



Guinea-Bissau — Va-PoReg Country Report

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

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

01/01/1879 Start Direct Rule Colonial Regime [of Portugal]: In 1446, Portuguese mariner Nuno Tristão first discovered the territory later known as Portuguese Guinea. In 1879 Guinea Bissau was separated from Cape Verde as the colony Portuguese Guinea. However, it was not until 1905 that the borders of the territory were officially determined. Initially, the region suffered from slave trade exploitation, which led to hostility among the indigenous people and uprisings in the early 20th century. The military eventually pacified the area, and in 1952, it was formally established as an Overseas Province of Portugal. In 1956, a dissatisfied group of Cape Verdeans, led by Amílcar Cabral, Luís de Almeida Cabral, Aristides Pereira, and Rafael Barbosa, formed the African Party for the Independence of Guinea and Cape Verde (PAIGC). Their attempts to negotiate with the Portuguese government failed, prompting the PAIGC to initiate an armed struggle in 1963, with support from Warsaw Pact nations. By the early 1970s, the PAIGC claimed control over two-thirds of the mainland territory. On 01/20/1973, Amílcar Cabral was assassinated in Conakry, Guinea, allegedly by dissidents within the PAIGC but with suspected involvement from the Portuguese military. Six months later, Pereira and Cabral's brother, Luís, were confirmed as the new leaders of the party during a PAIGC congress (Lansford 2021: 670-671). On 09/24/1973 Guinea-Bissau declared its independence from Portugal. LIED confirms that multiparty legislative elections as well as universal elections were absent during this period. Both LIED and V-Dem's PCLI indicate that political liberties were absent. Until 1971, V-Dem's JCE indicates that judicial constraints on the executive are absent. Simultaneously, V-Dem's LCE shows no value, which, with appropriate caution, can be interpreted as an absence of legislative constraints on the executive. For the years 1972-1974, V-Dem's JCE is interpreted by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were absent, and V-Dem's LCE is similarly interpreted as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were also absent.

09/10/1974 End Direct Rule Colonial Regime [of Portugal, Military Autocracy]/Start One-Party Autocracy: On this date, the country became independent from Portugal under the PAIGC, led by Luis Cabral, which had led the fight for independence (Piette 2005: 526, Geddes/Wright/Frantz 2014b: 65). The PAIGC was the constitutionally exclusive political force in society and the state, the PAIGC maintained control through a single-party system. We interpret the direction of this regime change event as liberalization, as the country's independence, the maintenance of executive and legislative elections with universal suffrage, and at least some enhancements in executive limitations, even when there were no political liberties and the country was classified as not free, were all factors. The Regional Councils' elections in December 1976, which lacked competitiveness, secured the PAIGC's ongoing dominance by obtaining approval for the proposed candidate list. (Clemente-Kersten 1999: 461) In 1977 universal suffrage was introduced.¹ Vieira took on the role of the commander in chief of the armed forces in Guinea-Bissau. After the accidental death of his predecessor, Francisco Mendes, in July, Vieira assumed the position of prime minister in Guinea-Bissau in August 1978.² The newly approved constitution in November 1980, enhanced the authority of the President by abolishing the position of Prime Minister (Clemente-Kersten 1999: 662), therefore, eliminating Vieira's office. According to LIED no multiparty executive and legislative elections were held from 1974 to 1976, from 1977 to 1980, executive and legislative elections, which weren't multiparty were held. 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.

Moreover, political liberties are indicated as absent per LIED and per V-Dem's PCLI for this time. According to Polity5, during this period, the executive encountered slight limitations on decision-making power imposed by other institutions. From 1975 to 1979, 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. For 1980, V-Dem's JCE is interpreted by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were absent, and V-Dem's LCE is similarly interpreted as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were also absent. While V-Dem's indicators suggest the presence of moderate judicial and even robust legislative constraints, this clearly contradicts the historical record of closed Congress and executive dominance; in our assessment, Polity5's classification of unrestricted executive authority provides the more accurate reflection of political reality during this period.

