

Transitional Justice Research Collaborative

Human Rights Prosecutions Coding Manual

Revised February 2018

Principal Investigators:

Professor Kathryn Sikkink

University of Minnesota

Contact email: sikkink@umn.edu

Professor Leigh Payne

University of Oxford

Contact email: leigh.payne@sant.ox.ac.uk

Project Team:

Geoff Dancy, PhD

Director

Tulane University

Contact email: gdancy@tulane.edu

Bridget Marchesi, PhD Student

Assistant Director

University of Minnesota

Contact email: march122@umn.edu

Table of Contents

Section 1: Project Overview.....	2
Purpose.....	2
Previous Databases	2
Section 2: Definitions.....	4
2.1 Definitions.....	4
2.2. Units of Analysis.....	6
Section 3: Data Collection Strategy.....	7
Step 1: Generating a Union Dataset.....	7
Step 2: Creating a Source Book.....	7
Step 3: Performing Extra Research	8
Step 4: Entering Data onto Administrative Website	8
Section 4: Coding Template and Data Entry.....	9
Trials Coding	9
Country	9
Start Year	10
End Year	10
Case Description	10
Narrative	10
Crime Period.....	10
Save.....	11
Click “Save Trial and View Accusations”	12
Accusations Coding.....	12
Name/Description	12
Rank	12
Rank Subcategory (Old/Obsolete).....	13
Membership.....	13
Additional Information	13
Charges	13
Preliminary Trial Process	14
Court Levels 1-5.....	14
Trial Court Type.....	15

Court Name	15
Trial Plaintiff.....	15
Relevant Information.....	16
Statute or Amnesty Circumvented.....	16
Verdict.....	16
Guilty Sentence.....	16
Guilty Sentence.....	16
Outcome Date.....	16
Sources.....	17
Section 3: Appendix.....	17

Section 1: Project Overview

Purpose

Scholars and policymakers have recently advocated transitional justice as a means to strengthen both democracy and human rights protections. Transitional justice is defined as a set of processes to address past human rights violations following periods of political turmoil, state repression, or armed conflict. It encompasses three main mechanisms—human rights prosecutions, truth commissions, and amnesty— along with lustration policies, reparations, institutional reforms, commemorative acts, and the construction of monuments and museums. Despite significant geographic and institutional variation, transitional justice mechanisms are assumed to share a common set of goals: avoid “repeating, reenacting, or reliving past horrors” (Bhargava 2000, 54); deter future violations; restore the dignity of citizens victimized by atrocity; and stabilize democratic rule.

The purpose of this part of the project is to detail as much information as is available on *criminal prosecutions of human rights violators*, by building on and deepening information that has been gathered in two previous data collection efforts.

Previous Databases

Payne et al.’s Transitional Justice Data Base (TJDB) includes information on 161 countries from 1970-2007. They constructed the data base from a systematic analysis of one primary source: *Keesing’s World News Archives*. The data base includes the five transitional justice mechanisms recognized universally by scholars and practitioners, but in specific regard to prosecutions, it finds a total of 338 country-years with trials of either state agents or opposition members. For any single year, a country is coded “1” for having a trial that

Transitional Justice Research Collaborative
Supported by National Science Foundation Grant No. 0961226

reached a verdict in that year, or “0” if it does not have a trial that reached a verdict in that year.

Sikkink et al.’s Human Rights Prosecutions Data Base (HRPDB) includes information on 136 countries in the world from 1974-2006. The data base draws primarily on the U.S. State Department *Country Report on Human Rights Practices*, which surveys human rights issues in every country of the world each year. The HRPDB contains domestic, foreign, and international human rights prosecutions, both those that result in verdicts, and those that impose other costs on the accused without reaching a verdict, such as indictments, extraditions, and detention. For any single year, a country is coded “1” for having human rights prosecutorial activity in that year, or “0” if it does not have a prosecutorial activity in that year. The HRPDB finds a total of 1,120 country-years with some trial activity for human rights violations, in both transitional and consolidated democracies.

