



Guatemala — Va-PoReg Country Report

Kailitz, Steffen, et al., 2026: Varieties of Political Regimes (Va-PoReg). Country Report Guatemala, Dresden: Hannah Arendt Institute for Totalitarianism Studies.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/JYEL7U>

09/15/1821 Start Electoral Oligarchical Autocracy: On 09/15/1821, Guatemala, a former colony of Spain, became part of the Federal Republic of Central America, which declared independence from Spain. On 04/17/1839, Guatemala declared its independence from the Federal Republic of Central America. From 02/08/1898 to 04/15/1920 Manuel José Estrada Cabrera was the President of Guatemala, using brutal methods and effectively controlling general elections to assert his authority. On 04/15/1920, Dictator Manuel Estrada Cabrera (1898-1920) was declared mentally unfit to rule by the National Assembly. The background was the formation of a new political party, the so-called Unionist Party, which had organized large scale demonstrations. Between 04/08 and 04/14/1920 the 'Tragic Week' took place. Cabrera refused to leave office and triggered civil uprisings under the leadership of the Unionist Party. Important for the downfall of Cabrera was also the missing support of the United States and the United Fruit Company, which saw their interests better protected in a new president. On 04/15/1920 he surrendered, and Carlos Herrera y Luna assumed the role of interim president until 09/15/1920 and was elected on 08/27/1920 (Cardoso 1986: 220-21, Dunkerley 1990: 212, Casey et al. 2020: 7).¹ Despite the popular uprising the change in the presidency does not display a regime change. The coalition which had been responsible for the ousting of Cabrera was very heterogenous and pursued different goals. Therefore, Herrera was not only tasked with safeguarding the interests of the economically and politically influential coffee elite in the nation, but he also faced intense pressure to meet exaggerated social, economic, and political expectations from university students and urban workers (Kit 1993: 34). Nearly the whole Guatemalan elite was at that point dependent on the coffee industry, therefore, the decline in coffee prices led to a serious economic and political crisis. Despite Herreras good intention to pursue a politic style which would adhere individual liberties, press freedom and liberal principles in general, he was not able to overcome the economic and the incrementing political crisis (Kit 1993). Universal male suffrage was only granted in 1945. Before then illiterates were excluded and therefore a huge part of the indigenous population (Kellam 2013: 28-29). During the rule of Cabrera (1904, 1910, 1916) voters made only 5.0 % of the whole population up. In 1920 the percentage rose to 20,6 percentage (Vanhanen 2019). We classify this period as an electoral oligarchical autocracy because of the restricted suffrage and the clearly identifiable oligarchic class made up of the coffee elite. Based on our observations, multiparty executive and legislative elections were held during this period, which aligns with the observations of LIED. LIED categorizes elections during this time as not competitive. In addition the elections were not free and fair and executive constraints extremely weak. V-Dem's EF&FI and CEI score the elections as neither free, fair nor clean. Besides, both LIED and V-Dem's PCLI confirm that political liberties were absent for the whole period. Based on Polity5's assessment, during this period, the executive operated with unlimited authority, facing no institutional checks on power. From 1900 to 1918, V-Dem's JCE is interpreted by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were limited, while V-Dem's LCE is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were absent. From 1919 to 1921, V-Dem's JCE is interpreted by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were moderate, while V-Dem's LCE is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were absent.

12/05/1921 End Electoral Oligarchical Autocracy/Start Military Autocracy: On this date the military under the leadership of General Jose Maria Orellana took over in a coup and forced the resignation of Herrera. Orellana

