pressures and democratic strain (Vachudova, 2020). Belarus illustrates the consequences of failed democratic transition, where non-competitive elections have consolidated authoritarian rule, intensified repression and resulted in sustained domestic unrest and international isolation (Freedom House, 2024). Hungary points to a different trajectory: although elections continue to be held, the erosion of checks and balances has weakened the substantive meaning of leadership alternation, reflecting a broader pattern of democratic backsliding (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018; V-Dem, 2024)..

In Africa, a few standout countries keep showing how democracy can really work through peaceful, repeated handovers of power. Ghana, Botswana, Senegal, Mauritius and Cape Verde have strong democratic systems having fair elections and respect for the results (even when a party that's ruled for decades gets voted out) and make the switch smoothly. This builds real trust, keeps politics calm and helps economies and everyday life improve (Gyimah-Boadi, 2024). The other side of the story is Mali and Sudan, where things fall apart when the handover process breaks, having military control, violence from jihadist groups resulting in civil war, people lacks basic necessities and the economy fails (Carothers, 2024)..

In Asia, Indonesia's 2024 elections showed how democracy can really work well, with a smooth and peaceful transfer of power in such a huge, diverse country (Aspinall, 2024). India has been doing the same thing for decades—running regular, fair elections where both the winners and losers accept the results without major trouble, keeping the system stable overall. Malaysia is another good example: even in a place where one big group dominated politics for so long, real peaceful change is possible. A few years back, opposition parties took power and even with coalition ups and downs, leaders keep handing over power without violence. Heading into 2026, Anwar Ibrahim's unity government has stayed relatively stable despite some cabinet tweaks and coalition challenges. On the flip side, Myanmar is a tragic case of things going completely wrong. The armed forces refused to accept the election results, launched a coup (Cheesman, 2024). Iran isn't much different—no genuine peaceful change of leaders, because the system only allows certain approved candidates to run and powerful unelected groups keep tight control over everything competition (Maltz, 2024). South Korea has a peaceful transfer of power, but in late 2024 and early 2025, it faced a serious crisis: the president

attempted to impose martial law, leading to strong protests across the country. Parliament impeached the President, the Court upheld it, President was removed from office and an election elected a new President and the transition happened peacefully in the end (Han, 2025).

In Oceania, Australia and New Zealand consistently demonstrate peaceful transfers through parliamentary conventions and electoral trust (McAllister, 2024). In contrast, the Solomon Islands has experienced political instability and contested leadership changes, necessitating external intervention and institutional reform (Dinnen, 2023).

5. INDIA'S EXPERIENCE OF PEACEFUL TRANSFER OF POWER

India has sustained peaceful transfer of power because of strong constitution and institutional resilient. The Constitution established a strong governance foundation and universal adult franchise granted every adult the right to vote. This helped to have a democratic tradition of changing governments peacefully in a highly diverse society.

The first general elections of 1951–1952 after independence were truly unique. Nothing like this had happened before in the post-colonial world. Millions of people, regardless of language, religion, caste, or economic background took part in voting for the first time. The successful conduct of elections and the acceptance of the results by political leaders, built faith in elections and marked the beginning of peaceful democratic governance (Austin, 1999).

In the early decades after independence, one political party (the Congress) dominated politics. Even so, democratic rules were consistently followed, ensuring that political power rested on electoral consent rather than force. By making elections the only legitimate way to gain power, this period created expectations that later made real changes in government, such as the rise of different political parties.

6. ELECTORAL ALTERNATION AND DEMOCRATIC CONSOLIDATION

The real turning point for India was 1977. Before that, the country had gone through the "Emergency," a period where basic rights were taken away. But when the next election came, the people used their power to step-down the then government. Even after such a tense time, the handover of power was totally peaceful. There was no fighting or refusal to leave. This proved that the Constitution is supreme and above any leader.

Experts consider that moment as the day Indian democracy truly "matured". It showed that even the most powerful party could lose and walk away peacefully without violence (Linz and Stepan, 1996). It sent a clear message that in India, power cannot be taken by force, rather it can be earned through ballot.