Our goal in this project is to start with unmatched binary data on prosecution-country-years and to end with fine-grained, countable data on the number of prosecutions during any given country-year, the number of accused being charged in those cases, and a variety of other pieces of information relating to the case, the trial process, and the outcome.

Section 2: Definitions

2.1 Definitions

(1) What is a human rights criminal prosecution?

We define a human rights criminal prosecution as “the use of domestic, foreign, or international courts of law to bring criminal procedures—including preliminary trial processes, trial hearings, or verdict and sentencing—against state agent perpetrators of human rights violations.” Human rights prosecutions encompass a variety of actions made by a number of actors. They have also been called human right trials, and they can include actions taken by the International Criminal Court (ICC) or ad hoc tribunals (as in the Slobodan Milosevic trial); foreign courts bringing charges against nationals of another country (as in the Augusto Pinochet case); or domestic courts bringing charges against their own nationals (as in Guatemala’s Rios Montt trial).

*(2) What is a **transitional** human rights criminal prosecution?*

Though an additional element of our project involves coding the universe of human rights prosecutions documented by previous research, our website presents information specifically on *transitional* human rights criminal prosecutions and international prosecutions. Transitional are prosecutions that take place in times of democratic transition. For our purposes, prosecutions are transitional if they meet the following criteria:

- The human rights violation takes place prior to the democratic transition
- The prosecution is initiated during or after the democratic transition

Coders are provided with the list of democratic transition years included in the Appendix of this document so they might determine the years of democratic transition.

Because international trials need not follow democratic transitions, but deal pointedly with human rights issues, we present data on the www.transitionaljusticedata.com that pertains to all international trials directed toward nationals from any given country.

*(3) What is **criminal** prosecution?*

We are interested in criminal prosecutions, which are designed to resolve accusations brought by a government actor against a person accused of a crime. These prosecutions can be initiated against many individuals at once, in what we might call a *group* trial, or they may be brought against only one person. In common law systems, most criminal defendants are entitled to a trial held before a jury. The rules of criminal procedure provide rules for criminal trials. We do not include civil trials, which incorporate disputes involving tort, contract disputes, property disputes, administrative law, commercial law, and other matters

that involve private parties and groups. Civil trials include, for example, individuals suing other individuals or groups for damages or remedy.

(4) What is domestic, foreign, or international?

Most of our coding involves ‘domestic trials,’ which include all prosecutorial activity conducted in a single country for crimes committed in that country OR for crimes committed anywhere by nationals of that country. This differs from ‘foreign trials,’ which involve prosecutorial activity conducted in a national court for crimes committed in another country by foreign nationals. If the UN is involved in setting up or running the court, then attendant prosecutorial activity is considered a ‘hybrid’ or ‘international trial,’ and is thereby not technically a ‘domestic trial.’

Foreign trials invoke:

universal jurisdiction (nature of the crime without regard to the nationality of victim or perpetrator or the territory where the crime occurs); passive personality jurisdiction (nationality of victim); or protective principle jurisdiction (state interest without regard to the nationality of the victim, perpetrator or where the crime occurs); (or some combo of the three).

Domestic trials invoke:

territorial jurisdiction (crime occurs in territory); and nationality jurisdiction (perpetrator is national of the state but crime occurs outside of the territory)

(5) What are preliminary trial processes, trials, and verdict and sentencing?

Preliminary trial processes include indictments, arrests warrants, arrests, extradition requests, extraditions, detentions of suspects (in-house or in prison), and court decisions on a procedural matter, such as determining that the court has jurisdiction or that an amnesty is inapplicable to the case. All of the reported preliminary trial procedures will be included.

Trials involving individual or groups of individuals being held accountable by a criminal court will be coded. A court of law is defined as an official judicial body created, financed, and operated by state actors, international governmental organizations, or both. *Note: ‘Trials’ do not necessarily or exclusively involve oral argument. In many countries, trials take place through written argument. Coders should be sensitive to this issue, and not mistake actual trials for mere preliminary processes.*

Verdicts from domestic, international, and hybrid trials will be included as long as they involve criminal trials for human rights violations. The verdicts will include both guilty and not guilty verdicts. They will also include convictions, acquittals, plea bargains, and dismissals. Sentences will be included.