and the two military officers José María Lima and Miguel Larrave formed a military junta. On 12/06/1921 the National Assembly accepted the resignation of the former president. The National Assembly was dismissed, because the Junta claimed that Cabrera had been removed unconstitutional and therefore, the Assembly and all legislation passed in this period had to be unconstitutional too. The old Assembly of the Cabrera period was reinstated. This Assembly then named Orellana the First Designate and on 12/11/1921 he assumed executive responsibilities (Kit 1993: 59-61). On 02/22/1922 presidential elections were held. Orellana won against Jorge Ubico. The military controlled the elections and silenced any opposition.² During General José María Orellana's presidency in Guatemala, political parties were banned. This move was part of his broader efforts to consolidate power and control the political landscape of the country. In 1926 Orellana was succeeded by General Lazaro Chacon. On 12/05/1926, general elections were held in Guatemala. The presidential election resulted in a victory for General Lázaro Chacón, who received 88.6% of the vote. Whilst the elections were rigged, the Progressive Liberal Party did manage to win some seats in the Congress.³ After Lazaro Chacon suffered a stroke in 1930, he was succeeded by cabinet member Baudilio Palma. LIED still indicated that political liberties were absent. V-Dem's PCLI scores them as not really present until 1923 and as absent from 1924 onwards. According to Polity5, during this period, the executive encountered slight limitations on decision-making power imposed by other institutions. For the relevant regime period, V-Dem's JCE is interpreted by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were moderate, while V-Dem's LCE is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were absent. According to LIED no multiparty executive and legislative elections were held in 1921, in 1922 executive and legislative elections, which weren't multiparty, were held, from 1923 onward multiparty executive and legislative elections were held.

12/16[&17]/1930 End Military Autocracy/Start Military Autocracy: On this date, a military coup led by General Orellana Contreras and Luis Leonardo forced Palma to resign after a short battle inside the Presidential Palace. During the fight, that lasted no more than an hour, Mauro de León died. The Liberal Progresista party placed General Roderico Anzueto in the key position of Chief of Police. Once in power, Orellana Contreras reformed the Cabinet and worked on restructuring the Guatemalan military bases. However, given the large investments that American companies had in Guatemala -especially the United Fruit Company, the United States Secretary of State Henry Stimson publicly denounced Orellana as an unconstitutional leader and demanded his removal. Realizing that the Americans would not recognize his government, Orellana resigned on 12/29. Stimson sent Ambassador Shelton Whitehouse to tell Orellana Contreras that his country would not be dealing with the new Guatemalan president whatsoever. Whitehouse pressed the National Assembly to force Orellana Contreras to resign, taking advantage of Orellana's lack of political experience, and the American government needed a stable regime in Guatemala (Dunkerley 1990: 213, Casey et al. 2020: 8).⁴ LIED identifies political liberties as absent, and V-Dem's PCLI is also classified by us as indicating that political liberties were absent. During this regime period, V-Dem's JCE is classified by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were moderate, whereas V-Dem's LCE is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were absent.

02/09/1931 End Military Autocracy/Start Military Autocracy: On 02/14/1931, yielding to pressure from the USA, coup leader Orellana relinquished power, paving the way for General Jorge Ubico to successfully coerce opposition candidates into refraining from participating in the 02/1931 elections, where he secured victory unopposed. Throughout his term, Ubico systematically obstructed opposition involvement, seldom convened cabinet meetings, reduced Congress to a symbolic role, and maintained a substantial secret police force to quell dissent (Dunkerley 1990: 213-15, Yashar 1997: 42-49, Streeter 2000: 10-12, Casey et al. 2020: 8). The Liberal Party and Progressives nominated Ubico as the only candidate, leading to his election with 305,841 votes. Upon taking office, Ubico promised a "march toward civilization" and adopted dictatorial powers, establishing an autocratic regime. John Gunther in 1941 highlighted Ubico's complete control over Guatemala. Ubico militarized key institutions and placed military officers in significant government roles, frequently conducting national tours with military and official entourage to underscore his authority.⁵ Since

1930 both LIED and V-Dem's PCLI confirm the absence of political liberties. Based on Polity5's assessment, during this period, the executive operated with unlimited authority, facing no institutional checks on power. For the relevant regime period, V-Dem's JCE is interpreted by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were moderate, while V-Dem's LCE is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were absent. According to LIED executive and legislative elections, which weren't multiparty, were held.

07/01/1944 End Military Autocracy/Start Non-Electoral Transitional Regime: In June 1944, student protests sparked a political shift, leading to Ubico's resignation once junior officers and the middle class showed their support (Dunkerley 1990: 218, Streeter 2000: 12, Casey et al. 2020: 8). A junta composed of military officers Francisco Javier Arana, Jacobo Árbenz and Jorge Toriello took power and quickly announced presidential elections.