11/14/1980 End One-Party Autocracy/Start Military Autocracy: On this date a military coup led by Prime Minister and General João Bernardo Vieira took place. Allegations of ethnic domination and repression in the highest level of government was cited as the reason for Vieira's coup. Vieira maintained the single party but replaced the National Assembly and State Council. He announced the creation of a predominantly military nine-man Revolutionary Council, which exercised after the coup all executive and legislative powers in the country.³ Following the coup, Cape Verde abandoned its plans for unification, leading to a significant departure of Cape Verdeans from the party (Forrest 1987: 103-5, Piette 2005: 526, Lansford 2012c: 579, Geddes/Wright/Frantz 2014b: 65). According to LIED no multiparty executive and legislative elections were held. Per FH, for this regime period, the country scores between 11 and 14 as not free, which we also interpret as not free. In addition to that, LIED and V-Dem's PCLI still indicate the absence of political liberties. According to Polity5, during this period, the executive held unlimited authority with no institutionalized constraints on decision-making power. For the relevant regime period, V-Dem's JCE is interpreted by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were absent, and V-Dem's LCE is similarly interpreted as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were also absent.

05/06/1984 End Military Autocracy/Start One-Party Autocracy: On this date, On 05/06/1984, military rule in Guinea-Bissau formally ended with the adoption of a new constitution. The Revolutionary Council, which had governed since the 1980 coup under João Bernardo Vieira, was dissolved and replaced by a civilian State Council. A civilian government was reinstated, but the constitution simultaneously enshrined the PAIGC as the sole legal party. This transition was deliberately initiated and carefully managed by the ruling elite to stabilize its power on a new institutional foundation. The 1984 constitution thus marked a classic case of strategic restructuring: it replaced direct military rule with the façade of civilian institutions while consolidating the one-party monopoly of the PAIGC. National elections were introduced, but these were strictly one-party elections. All candidates were members of the PAIGC, the selection process was controlled within the party, and voters could only ratify the party's pre-approved lists. Vieira himself remained in power as head of state under this arrangement, ensuring that military leaders retained decisive influence. The outcome was the formal establishment of a one-party autocracy. The institutional redesign gave the regime a constitutional and electoral veneer, but it excluded any real political competition and entrenched authoritarian rule under the PAIGC. In short, the 1984 transition in Guinea-Bissau was a strategic restructuring that transformed military autocracy into one-party autocracy through controlled, noncompetitive elections. Military leaders, above all Vieira, continued to dominate key positions, and political opposition remained entirely excluded. The elections for the Regional Council held in 1984 affirmed the PAIGC party lists (Clemente-Kersten 1999: 462). The opposition against the regime grew after the execution of two regime critics and the arrest of 52 supporters. Influenced by various organizations, such as the Democratic Front (FD) led by Aristide Menezes, the country lifted the ban on political parties and further institutional barriers in 1991. Furthermore, freedom of press and union choice were admitted. International pressure and the breakdown of the Eastern Europe communist regimes led to economic liberalization. In December 1991 the post of Prime Minister was reinstated. Parliamentary elections were supposed to be conducted in 1992, but Vieira postponed them twice until 1994 (Clemente-Kersten 1999: 462).⁴ According to LIED executive and

legislative elections, which weren't multiparty were held. 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. While LIED's scores still code political liberties absent, V-Dem's PCLI categorizes the political liberties as absent until 1991 and decrease into a range which we interpret as not really present afterwards. From 1984 to 1990, as per Polity5's categorization, the executive experienced minimal limitations on decision-making, placing it in the first intermediate category. Between 1991 and 1993, based on Polity5's assessment, the executive faced slight limitations on power. From 1985 to 1992, For the relevant regime period, V-Dem's JCE is interpreted by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were absent, and V-Dem's LCE is similarly interpreted as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were also absent. For 1993, 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. The following year, V-Dem's JCE is interpreted by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were limited, and V-Dem's LCE is similarly interpreted as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were also limited.