(6) What are human rights violations?

For the purposes of the TJRC, human rights abuse(s) are violations of physical or personal integrity rights carried out by a state or agents of the state. Violations include abuses such as extrajudicial killing, torture or similar physical abuse, disappearances, and political imprisonment.¹ We focus specifically on violations of physical integrity, including the right not to be tortured, summarily executed, disappeared, or imprisoned for political beliefs. In some cases, these acts can be legally or rhetorically classified as war crimes, crimes against humanity, or genocide. The human rights violations in question can be committed by state agents or non-state agents associated with the state (e.g. paramilitaries). In the event that a state agent committed an act violating physical integrity of a citizen, and he/she faces charges for it, then the phenomenon would enter the scope of our analysis. We DO NOT include cases where an individual is being charged for political crimes like conspiracy to commit a coup, acts of treason, or for corruption—unless the individual is also being charged for human rights violations.

2.2. Units of Analysis

The TJRC collects prosecution data has two units of analysis: the trial and the accusation. Because many individuals can be prosecuted simultaneously, we gather data on each individual accused person, and information on the trial. Because accused individuals will share trial information in some cases, this can be thought of as ‘embedded’ or ‘multilevel’ data. An analogy is the classroom. If we were to collect data on a class of students, we might take a survey of student characteristics (age, IQ), and also on classroom characteristics (teacher, school). We employ a strategy that allows us to simultaneously collect data on the accused individually and the trial in general.

¹ See Wood and Gibney (2010) and Cingranelli and Richards (1999) for more information about physical integrity rights and related standard based measures.

Section 3: Data Collection Strategy

This is an effort to create more nuanced data using previously existing datasets. For that reason, the data collection strategy involves many steps—starting with the generation of a union dataset to create a coding universe and ending with data entry into an administrative website.

Step 1: Generating a Union Dataset

There are wide discrepancies between the two datasets produced by the previous research projects. Of the 338 prosecutions listed in TJDB, and 1,120 prosecutions listed in HRPDB, the datasets are in agreement on only 152 country years. Therefore, we have created a list of country-years for further investigation that is based on the union, rather than the intersection, of these two datasets. We isolated 1,308 country-years which were previously coded by either team as having featured at least one prosecution for human rights crimes from 1970 to 2007. This file was saved as a simple list of country-years with prosecutions. Because the list only goes through 2007, our coders had to update information on prosecutions using the State Department Reports for *every democratic country* from 2008-2010.

Step 2: Creating a Source Book

Using the list of country years previously coded as having any prosecutorial activity, trial information is gathered from State Department's *Country Report on Human Rights Practices*. Reports for each country and year are read for information on criminal human rights prosecutions. Any information regarding these trials is clipped and pasted into a sourcebook. The sourcebook is organized by a unit defined by the country and year of the report, called a country-year (ex. Indonesia 2005). The result is a single document containing all information on prosecutions of human rights violations in democratic countries that can be found in the State Department reports.

The information inside the source book has been marked for ease of replication. Yellow highlights indicate a prosecution. Red letters indicate a guilty verdict. Green letters indicate a dismissal or acquittal.

Using the State Department Reports to create a general source book has two disadvantages. First, the coverage of the reports begins in 1976. Because we are seeking data back to 1970, pre-1976 prosecutions need to be 'filled in' using a different source. For these prosecutions, we revisit the Keesing's Record of World Events to code human rights criminal prosecutions. The only pre-1976 cases which meet the definitional criteria pertaining to human rights violations take place in Greece and Portugal. The second disadvantage is that often, the information in the State Department Reports is not sufficiently detailed. For this reason, we turn to Lexis Nexis and other secondary sources to fill in the data during Step 4.

Step 3: Performing Extra Research

When you review the source book, you will notice that some trial activity repeats across country-years, and that you will have to find trial ‘threads’ to trace over time. Do not re-code information that is repeated verbatim. Only information on new activity should be coded onto the website.