12/17[-19]/1944 End Non-Electoral Transitional Regime/Start Electoral Democracy: On these dates largely free and fair presidential elections were held.⁶ The following ten years until 1954 are known as the Guatemalan Revolution.⁷ Women could vote from 1945 on, but only if literate.⁸ Universal female suffrage was only granted in 1965 (Rodriguez-Saenz 2008: 314). The regime is despite severe democratic defects usually classified as democratic (GWF, MCM, PRC, BMR). There was no universal adult suffrage, regardless of literacy. Hence, we face an exclusive electoral regime. Based on our observations, multiparty executive and legislative elections were held during this period, which aligns with the observations of LIED. LIED categorizes these elections as competitive. V-Dem's EF&FI scores them as somewhat free and fair while their CEI scores electoral cleanliness as ambiguous. Additionally, political liberties were absent according to LIED and classified as what we interpret as somewhat present by V-Dem's PCLI. According to Polity5, during this period, the executive encountered slight limitations on decision-making power imposed by other institutions. From 1945 to 1952, V-Dem's JCE is interpreted by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were robust, while V-Dem's LCE is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were moderate. For 1953 and 1954, V-Dem's JCE is interpreted by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were moderate, while V-Dem's LCE is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were absent.

06/27/1954 End Electoral Democracy/Start Military Autocracy: On this date, fearful of communism in the Western hemisphere the CIA in league with anti-Arbenz rebel leader Armas overthrew the democracy (Dunkerley 1992: 300, Gibson 1989: 172, Geddes/Wright/Frantz 2014b: 62).

06/29/1954 End Military Autocracy/Start Military Autocracy: The CIA aided other opposition military leaders to oust the Diaz junta and helped to install the Monzon junta. In 1956 universal male suffrage was introduced (LIED). Carlos Castillo Armas was assassinated in 1957, and elections were held immediately afterwards by a military junta. However, these elections were so fraudulent that popular outcry forced a fresh ballot.⁹ LIED codes political liberties as absent. V-Dem's PCLI indicates an ambiguous state in 1954 and a decrease to an absent level afterwards. As per Polity5's classification, the executive wielded unrestricted authority without any formal limitations during this time. For the relevant regime period, V-Dem's JCE is interpreted by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were moderate, while V-Dem's LCE is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were absent. According to LIED no multiparty executive and legislative elections were held in 1954 and 1955, in 1956 only legislative elections, which weren't multiparty, were held.

10/24/1957 End Military Autocracy/Start Military Autocracy: Rioting following a contested election resulted in a military coup. On this date a group of 80 military officers marched into the presidential palace and replaced provisional president Luis Arturo González López with a three-person junta led by army Colonel Óscar Mendoza.¹⁰ Both LIED and V-Dem's PCLI indicate political liberties were absent. As per Polity5's classification, the executive wielded unrestricted authority without any formal limitations during this time. During this regime period, V-Dem's JCE is classified by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the

executive were moderate, whereas V-Dem's LCE is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were absent. According to LIED only multiparty legislative elections, which weren't multiparty, were held.

02/02/1958 End Military Autocracy/Start Electoral Autocracy: Congress selected the candidate who secured the most votes in the January 1958 election as president, a contest from which left-leaning candidates were barred. Despite the exclusion of several parties with significant public backing, rendering the election neither free nor fair, a candidate opposed by the military emerged victorious (Dunkerley 1988: 439, Geddes/Wright/Frantz 2014b: 62-63). Based on our observations, multiparty executive and legislative elections were held during this period, which aligns with the observations of LIED. LIED categorizes the elections as not competitive. V-Dem's EF&FI and CEI score them as neither free, fair nor clean. Furthermore, according to LIED and V-Dem's PCLI political liberties were not achieved. According to Polity5, during this period, the executive encountered slight limitations on decision-making power imposed by other institutions. For the relevant regime period, V-Dem's JCE is interpreted by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were moderate, while V-Dem's LCE is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were absent.