07/03/1994 End One-Party Autocracy/Start Electoral Hybrid Regime: On this date, the first multi-party elections since independence took place. In the presidential election, the result was a victory for incumbent João Bernardo Vieira of the African Party for the Independence of Guinea and Cape Verde (PAIGC). Vieira, despite being an army major, did not rely on the military to retain his power. Surprisingly, his actions, such as dismissing the chief of staff and confronting smaller dissident groups, indicated that the military was not consistently supportive of his authority. In 1991, Vieira voluntarily resigned from his military position and ran for presidential elections. Furthermore, during this period, the legislature saw the representation of multiple political parties (Magaloni/Chu/Min 2013b: 22). His opponent in the first multiparty presidential election Kumba Ialá did not accept the results immediately. He raised concerns regarding organizational shortcomings, which raised doubt about the rightfulness of Vieira's victory. The UN Election Observer Commission declared the elections as free and fair. Thereafter Ialá resigned as opposition leader. Although improvements towards democracy had been made, there were still shortcomings, such as the conservation of power by former leaders. The opposition had just started to organize and was therefore still immature and missing political tradition but was represented in parliament and was therefore able to increase political activity. The allocation and concentration of power stayed essentially the same (Clemente-Kersten 1999: 462-663, Ferreira 2004: 46). The transition from a one-party autocracy to an electoral regime should be understood as a process rather than a singular decision made by regime elites. The ruling elite maintained its authoritarian character (Jaló 2023: 5). We classify the regime as semidemocracy, because the electoral process did not show severe deficits, which would justify a classification as electoral autocracy. At the same time, Guinea-Bissau had not completed the transition to democracy. The classification is disputed. AF and LIED classify the regime between 1994 and 1997 as electoral democracy. GWF classifies it as personal, BR as military dictatorship and HTW as well as MCM as multiparty autocracy. In 1997, Guinea-Bissau became a member of the West African Economic Monetary Union and the Franc Zone. However, the resulting fiscal instability, partly influenced by these decisions, contributed to political unrest. The situation reached a critical point in 1998 when President Vieira dismissed military chief of staff Brigadier (later General) Ansumane Mané. In response, Mané led a rebellion fueled by widespread frustration and opposition to Vieira's rule. Numerous cease-fires were attempted but repeatedly broken, leading to the intervention of troops from Guinea, Nigeria, Senegal, and France. With each round of fighting, Vieira found himself increasingly isolated in Bissau. In May 1999, he was compelled to surrender and subsequently went into exile in Portugal.⁵ 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 the electoral freedom and fairness of these elections as ambiguous and as somewhat free and fair from 1999 onwards. . Their CEI scores them as not really clean until 1999 and as ambiguous afterwards. Per FH, for the period until 1997, the country scores between 6 and 7, categorized as partly free, which we interpret as rather free. In 1998, the country is partly free with a score of 8, which we interpret as rather not free. According to

FH, from 1999 to 2002 a score between 9 and 10 makes the country not free, which aligns with our interpretation of rather not free. Additionally, political liberties were coded as absent by LIED and as what we interpret as ambiguous by V-Dem's PCLI. In this regime period Guinea-Bissau according to our observations was a borderline case between an electoral autocracy and an electoral hybrid regime. Between 11/28/1999 and 01/16/2000, general elections took place, followed by a second round for the presidential election on 01/16/2000. The opposition leader, Kumba Ialá of the Party for Social Renewal (PRS), won the presidential election, defeating Malam Bacai Sanhá of the ruling African Party for the Independence of Guinea and Cape Verde. The PRS also achieved success in the National People's Assembly election, securing 38 out of 102 seats. Notably, this marked the first time since the country's independence in the 1970s that an opposition party had won an election.⁶ The elections were deemed free and fair by international observers.⁷ Based on our observations, multiparty executive and legislative elections were held during this period, which aligns with the observations of LIED. As per Polity5's classification, the executive experienced moderate limitations on authority, placing it in the second intermediate category. From 2000 to 2002, as per Polity5's classification, the executive's authority was significantly constrained by institutional checks 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, while V-Dem's LCE is classified by us as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were also moderate.