The optimal way to go about coding is to cull as much specific information from the source book on any single case, search that case in Lexis Nexis and Google, and create a narrative of what happened in that case. Use that narrative to fill in the information on the webpage. Sometimes this will take a long time because of the volume of information. Do your best to discover the facts of any particular case, but try not to spend more than one hour on any given accused individual or group.

Step 4: Entering Data onto Administrative Website

The collection of additional information on the trial and accusation(s) can coincide with data entry into the administration website “For Coders” on www.transitionaljusticedata.com. If you use an outside source to generate information, that source should be included in the “Sources” text box located within each “Accusations” tab (more below). This process, and other data entry instructions, are detailed in Section 4.

Section 4: Coding Template and Data Entry

On the administrative website, a password protected data entry program that has been developed by the NSF team, the coder will have the option of choosing “Add Trials.” One the coder clicks on this button, he/she will have the option of creating a new entry or modifying an already-existing entry. To create a new entry, he/she will click on the Add Trial button in the upper left. From here, the coder will input information first on the trial, and then on each accusation that belongs to that trial. For example, in Argentina’s Trial of the Juntas, 9 different junta leaders were tried for their involvement in various human rights abuses. After general information on the trial is gathered, the coder will create a page for each accused person, along with information about his/her case (detailed below).

Important coding rule: if the source information does not include the names of any individuals, but rather states that “six soldiers were tried for the involvement in...”, then the six soldiers will be included as only one accused. The reason for this is that we want to avoid over-counting accused persons. Adding six entries would provide no additional useful information. If the source claims names one individual, but not the others being tried alongside him/her, then the named person gets a unique accusation entry, while the others share only one entry.

Trials Coding

Country

“What is the country name?”

Country name is the name of the country that the trial took place in, or is the country to which the targeted national belongs. For example, when Chile targets its own nationals for trial, the country selected would be Chile. When Britain targets Chile’s Augusto Pinochet for prosecution, the country selected by the coder would also be Chile.

Coders choose country name from drop down menu.

Trial Type

“Was the trial domestic, foreign, or international?”

Refer to definition above. Should you choose “foreign”, fill the following boxes:

Country Trial – *In what country was the trial conducted?*

Country Crime – *In what countr(ies) were the crimes committed?*

Country Victim – *What was the nationalit(ies) of the victim(s)?*

Jurisdiction – *What type of jurisdiction was exercised? Check all that apply. See definition above.*

Start Year

“In what year was the prosecution initiated?”

Start year is the year in which the indictment against the accused individual or individuals was issued.

Coders choose start year from drop down menu.

End Year

“In what year was the last verdict issued?”

End year is the year in which the last verdict of any type—for any accused person in the trial (in the case of a group trial)--was issued. For this information, the coder will have to first code the information in the accusations, and then double back to the initial trial page.

Note: This information is very difficult to find sometimes, especially given that trials last for a long time. Only register an end date in those instances that a verdict has been reached in the initial trial, or in an appeal, and you know when that occurred.

Coders choose end year from drop down menu.

Case Description

“Who was tried for what crime against what victim in what place?”

Case description is a one sentence description of the prosecution, including, in order: who was tried, for what crimes, against what victim, in what place. In the event that all of the information is not available, leave it missing. Each description should follow this format: “Trial of [PERSON/GROUP NAME] for [CRIME DESCRIPTION] against [VICTIM/GROUP] on [DATE/YEAR/RANGE OF YEARS] in [PLACE].”

Narrative

“What is the story of the prosecution?”

Coders have not specific instruction for the Narrative box, except to write additional information concerning the historical origin, significance, and outcome of the trial that the coder deems relevant.

Note: This is not the highest priority, so only write a narrative if you feel that additional information is needed, or that you learned things that cannot be reflected in the coding scheme.

Crime Period (Old/Obsolete)

“When was the crime of interest committed in relation to the democratic transition?”

Knowing when the crime occurred helps us establish whether the prosecution in question is ‘transitional’ in nature. Using the list of democratic transitions, the coder will determine whether the crime happened prior to democratic transition, or during another time period.

NOTE: In the event that a country experienced multiple transitions, the coder will observe whether the crime happened during any autocratic period, and whether the trial happened within any following democratic period.