In the years after that, peaceful power shifts became the new normal. Sometimes one party won and other times a big group of different parties (a coalition) had to work together to lead. This made everyone realize that no one is "king" forever—losing an election is just part of the game. Because these handovers happened so smoothly over and over again, regular people started to really trust the system. They knew their vote actually counted and that trust is exactly what has kept Indian democracy alive through all its ups and downs.

7. INSTITUTIONAL ARCHITECTURE SUPPORTING PEACEFUL TRANSFERS

India's history of peaceful transfers of power is closely linked to the strength and autonomy of its democratic institutions. The Election Commission of India has played an important role by conducting credible elections by ensuring level-playing fields to every stakeholders thorough enforcing the Model Code of Conduct and maintaining confidence in the credibility of election results. Its working have been widely recognised as key reasons why election outcomes are generally accepted by political actors and the public (Quraishi, 2014).

The judiciary has also ensured stable democratic succession. Political parties and leaders have also faith in the Constitution and the Court. Any kind of political disputes is brought in court and the decision of the court is acceptable to one and all. Together, these institutions have created the environment that make peaceful transfers of power possible in India.

8. SCALE, DIVERSITY AND LOGISTICAL COMPLEXITY

India's experience is unmatched because of the huge size and diversity. Conducting elections for hundreds of millions of electors across different regions, geographic terrains, languages and social groups is a tough task. Even with these challenges, changes of government have taken place peacefully, without violence or breakdown of institutions. This reflects both the administrative strength of the Indian state and the general willingness of citizens and political leaders to accept election results (International IDEA, 2024).

The fact that power changes hands peacefully in such a diverse society shows how deeply democratic values are rooted in Indian political system. Elections are widely seen as a legitimate way to bring about political change, even during periods of strong competition and political tension.

Recent general elections have once again reaffirmed India's capacity to manage democratic process. Although the ruling party has remained in power in recent election cycles, opposition parties have accepted the results, avoiding any kind of disruptions. International observers have also recognised India's elections as credible and professionally managed (Norris, 2024).

9. INDIA IN COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

In the world of political science, India is seen as a true "outlier"—a country that broke all the rules. Usually, when historians look at nations gaining independence from colonial rule, they see a sad pattern of coups, dictators, or one-party takeovers. But for over seventy years, India has consistently passed power from one hand to another without picking up a gun. This didn't happen by accident; it was the result of smart early choices in the Constitution and a deep-seated respect for the idea that the law is higher than any politician (Przeworski, 2019).

What makes the Indian story so important for researchers is that it proves democracy can work anywhere. A lot of old-school theories used to claim that a country needed to be wealthy or have a very similar population to stay democratic. India flips that logic on its head. It shows that even with some kind of poverty & illiteracy, huge diversity and a billion-plus people, you can still have a peaceful handover of power. It once again proved that democracy isn't just for rich or small countries, it's about building institutions that people actually trust.

10.COMPARATIVE OVERVIEW

Looking at the evidence from different continents, one thing is clear: a country’s survival depends on how it handles losing an election. In countries, where people trust the election process and where courts actually do their jobs and where politicians follow the rules, democracy stays strong even when there is close competition. But when leaders try to rig the results or refuse to step down, when election results are rejected or manipulated, institutions quickly erode, opening the door to repression, military takeovers, or chronic instability, as shown in the table below:

Table 1: Peaceful and Failed Transfers of Power Across Continents

Continent	Peaceful Transfer Cases (References)	Failed Transfer Cases (References)	Key Consequences of Failed Transfers
North America	United States (Levitsky et al., 2024) Canada (Freedom House, 2024)	Haiti (Freedom House, 2024)	Political violence, prolonged instability
South America	Chile (Mainwaring, 2024)	Venezuela (Corrales, 2024)	Authoritarian consolidation, economic collapse, mass migration
Europe	United Kingdom; Germany (Merkel, 2024); Spain; Portugal (Lijphart, 2019); Nordic states (Møller & Skaaning, 2023); Czech Republic; Slovenia (Vachudova, 2020)	Belarus (Freedom House, 2024); Hungary (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018; V-Dem, 2024)	Repression, democratic erosion, weakened checks and balances, international isolation
Africa	Ghana; Botswana; Senegal; Mauritius; Cape Verde (Gyimah-Boadi, 2024)	Mali; Sudan (Carothers, 2024)	Military coups, constitutional suspension, civil conflict, humanitarian crises
Asia	India (Austin, 1999; Norris, 2024); Indonesia (Aspinall, 2024); Malaysia (Case, 2023); South Korea (Han, 2025)	Myanmar (Cheesman, 2024); Iran (Maltz, 2024); Thailand (Chambers, 2020)	Military coups, restricted political competition, civil war, democratic breakdown
Oceania	Australia; New Zealand (McAllister, 2024)	Solomon Islands (Dinnen, 2023)	Governance instability, contested leadership, external intervention

Looking at the evidence from different continents, one thing is clear: a country’s survival depends on how it handles losing an election. In countries, where people trust the election process and where courts actually do their jobs and where politicians follow the rules, democracy stays strong even when there is close competition. But when leaders try to rig the results or refuse to step down, when election results are rejected or manipulated, institutions quickly erode, opening the door to repression, military takeovers, or chronic instability.

This comparison also proves that you don’t have to be a rich country to have a working democracy. It isn’t about how much strong economy a nation has or where it is on the map; it’s about how much the people are involved in democratic process and whether the public believes their vote actually counts. Ultimately, the simple act of accepting a loss is the strongest shield a country has against total collapse.

11.CONCLUSION

The peaceful transfer of power is the best proof that a democracy is seasoned, healthy and working the way it should. Examples from around the world show that where leaders accept

election results and hand over power without conflict, democratic systems tend to be more stable and better able to face difficult times. Where this does not happen, the results are often serious, including political violence, authoritarian rule and long-term damage to public institutions.

In this global context, India's democratic journey stands out. For many decades, power has changed hands peacefully in a society marked by great diversity, where every corner is totally different from other. This is against the idea that democracy can survive only in small, wealthy, or socially homogeneous countries; conversely, India demonstrates that following constitutional driven-path, credible electoral institutions and public trust in elections, democratic governance can be sustained.

When political parties, especially the party in power, respect the results and let power change hands peacefully, society benefits from more stability, development and strengthen the hands of constitutional bodies. On the other side, when elections are sabotaged through electoral fraud, widespread coercion, voter suppression, or manipulation of results, they often leads to mass protests and violent crackdowns, economic collapse, human rights violations and mass displacement as refugees, creating regional migration pressures immense human suffering. History and recent events provide clear illustrations of this pattern.

India's experience shows that the peaceful transfer of power is a core element of democratic strength. While new challenges continue to arise, the country's institutional foundations and long-standing democratic practices show that peaceful transitions can be sustained. As many democracies are under pressure, protecting the norms and institutions that enable peaceful transfers is crucial for the future of democracy.