03/30/1963 End Electoral Autocracy/Start Military Autocracy: Colonel Enrique Peralta orchestrated a military coup that installed a ruling military junta under his leadership (Dunkerley 1988: 443, Geddes/Wright/Frantz 2014b: 63). After coming to power, Peralta suspended the Constitution, dissolved the Congress, and banned the Communist Party (PGT) (Weaver 1969).¹¹ Voting restrictions were lifted in 1965. Illiterates could vote from then on.¹² Besides, political liberties were still indicated as absent per LIED and V-Dem's PCLI. As per Polity5's classification, the executive wielded unrestricted authority without any formal limitations during this time. During this regime period, V-Dem's JCE is classified by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were moderate, whereas V-Dem's LCE is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were absent. According to LIED no multiparty executive and legislative elections were held.

05/10/1966 End Military Autocracy/Start Electoral (Military) Autocracy: Following the March 1966 presidential election, Mendez Montenegro was appointed president by Congress in accordance with the constitution, due to the absence of a majority victor in the election. The left and various other parties were barred from participation. Montenegro, a civilian centrist, secured the highest number of votes against a candidate backed by the military. To be sworn in, he was compelled to concede control over military "own" affairs and key policy domains to the military. (Calvert 1985: 83, Dunkerley 1988: 459, Johnson 1971: 35, Weaver 1970: 68, 78). Beginning in November 1966, a state of siege further curtailed constitutional rights (Dunkerley 1988: 457, Geddes/Wright/Frantz 2014b: 63). On 03/01/1970 Colonel Arana, candidate of the military, MLN and PID, won in a presidential election in which the left and some other parties were prohibited from running (Berger 1986: 563, Dunkerley 1988: 459, Johnson 1971: 41, Montenegro Rios 2002: 122-23, 133). From this election until 1985, only military officers were permitted to win elections, so this regime is coded as a different from the previous one in which civilians shared top policy making positions with the military" (Geddes/Wright/Frantz 2014b: 63). Different from GWF, which coded the presidential election of 1970 as a regime change, we view it as a continuation of the military subtype of an electoral autocracy, with more or less the same ruling elite. Based on our observations, multiparty executive and legislative elections were held during this period, which aligns with the observations of LIED. LIED categorizes the elections as not competitive. V-Dem's EF&FI and CEI score them as neither free, fair nor clean. As per FH's classification for 1972, the country receives a score of 5 as free, which we categorize as rather free. In 1973 the country is classified as free, scoring between 2 and 4, which we also place in the free category. Between 1974 and 1978 a score of 6 to 7 for the assessed regime period designates the country as partly free, which aligns with our interpretation of rather free. Per FH's evaluation for 1979, the country scores from 9 to 10 as not free, which we categorize as rather not free. For the remaining period a score between 11 and 14 makes the country not free, which we also place in the not free category. Moreover, political liberties were still absent (LIED, V-Dem PCLI). According to Polity5, during this period, the executive encountered slight limitations

on decision-making power imposed by other institutions. For the relevant regime period, V-Dem's JCE is interpreted by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were moderate, while V-Dem's LCE is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were absent.

03/23/1982 End Electoral (Military) Autocracy/Start Military Autocracy: General Romeo Lucas towards the end of his term was seen as threatening to the popular will and the military establishment. In March 1982, a CIA-backed coup led by General Efraín Ríos Montt Ríos deposed incumbent Lucas, effectively negating the victory of Ángel Aníbal Guevara, the hand-picked successor of Lucas and candidate of the Popular Democratic Front, in fraudulent presidential elections held on 03/07/1982. Montt established a short lived junta before ruling on his own (Haggard/Kaufman/Teo 2016: 80).¹³ As per Polity5's classification, the executive wielded unrestricted authority without any formal limitations during this time. LIED identifies political liberties as absent, and V-Dem's PCLI is likewise classified by us as showing that political liberties were absent. During this regime period, V-Dem's JCE is classified by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were moderate, whereas V-Dem's LCE is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were absent. According to LIED no multiparty executive and legislative elections were held.

08/08/1983 End Military Autocracy/Start Military Autocracy: Vicores and his group of dissident armed forces believed that religious extremism had taken over the government. He removed Montt and took the military presidency for himself. In 1984, the military government declared elections for an 88-member Constituent Assembly, tasked with formulating a new constitution and electoral law. The constitution was officially unveiled in 06/1985 (Haggard/Kaufman/Teo 2016: 30).¹⁴ As classified by FH for this regime period, the country is scored from 11 to 14 as not free, which corresponds to our interpretation of not free. Since 1982 LIED and V-Dem's PCLI indicate that state of political liberties is classified as absent per LIED and per V-Dem's PCLI. were absent. As per Polity5's classification, the executive wielded unrestricted authority without any formal limitations during this time. For the relevant regime period, V-Dem's JCE is interpreted by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were moderate, while V-Dem's LCE is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were absent. According to LIED no multiparty executive and legislative elections were held.