Coders choose a response from drop down menu:

Crime Period = Before democratic transition (if crime happened before beginning of transition)

Crime Period = During democratic transition (if crime happened amidst range of transition years)

Crime Period = After democratic transition (if crime happened after final year of transition)

Crime Period = No transition (For international trials coding: if country had no democratic transition, ex. Rwanda)

Crime Period = Between transitions (obsolete category previously used for multiple transitions)

Crime Period = Don't Know

How Many Accused?

How many people do you estimate were tried in this prosecution?

Trial Context

In what political context did this trial take place? Check democracy if the country was in a democratic period (defined as 1 or greater on the Polity II scale). Check autocracy if the country was lower than 1 on the Polity II scale. Check transitional if the trial took place in any year following a democratic transition after 1970. You MAY check transition as well as other boxes.

Trial Content

Did this trial deal with human rights violations, crimes concerning civil conflict, or corruption?

If the accused were charged with crimes that fit the definition of human rights violations above, check the human rights box. If they deal with crimes against the state—like treason, political activism, rebellion, or the organization and/or participation in a couple—check the conflict box. If they deal with economic or political corruption of any kind, check the corruption box. You CAN check more than one box.

Does this fit our definition of transitional human rights trial?

Does the trial meet all of the criteria to be considered a transitional human rights trial?

This one is very important. You mark a “1” here if, and only if, the prosecution meets the following criteria (Use the Appendix for assistance):

1. It occurs following a democratic transition
2. The defendant was a state agent during the previous autocratic period
3. The trials is for human rights violations that were committed during the autocratic period

Save

Click “Save Trial and View Accusations”

If adding a new accusation, click “Add Accusation”

Accusations Coding

In each accusations page, you will code information specific to the accused individual, and where he/she is in the process of prosecution. A new accusation should be added *for each individual on which you have information*. That is, if the accused is named in the source, a new accusation page will be created. If the source information groups together a number of nameless individuals—e.g. “six soldiers were held” or “10 police officers were tried”—then only one entry will be created. The reason for this is that in the latter cases, we do not have enough information to warrant separate entries. It also helps us avoid over-counting.

Name/Description

“What is the name of the individual, or the description provided in the source material?”

Here you list simply what the name of the person is, or whether he/she is a “member of the police”, a “soldier”, etc.

If a group of individuals are identified, but none is named, just put the name of the group as it is referenced in the source material. For example: “Ten soldiers.”

Rank

“Is the Individual of high or low rank?”

The purpose of the variable is to identify whether the accused is of high or low rank. High-ranking individuals include:

- Heads of state
- Cabinet Ministers, Senators, and Parliamentarians
- Military Generals
- Admirals
- Heads of security forces – This can include militarize police, paramilitaries associated with the state, and torture or death squads. “Head” means a person generally understood be in charge or mostly in charge of the organization

Every one else will be considered not high-ranking, or low-ranking

Note: “high rank” keyword/ phrases: presidents, dictators, generals, admirals, governors, senators, executive committees, high ranking judges from high courts such as Supreme Court or Court of Appeals or Constitutional Court, representatives (similar to senators) , deputy prime minister (usually holds position of minister of foreign affairs), head of security force or national police.

Coders choose a response from drop down menu:

Rank = Low

Rank = High

Rank = Don't Know

Rank Subcategory (Old/Obsolete)

"What is the exact rank of the individual?"

This was a category originally coded by the coders, and some of the information is accurate, but the team made a decision that our original categories were not exhaustive or clear enough to be used.

Coders chose all responses that apply from drop down menu:

Rank subcategory=Rulers

Rank subcategory=Officers

Rank subcategory=Non-commissioned officers (NCOs)

Rank subcategory=Footsoldier

Rank subcategory=Bureaucrat

Rank subcategory=Rulers

Rank subcategory=Don't know

Membership

"To what group does the individual belong?"

The purpose of the variable is to identify whether the individual tried is an agent of the state, or a member of opposition groups. Though we are only looking for data on state agents, we also come across a good deal of information on opposition members who are tried. We code this information as well.