REFERENCES

- [1] Aspinall, E. (2024). Indonesia's elections and democratic resilience. *Journal of Democracy*, 35(2), 45–59.
- [2] Austin, G. (1999). *Working a Democratic Constitution: The Indian Experience*. Oxford University Press
- [3] Carothers, T. (2024). Democracy after coups in Africa. *Carnegie Endowment Report*.
- [4] Case, W. (2023). *Malaysia's electoral breakthrough and coalition politics*. *Asian Survey*, 63(4), 620–641.
- [5] Chambers, P. (2020). *Thailand's repeated democratic breakdowns*. *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, 42(1), 1–25.
- [6] Cheesman, N. (2024). Myanmar's coup and democratic collapse. *Asian Survey*, 64(1), 1–22.
- [7] Corrales, J. (2024). Venezuela's authoritarian consolidation. *Latin American Politics and Society*, 66(1), 1–20.
- [8] Dahl, R. (1971). *Polyarchy*. Yale University Press.
- [9] Diamond, L. (2020). *Ill winds: Saving democracy from Russian rage, Chinese ambition and American complacency*. New York: Penguin Random House.
- [10] Dinnen, S. (2023). *Political instability and state-building in the Solomon Islands*. *Pacific Affairs*, 96(3), 401–420.
- [11] Freedom House. (2024). *Freedom in the World 2024: Marking 50 Years in the Struggle for Democracy*. Freedom House.
- [12] Gyimah-Boadi, E. (2024). Democratic alternation in Africa. *Third World Quarterly*, 45(6), 1021–1038.
- [13] Han, S. (2025). Martial law, democratic erosion and democratic resilience in South Korea. *Asian Journal of Comparative Politics*, 0(0). <https://doi.org/10.1177/20578911251369983>
- [14] Huntington, S. (1991). *The Third Wave*. University of Oklahoma Press.
- [15] International IDEA. (2024). *Global State of Democracy Report 2024*. International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance.

- [14] Kohli, A. (2020). *Democracy and development in India: From transition to consolidation*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- [15] Levitsky, S., & Ziblatt, D. (2018). *How Democracies Die*. Crown Publishing.
- [16] Levitsky, S., Way, L., & Casey, N. (2024). Polarization and democratic stress. *Comparative Political Studies*, 57(4), 567–590.
- [17] Levitsky, S., Ziblatt, D., McCoy, J., & Press, B. (2024). *The 2020 U.S. election and democratic strain*. *Journal of Democracy*, 35(1), 20–35.
- [18] Lijphart, A. (2019). *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries* (2nd ed.). Yale University Press.
- [19] Mainwaring, S. (2024). Democratic stability in Latin America. *Electoral Studies*, 82, 102620.
- [20] Maltz, G. (2024). *Electoral authoritarianism in Iran*. *Middle East Journal*, 78(1), 30–48.
- [21] McAllister, I. (2024). Electoral trust in Australia. *Australian Journal of Political Science*, 59(1), 1–18.
- [22] Merkel, W. (2024). Democracy in crisis? *Government and Opposition*, 59(3), 401–420.
- [23] Miller, C. (2025). *The origins of peaceful power transfer in the United States*. *Journal of American Political History*, 42(1), 23–45.
- [24] Møller, J., & Skaaning, S.-E. (2023). *Democracy and Democratization in Comparative Perspective: Conceptions, Conjunctures, Causes and Consequences* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- [25] Norris, P. (2024). *Do elections still matter? Democratic trust in the 21st century*. Cambridge University Press.
- [26] Paul, T. V., Wivel, A., & He, K. (2024). *International organizations and peaceful change*. Cambridge University Press.
- [27] Przeworski, A. (1991). *Democracy and the Market*. Cambridge University Press.
- [28] Quraishi, S. Y. (2014). *An Undocumented Wonder: The Great Indian Election*. Rupa Publications.
- [29] Sishuwa, S. (2025). *Elite and popular basis for legitimacy of democracy in Zambia since 1991*. *Canadian Journal of African Studies*. 59, , 361-382. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00083968.2025.2492382>
- [30] Snidal, Duncan. (2025). *How informal intergovernmental organizations facilitate cooptation and promote peaceful change intimes of power rivalry*. *Contemporary Security Policy*. 46, 1, 150–176. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13523260.2024.2424706>
- [31] Yadav, Y. (2024). *Elections and democratic consolidation in India*. *Indian Journal of Political Science*, 85(2), 101–120.
- [32] Vachudova, M. A. (2020). *Democratic Backsliding in Central Europe*. *East European Politics*, 36(3), 318–340.
- [33] V-Dem Institute. (2024). *Democracy Report 2024: Democracy Winning and Losing at the Ballot*. University of Gothenburg.