11/16/2002 End Electoral Hybrid Regime/Start Electoral (Personalist) Autocracy: On this date the elected President, Kumba Ialá, leader of the Social Renewal Party (PRS), dissolved parliament. Initially, new elections were scheduled for February 2003, but they were postponed several times - first to April, then to July, and later to October 2003.⁸ Ialá ruled in this period by decree, engaged in the harassment of the opposition, and ordered the arrest of opposition leaders (Geddes/Wright/Frantz 2014b: 65, Piette 2005: 532-33, Lansford 2012c: 579).⁹ Since there was almost no control of the executive in this period, it is understandable that GWF and AF classified the case as a personalist regime. However, while elections were several times postponed in this period, we would still classify this rather brief regime period as an electoral autocracy. According to LIED multiparty executive and legislative elections were held during this period. Per FH's evaluation for this regime period, the country scores from 9 to 10 as not free, which we categorize as rather not free. Moreover, political liberties were coded as absent by LIED and by V-Dem's PCLI indicate an ambiguous state regarding political liberties. According to Polity5, during this period, the executive's constraints fell into Intermediate Category 1, between unlimited authority and slight limitations. Based on our observations, multiparty executive and legislative elections were held during this period. For the relevant regime period, V-Dem's JCE and LCE are both interpreted by us as indicating moderate constraints on the executive.

09/14/2003 End Electoral (Personalist) Autocracy/Start Military Autocracy: When Ialá moved to stall elections and failed to pay certain army factions, Chief of Staff and Defense Minister General Veríssimo Correia Seabra overthrew him and installed himself at the head of a junta that oversaw a transition to a more competitive electoral regime (Lansford 2012c: 579).¹⁰ Henrique Rosa was appointed to lead the interim government and assumed the presidency on 10/28/2003. Meanwhile, Seabra maintained his position as the chairman of the National Transition Council.¹¹ The decisive criterion for the classification is the legitimization pattern: General Seabra's coup invoked guardianship legitimization by asserting military necessity to resolve the political crisis caused by Ialá's electoral stalling and failure to pay military factions, justifying substantive sovereign military authority rather than temporary procedural facilitation. his guardianship legitimization pattern is reinforced by the institutional structure: Seabra simultaneously retained Chief of Staff, Defense Minister, and Chairman of the National Transition Council while appointing Rosa as subordinate "interim president," demonstrating that the military as unified corporate institution exercised sovereign authority and override capacity through junta governance. According to LIED no multiparty executive and legislative elections were held. As per Polity5's categorization, the executive experienced minimal limitations on decision-making, placing it in the first intermediate category. During this regime period, V-Dem's JCE is

classified 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 also moderate. As classified by FH for this regime period, the country scores between 9 and 10 as not free, which we interpret as rather not free. While LIED's political liberties continue to be coded as absent, V-Dem's PCLI increased to a range which we interpret as somewhat present.