Coders choose a response from drop down menu:

Current state agent = someone working for the government when the prosecution begins

Former state agent = someone who is no longer working for the government

Opposition member = someone who is operating in resistance to the government. Can be a politician, a rebel, or a resistor

State agent operating in another country = This is for those military or security members who commit human rights violations in another state, but are tried at home

Additional Information

"Is there any additional information about the accused that is relevant?"

The purpose of this text box is to specify additional details about the accused.

Charges

"What are the charges?"

The purpose of the variable is to what charges the individual is being tried for. The coder will list the charges as they are stated in the source document.

If the charges are not listed, please click the “charges unknown box” below the Charges box.

Preliminary Trial Process

“What are the preliminary trial processes the individual underwent?”

The purpose of this list of checkboxes is to determine all of the various processes the individual underwent over the whole process of the prosecution. The coder will click all that apply.

Court Levels 1-5

“What are the various court levels and decisions at those different levels?”

Most of the time you will not be able to find all of this information, and that is okay. The purpose of this series of variables is to trace the process of each trial. The coder will isolate the various courts through which each trial proceeded. The coding will proceed in a series of steps. For each ‘court level,’ the coder will choose the following:

Court Level X=Lower

Court Level X=Appeals

Court Level X=Higher

Court Level X=Military

Court Level X=Foreign

Court Level X=International

Court Level X=Hybrid

Court Level X=Other

Court Level X=Don’t Know

The coder will then type the name of the court as it appears in the source document in the box labeled “Name”

In the Verdict drop down, the coder will choose between the following values:

Verdict=Guilty

Verdict=Acquittal

Verdict=Acquittal Overturned

Verdict=Acquittal Upheld

Verdict=Plea Bargain

Verdict=Pending

Verdict=Dismissal

Verdict=Guilty Upheld

Verdict= Guilty Overturned

Verdict=Guilty-Sentence Reduced

Verdict=Guilty-Sentence Reduced

The coder will then choose the length of the sentence that was determined by the verdict, if the verdict results in a sentence.

Sentencing Time=Less than 1 Year
Sentencing Time=1-3 Years
Sentencing Time=4-9 Years
Sentencing Time=10-19 Years
Sentencing Time=20-30 Years
Sentencing Time=Life Imprisonment
Sentencing Time=Death Penalty

The coder will then choose the sentencing arrangement:

Sentencing Arrangement=Ordinary Prison
Sentencing Arrangement=Special Detention
Sentencing Arrangement=Suspended Sentence
Sentencing Arrangement=Unknown

Finally, the coder will choose from the drop down menu label “Verdict date” the date on which the verdict happened. If only the year is available, only the year should be coded.

The coder repeats this process for each and every trial court through which the trial progressed.

Trial Court Type

“Was the trial domestic, foreign, or international?”

The purpose of the variable is to determine in which jurisdiction the trial was initiated.

Coders choose a response from drop down menu:

Trial Court Type = Domestic
Trial Court Type = Foreign
Trial Court Type = International

Court Name

“What was the name of the last court through which the trial proceeded?”

List the name of the last court listed in the court levels section.

Trial Plaintiff

“Who brought the case to trial?”

The purpose of the variable is to establish which procedures were used to bring the criminal case against the defendant.

Coders choose a response from drop down menu:

Trial Plaintiff = Military/State Prosecutor
Trial Plaintiff = Individual Victim
Trial Plaintiff = Human rights organization

Trial Plaintiff = State prosecutor and victim (private) prosecution
Trial Plaintiff = International Prosecutor

Relevant Information

“Is there any additional relevant information pertaining to the trial process?”

The purpose of the variable is to give coders the opportunity to add elements not captured by the coding instrument.

Statute or Amnesty Circumvented

“Did the trial circumvent a statute or amnesty?”

The purpose of the variable is to identify whether the trial made a procedural contribution by proceeding in spite of statutes or amnesties limited criminal responsibility.

Verdict

“What is the final verdict in the trial?”

Here the coder will choose the final verdict as it stands based on the information collected in the court level data. That is, here the coder will select the last verdict that was issued.