11/03/1985 End Military Autocracy/Start Electoral (Military) Hybrid Regime: On this date the first round of presidential elections was held. The second round of a fair, semi-competitive presidential election in which non-leftist parties were allowed to run was won by the Christian Democrats (Anderson 1988: 61). The military-maintained authority over its own matters and possessed veto power over significant policy domains. It persisted in excluding left-leaning parties from participating in elections and retained veto authority in certain policy arenas (Dunkerley 1988: 498-99, Geddes/Wright/Frantz 2014b: 63-64). The government's exclusion was often justified under the pretext of national security and anti-communism during the Cold War era. The critical question is whether all these excluded parties were extremist, or if some were non-violent political groups advocating for leftist ideologies within a legal framework. One of the central issues was the absence of judicial oversight over the executive's power to ban political parties. This lack of judicial review enabled the arbitrary exclusion of political parties, particularly leftist groups, from the electoral process, hindering true democratic representation. Hence, the regime is classified as a military subtype of an electoral autocracy. Based on our observations, multiparty executive and legislative elections were held during this period, which aligns with the observations of LIED. LIED categorizes elections during this time as competitive. V-Dem's EF&FI scores electoral freedom and fairness as ambiguous between 1985 and 1989. After that, it scores elections as somewhat free and fair. V-Dem's CEI scores electoral cleanliness as ambiguous. Per FH's scoring for 1985, the country is classified as partly free with a score of 8, which we categorize as rather not free. Between 1986 and 1990 a score of 6 to 7 for the assessed regime period designates the country as partly free, which aligns with our interpretation of rather free. In 1991 the country receives a score of 8, which we interpret as falling into the rather not free category. For the remaining period the country scores from 9 to 10 as not free, which we categorize as rather not free. Moreover, political liberties

were still absent according to LIED. V-Dem's PCLI considers them as ambiguous. FH classifies Guatemala in this period as partly free. According to Polity5, during this period, the executive encountered slight limitations on decision-making power imposed by other institutions. Given all observations Guatemala is according to our classification an electoral hybrid regime in this period. For the year 1986, V-Dem's JCE is interpreted by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were robust, while V-Dem's LCE is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were limited. From 1987 to 1993, V-Dem's JCE is interpreted by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were robust, while V-Dem's LCE is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were moderate. For 1994 and 1995, V-Dem's JCE and LCE are both interpreted by us as indicating robust constraints on the executive.