03/28/2004 End Military Autocracy/Start Electoral Hybrid Regime: On this date fair legislative elections were held, and fair presidential elections in June-July 2005 completed the transition the following year (Geddes/Wright/Frantz 2014b: 65). In March 2005, Kumba Ialá expressed his intention to participate in the upcoming elections scheduled for June, despite being barred from politics in 2003, along with Vieira who had recently returned from exile in April. However, both candidates were granted permission to run in April. In the following month, Ialá declared himself as the current president and briefly occupied the presidential building. Despite his defeat in the initial round of voting, Ialá eventually supported Vieira, who won in the second round of elections held in July. While allegations of fraud were raised by opposition supporters, international observers declared the elections to be free and fair.¹² Generally human rights were respected, but some deficits remained. These concerned, for example, freedom of speech or women's rights. Another deficit concerned the independence of the judiciary.¹³ Growing conflict between the military elite and President Vieira's administration, driven in part by ethnic tensions, led to increased domestic instability. In November 2008, Vieira survived an attack by mutinous soldiers, described as an attempted coup. 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 competitive. V-Dem's EF&FI scores them as somewhat free and fair. Their CEI scores their electoral cleanliness as ambiguous. As per FH, for 2004, the country receives a score of 8, which we interpret as falling into the rather not free category. In 2005 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. For the remaining period the country is partly free with a score of 8, which we interpret as rather not free. Besides, LIED scores for the entire time that political liberties were absent. However, V-Dem's PCLI declares them as somewhat present. Based on Polity5's evaluation, during this period, the executive's power was limited to a degree between substantial constraints and parity with other institutions, fitting Intermediate Category 3. For the relevant regime period, V-Dem's JCE and LCE are both interpreted by us as indicating moderate constraints on the executive.

03/02/2009 End Electoral Hybrid Regime/Start Non-Electoral Transitional Regime: On this date, Vieira was assassinated by soldiers who believed he was responsible for the death of the chief of the armed forces, General Batista Tagme Na Waie, who had been killed in an explosion just hours earlier. The military denied any intention to seize power. According to the constitutional provisions, Raimundo Pereira, the parliamentary leader, was sworn in as interim president until elections could be held. Eventually, elections were scheduled for 06/28/2009.¹⁴

06/28/2009 End Non-Electoral Transitional Regime/Start Electoral Hybrid Regime: On this date, Malam Bacai Sanhá of the PAIGC won the presidential elections, defeating Kumba Ialá, the presidential candidate of the PRS. The elections were characterized as free and fair by international observers.¹⁵ The judiciary remained not fully independent, journalists were not able to work completely freely, and women still do not enjoy the same rights.¹⁶ Therefore, deficits in the institutional constraints on the executive and deficits in the guarantee of political and civil liberties remained. Per FH's scoring for the assessed regime period, the country is classified as partly free with a score of 8, which we categorize as rather not free. According to LIED no political liberties were coded. V-Dem's PCLI scores them as somewhat present for this time. On 01/09/2012, President Sanhá passed away due to complications from diabetes. Consequently, Pereira was once again appointed as the interim president. On 03/18/2012 presidential elections were held.¹⁷ According to LIED multiparty executive and legislative elections were present. LIED categorizes the elections as competitive. V-Dem's EF&FI scores them as somewhat free and fair. Their CEI scores the electoral cleanliness as ambiguous. Based on Polity5's evaluation, during this period, the executive's power was limited to a degree

between substantial constraints and parity with other institutions, fitting Intermediate Category 3. For the years 2010-2011, V-Dem's JCE and LCE are both interpreted by us as indicating moderate constraints on the executive. For 2012, V-Dem's JCE is interpreted by us as indicating that judicial constraints on the executive were limited, and V-Dem's LCE is similarly interpreted as indicating that legislative constraints on the executive were also limited.

04/12/2012 End Electoral Hybrid Regime/Start Military Autocracy: On this date a military coup led by Army Vice Chief of Staff General Mamadu Ture Kuruma was staged before the second round of a presidential election between Carlos Gomes Júnior and Kumba Ialá.¹⁸ After the coup, the leading candidates were arrested and the election was cancelled.¹⁹ After facing international condemnation and sanctions against the junta's leaders, an agreement was signed on 04/15/2012. This agreement resulted in the selection of Manuel Serifo Nhamadjo, the third-place candidate in the election, as the interim president.²⁰ The decisive criterion is the legitimization pattern: General Kuruma's coup asserted guardianship legitimization by cancelling scheduled elections and arresting presidential candidates, claiming military authority to override democratic processes deemed problematic—this represents substantive sovereignty claims invoking military necessity rather than self-limiting caretaker facilitation. The coup's action of terminating electoral procedures and detaining political leaders demonstrates guardianship logic that only the military possessed the capacity to determine legitimate political outcomes, justifying open-ended military rule based on crisis rather than temporary procedural management. This guardianship legitimization is confirmed by the institutional structure: the junta exercised corporate military command with unified override capacity, as evidenced by Nhamadjo's appointment occurring only after international sanctions forced accommodation, revealing that civilian authority operated within parameters imposed by military sovereign claims throughout the two-year period. According to LIED no multiparty executive and legislative elections were held. 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. Furthermore, LIED codes political liberties as absent while V-Dem's PCLI indicates them as somewhat present. Based on Polity5's assessment, during this period, the executive's power was noticeably limited but not substantial, fitting Intermediate Category 2. During this regime period, V-Dem's JCE is classified 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 also moderate.