11/12/1995 End Electoral (Military) Hybrid Regime/Start Electoral Democracy: On this date, rather free and fair general elections in which the left was for the first time allowed to participate marked the end of military rule (Jonas 2000: 21-22, Geddes/Wright/Frantz 2014b: 64).¹⁵ Based on our observations, multiparty executive and legislative elections were held during this period, which aligns with the observations of LIED. LIED categorizes all elections after 1995 as competitive and V-Dem's EF&FI scores them as somewhat free and fair. V-Dem's CEI continues to rank their electoral cleanliness as ambiguous until 2008, when it upgraded its score to somewhat clean elections. General elections were held on 09/11/2011 in order to elect the president, vice president, members of congress, members of parliament and mayors and counselors for all municipalities.¹⁶ Observers from the non-profit electoral watchdog, Mirador Electoral, reported 65 incidents of voting irregularities, including illegal campaigning in Guatemala's capital, as well as attempted vote buying in several sites across the country.¹⁷ The elections commenced on 06/16 in 2019, and during the August 2019 runoff, Alejandro Giammattei from the Vamos party secured 58 percent of the vote, triumphing over former first lady Sandra Torres of the center-left National Unity for Hope party (UNE). Although the results were deemed credible, electoral observers from the Organization of American States (OAS) highlighted irregularities, including disruptions, ballot burning, voter intimidation, and instances of violence. Giammattei assumed office in January 2020.¹⁸ General elections were held on 06/25/2023, covering various positions including the president, vice president, all seats in Congress, members of the Central American Parliament, and mayors and councils for all municipalities. Incumbent president Alejandro Giammattei could not run for reelection due to constitutional limits. As no presidential candidate secured over 50 percent of the vote in the first round, a runoff was held on 08/20/2023, between Congressman Bernardo Arévalo and former first lady Sandra Torres. Arévalo won nearly 61 percent of the vote. The ruling Vamos party gained the most seats in Congress. On 12/08/2023, the Attorney General's office reported "irregularities" in the election and requested an annulment of the results. However, the Constitutional Court upheld the election results on 12/14, ordering Arévalo's inauguration. Challenges in Congress caused delays, but Arévalo was eventually inaugurated on 01/15.¹⁹ Government functioning is significantly hampered by organized crime and corruption. Serious issues such as violence and criminal extortion schemes prevail, with victims having limited avenues for seeking justice.²⁰ As classified by FH for the period until 2001, the country is partly free with a score ranging from 6 to 7, which we place in the rather free category. Between 2002 and 2005 the country is partly free with a score of 8, which we interpret as rather not free. From 2006 to 2008 a score of 6 to 7 designates the country as partly free, which aligns with our interpretation of rather free. In 2009 and 2010 the country is classified as partly free with a score of 8, which we categorize as rather not free. Between 2011 and 2014 Guatemala is partly free with a score ranging from 6 to 7, which we place in the rather free category. From 2015 onward it receives scores of 8 to 9, which we interpret as falling into the rather not free category. Regarding the political liberties they were coded as absent for the entire time per LIED. V-Dem's PCLI scores them as somewhat present from 1996 to 1999, in 2018 and since 2020. For the other years full political liberties were given. From 1996 to 2014, based on Polity5's evaluation, the executive's power was limited to a degree between substantial constraints and parity with other institutions, fitting Intermediate Category 3. Since 2015, according to Polity5, the executive was subordinate to or held equal power with other institutions, indicating executive parity or subordination. In all regime datasets – BMR, GWF, LIED, MCM, RoW – Guatemala is classified as

a democracy. RoW classifies it as an electoral democracy. According to our data it is an electoral democracy. However, in the present and other parts of this regime period Guatemala is/was a borderline case between an electoral democracy and an electoral hybrid regime. From 1996 to 1999, V-Dem's JCE is interpreted by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were robust, while V-Dem's LCE is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were moderate. From 2000 to 2020, V-Dem's JCE and LCE are both interpreted by us as indicating robust constraints on the executive. For 2021 and 2022, V-Dem's JCE is classified by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were robust, whereas V-Dem's LCE is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were moderate. For 2023, V-Dem's JCE and LCE are both interpreted by us as indicating moderate constraints on the executive.

Electoral Democracy as of 07/01/2025 continued.

Additional sources (Bendel/Krennerich 2005, Cameron 1994, Villagrán de León 1993)

Notes

¹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Manuel_Estrada_Cabrera; https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Carlos_Herrera;
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tragic_Week_\(Guatemala\)#](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tragic_Week_(Guatemala)#)

² https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1922_Guatemalan_presidential_election

³ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1926_Guatemalan_general_election

⁴ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Baudilio_Palma#Coup_d'etat

⁵ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jorge_Ubico

⁶ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1944_Guatemalan_presidential_election

⁷ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Guatemalan_Revolution#October_Revolution

⁸ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Women%27s_suffrage

⁹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Miguel_Yd%C3%ADgoras_Fuentes

¹⁰ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Luis_Arturo_Gonz%C3%A1lez_L%C3%B3pez

¹¹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Enrique_Peralta_Azurdia

¹² https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Women%27s_suffrage

¹³ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1982_Guatemalan_general_election

¹⁴ https://www.constituteproject.org/constitution/Guatemala_1993?lang=en

¹⁵ <http://tinyurl.com/8chamu2>

¹⁶ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2011_Guatemalan_general_election

¹⁷ <https://insightcrime.org/news/brief/guatemala-elections-hit-by-fraud-ballot-burning/>

¹⁸ <https://freedomhouse.org/country/guatemala>

¹⁹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2023_Guatemalan_general_election

²⁰ <https://freedomhouse.org/country/guatemala/freedom-world/2022>

References

Anderson, Thomas P. (1988): *Politics in Central America: Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, and Nicaragua*. New York: Praeger.

Bendel, Petra/Krennerich, Michael (2005): Guatemala, in: Nohlen, Dieter (Hrsg.), *Elections in the Americas: A Data Handbook*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 317–353.

Berger, Susan A. (1986): *State and Agrarian Development: Guatemala (1931-1978)*. New York: Columbia University.

Calvert, Peter (1985): *Guatemala: A Nation in Turmoil*. Boulder: Westview.

Cameron, Maxwell A. (1994): *Explaining Autogolpes: A Comparative Analysis of Peru, Russia, Guatemala, and Brazil*. Atlanta, Georgia.

Cardoso, Ciro F. (1986): Central America: The Liberal Era, c. 1870-1930, *The Cambridge History of Latin America*. New York: The Cambridge History of Latin America, 195–228.

Casey, Adam E./Lachapelle, Jean/Levitsky, Steven, et al. (2020): *Revolutionary Autocracies, 1900-2015: Codebook*. Cambridge: Harvard University.

Dunkerley, James (1988): *Power in the Isthmus: A Political History of Modern Central America*. London: Verso.

- Dunkerley, James (1990): Guatemala since 1930, in: Bethell, Leslie (Hrsg.), *The Cambridge History of Latin America: 1930 to the Present*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 211-250.
- Dunkerley, James (1992): Guatemala, in: Bethell, Leslie & Roxborough, Ian (Hrsg.), *Latin American Between the Second World War and the Cold War, 1944-1948*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 300-326.
- Geddes, Barbara/Wright, Joseph/Frantz, Erica (2014a): Autocratic Breakdown and Regime Transitions: A New Data Set, in: *Perspectives on Politics* 12, 313-331.
- Geddes, Barbara/Wright, Joseph/Frantz, Erica (2014b): *Autocratic Regimes Code Book. Version 1.2*. Los Angeles, University Park, Bridgewater: UCLA, Pennsylvania State University, Bridgewater State University.
- Gibson, Edward (1989): Nine Cases of the Breakdown of Democracy, in: Pastor, Robert A. (Hrsg.), *Democracy in the Americas: Stopping the Pendulum*. New York: Holmes and Meier, 159-203.
- Haggard, Stephan/Kaufman, Robert/Teo, Terence (2016): *Distributive Conflict and Regime Change: A Qualitative Dataset (Codebook)*. San Diego/Rutgers: University of California/State University of New Jersey.
- Johnson, Kenneth F. (1971): The 1966 and 1970 Elections in Guatemala: A Comparative Analysis, in: *World Affairs* 134, 34-50.
- Jonas, Susanne (2000): Democratization through Peace: The Difficult Case of Guatemala, in: *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs* 42, 9-38.
- Kellam, Marisa (2013): Suffrage Extensions and Voting Patterns in Latin America: Is Mobilization a Source of Decay?, in: *Latin American Politics & Society* 55, 23-46.
- Kit, Wade (1993): The Unionist Experiment in Guatemala, 1920-1921: Conciliation, Disintegration, and the Liberal Junta, in: *The Americas* 50, 31-46.
- Montenegro Rios, Carlos R. (2002): *Historia de los Partidos Politicos en Guatemala*. Guatemala City: Mayaprin S.A.
- Streeter, Stephen M. (2000): *Managing the Counterrevolution: The United States and Guatemala, 1954-1961*. Athens: Ohio University Press.
- Vanhanen, Tatu (2019): *Measures of Democracy 1810-2018 Dataset*. Finnish Social Science Data Archive.
- Weaver, Jerry L. (1969): The Military Elite and Political Control in Guatemala, 1963-1966, in: *Social Science Quarterly* 50, 127-135.
- Weaver, Jerry L. (1970): Political Style of the Guatemalan Military Elite, in: *Studies in Comparative International Development* 5, 63-81.
- Yashar, Deborah J. (1997): *Demanding Democracy: Reform and Reaction in Costa Rica and Guatemala, 1870s-1950s*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.