04/13/2014 End Non-Electoral Transitional Regime/Start Electoral Hybrid Regime: The general elections in Guinea-Bissau took place on 04/13/2014, and a second round was conducted for the presidential elections on 05/18 due to no candidate securing a majority in the initial round.²¹ Presidential elections took place in Guinea-Bissau on 11/24/2019. Since no candidate secured a majority of the vote, a second round was conducted on 12/29. The incumbent president, José Mário Vaz, concluded in fourth place during the initial voting round, consequently not advancing to the runoff. Umaro Sissoco Embaló emerged as the winner in the second round with 54% of the vote.²² The 2019 parliamentary elections received commendation from the United Nations (UN) and the European Union (EU) for being peaceful and well-organized. An observation mission from the African Union (AU) considered the elections to be free and fair, although it acknowledged some shortcomings in the process.²³ Despite initially promising to accept the results, President Jose Mario Vaz's campaign manager accused his rivals of fraud.²⁴ Furthermore, deficits in the guarantee of political and civil liberties persist. These include violence and discrimination against women as well as a lack of judicial freedom and due process.²⁵ On 06/04/2023, snap parliamentary elections took place. President Umaro Sissoco Embaló dissolved the parliament on 05/16/2022, citing allegations of corruption and "unresolvable" conflicts between the National People's Assembly and other branches of government. The outcome saw the opposition coalition, Inclusive Alliance Platform – Terra Ranka, led by the African Party for the Independence of Guinea and Cape Verde, securing victory with 54 out of the 102 seats.²⁶ LIED categorizes the elections as competitive. V-Dem's EF&FI scores them as somewhat free and fair. Their CEI score on electoral cleanliness varies considerably, between not really and somewhat clean elections. Per FH's evaluation for this regime period, the country scores from 9 to 10 as partly free, which we categorize as rather not free. Furthermore,

LIED still scores an absence of political liberties, but V-Dem's PCLI views them as what we interpret as somewhat present. Based on Polity5's evaluation, during this period, the executive's power was limited to a degree between substantial constraints and parity with other institutions, fitting Intermediate Category 3. From 2015 to 2017, 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 limited. From 2018 to 2021, V-Dem's JCE and LCE are both interpreted by us as indicating moderate constraints on the executive. For 2022, V-Dem's JCE indicates that judicial constraints on the executive are moderate. Simultaneously, V-Dem's LCE shows no value, which, with appropriate caution, can be interpreted as an absence of legislative constraints on the executive. For 2023, 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 robust.

12/04/2023 End Electoral Hybrid Regime/Start Electoral Autocracy: Following failed coup attempts in 2022 and 2023, President Umaro Sissoco Embaló dissolved the parliament again on 12/04/2023, leaving the legislature largely non-functional. The dissolution took place less than 12 months after the last parliamentary elections, which is unconstitutional.²⁷ Furthermore, the elected government was deposed and replaced by a government chosen by the president. Legislative elections were initially scheduled for 11/24/2024, and presidential elections for December 2024, but both were postponed due to logistical and financial constraints, leaving Embaló in power without a functioning legislature or Supreme Court at the end of the year. President Embaló's presidential term officially ended on 02/27/2025, yet he remained in power, an action widely described as an "institutional coup", which effectively consolidated authority in the executive branch. Parliament continued to operate in a limited capacity. The Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and the United Nations (UN) attempted to mediate between the opposition and governing parties between 02/23/2025 and 02/28/2025, but they were unable to reach a consensus.²⁸ As classified by FH for this regime period, the country is classified as partly free with a score of 9, which corresponds to our interpretation of rather not free. 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 moderate. Based on V-Dem's PCLI, political civil liberties were ambiguous.

Electoral Autocracy as of 07/01/2025 continued.

Notes

¹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Women%27s_suffrage

² <https://www.britannica.com/place/Guinea-Bissau/Independence>

³ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1980_Guinea-Bissau_coup_d%27%C3%A9tat

⁴ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jo%C3%A3o_Bernardo_Vieira;
https://www.constituteproject.org/constitution/Guinea_Bissau_1996?lang=en

⁵ <https://www.britannica.com/place/Guinea-Bissau/Independence>

⁶ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1999%E2%80%932000_Guinea-Bissau_general_election

⁷ <https://www.britannica.com/place/Guinea-Bissau/Independence>

⁸ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kumba_Ial%C3%A1

⁹ <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2010/guinea-bissau>

¹⁰ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ver%C3%ADssimo_Correia_Seabra; <http://tinyurl.com/3naxznw>

¹¹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ver%C3%ADssimo_Correia_Seabra

¹² <https://www.britannica.com/place/Guinea-Bissau/Independence>

¹³ <https://2009-2017.state.gov/j/drl/rls/hrrpt/2006/78739.htm>

¹⁴ <https://www.britannica.com/place/Guinea-Bissau/Independence>

¹⁵ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2009_Guinea-Bissau_presidential_election

¹⁶ <https://2009-2017.state.gov/j/drl/rls/hrrpt/2010/af/154351.htm>

¹⁷ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Guinea-Bissau

- ¹⁸ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2012_Guinea-Bissau_coup_d%27%C3%A9tat;
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Plak_Phibunsongkhram#1957_coup_and_exile; https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mamadou_Ture_Kuruma
- ¹⁹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2012_Guinea-Bissau_presidential_election
- ²⁰ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2012_Guinea-Bissau_coup_d%27%C3%A9tat
- ²¹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2014_Guinea-Bissau_general_election
- ²² https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2019_Guinea-Bissau_presidential_election
- ²³ <https://freedomhouse.org/country/guinea-bissau/freedom-world/2022>
- ²⁴ <https://www.dw.com/en/guinea-bissau-election-polls-close-amid-fraud-claims/a-51396435>
- ²⁵ <https://2009-2017.state.gov/j/drl/rls/hrrpt/2015/af/252691.htm>
- ²⁶ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2023_Guinea-Bissau_parliamentary_election
- ²⁷ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2023_Guinea-Bissau_coup_attempt#Aftermath
- ²⁸ <https://www.idea.int/democracytracker/country/guinea-bissau>

References

- Ferreira, Patrícia Magalhaes (2004): Guinea-Bissau: Between Conflict and Democracy, in: *African Security Review* 13, 44-56.
- Forrest, Joshua B. (1987): Guinea-Bissau since Independence: A Decade of Domestic Power Struggles, in: *Journal of Modern African Studies* 25, 95-116.
- 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.
- Lansford, Tom (2012a): Cambodia, in: Lansford, Tom (Hrsg.), *Political Handbook of the World 2012*. Washington: Sage, 215-220.
- Lansford, Tom (2012c): *Political Handbook of the World 2012*. Washington: Sage.
- Lansford, Tom (2021): *Political Handbook of the World 2020-2021*. Thousand Oaks: CQ Press.
- Magaloni, Beatriz/Chu, Jonathan/Min, Eric (2013b): *Autocracies of the World, 1950-2012*. Version 1.0. Dataset. Stanford University.
- Piette, Luisa Hamden (2005): *Guinea-Bissau: Recent History, Africa South of the Sahara 2004*. London: Europa Publications, 526-547.