Verdict=Guilty

Verdict=Acquittal

Verdict=Plea Bargain

Verdict=Dismissal

Verdict=Pending

Verdict=Guilty Overturned

Verdict=Acquittal Overturned

Verdict=Don't Know

Note: An acquittal means that the defendant was ruled not guilty, were a dismissal means that the trials was discontinued based on lack of evidence or procedural issues.

Guilty Sentence

“What is the final sentence in the trial?”

The coder will specify the exact terms of the final sentence issued in the trial, if a verdict was issued.

Guilty Sentence

“Is there additional relevant information pertaining to the guilty sentence?”

This text box gives the coder a chance to specify any additional information regarding the nature of the sentence. For example, the coder might want to detail information they have found regarding time served, complications with the prison term, or exemption made for the convicted person's health.

Outcome Date

“What is the final decision date in the trial?”

Transitional Justice Research Collaborative
Supported by National Science Foundation Grant No. 0961226

The coder will choose the date of the final verdict in the trial. If you have information on the Court Levels, this should match the final date of the last court level activity.

Sources

“What are the sources used in coding the above information?”

Here, the coder will copy and paste citations and weblinks for all of the source information pertaining to any given accusations page.

Section 3: Appendix

Country Name	COW ID	Region	Spell type	Start	End
Albania	339	Euro	democratic transition	1990	1995
Albania	339	Euro	autocratic reversion	1996	1996
Albania	339	Euro	democratic transition	1997	2016
Algeria	615	MENA	democratic transition	2004	2016
Argentina	160	Amer	democratic transition	1973	1975
Argentina	160	Amer	autocratic reversion	1976	1982
Argentina	160	Amer	democratic transition	1983	2016
Armenia	371	Euro	democratic transition	1991	1995
Armenia	371	Euro	autocratic reversion	1996	1997
Armenia	371	Euro	democratic transition	1998	2016
Azerbaijan	373	Euro	democratic transition	1992	1992
Azerbaijan	373	Euro	autocratic reversion	1993	2016
Bangladesh	771	Asia	democratic transition	1972	1973
Bangladesh	771	Asia	autocratic reversion	1974	2008
Bangladesh	771	Asia	democratic transition	1991	2006
Bangladesh	771	Asia	autocratic reversion	2007	2008
Bangladesh	771	Asia	democratic transition	2009	2016
Belarus	370	Euro	democratic transition	1991	1995
Belarus	370	Euro	autocratic reversion	1996	2016
Benin	434	Africa	democratic transition	1990	2016
Bolivia	145	Amer	democratic transition	1982	2016
Brazil	140	Amer	democratic transition	1985	2016
Bulgaria	355	Euro	democratic transition	1990	2016
Burkina Faso	439	Africa	democratic transition	1977	1979
Burkina Faso	439	Africa	autocratic reversion	1980	2014
Burkina Faso	440	Africa	democratic transition	2015	2016
Burundi	516	Africa	democratic transition	2005	2014
Burundi	517	Africa	autocratic reversion	2015	2016
C Af Republic	482	Africa	democratic transition	1991	2002
C Af Republic	482	Africa	autocratic reversion	2003	2015
C Af Republic	482	Africa	democratic transition	2016	2016

Transitional Justice Research Collaborative
Supported by National Science Foundation Grant No. 0961226

Cambodia	811	Asia	democratic transition	1988	1996
Cambodia	811	Asia	autocratic reversion	1997	1997
Cambodia	811	Asia	democratic transition	1998	2016
Chile	155	Amer	democratic transition	1989	2016
Congo (Brazzaville)	484	Africa	democratic transition	1991	1996
Congo (Brazzaville)	484	Africa	autocratic reversion	1997	2016
Cote d'Ivoire	437	Africa	democratic transition	1999	2002
Cote d'Ivoire	437	Africa	autocratic reversion	2003	2010
Cote d'Ivoire	438	Africa	democratic transition	2010	2016
Croatia	344	Euro	democratic transition	1999	2016
Czechoslovakia	315	Euro	democratic transition	1989	1992
Czech Republic	315	Euro	democratic transition	1993	2016
Dominican Rep	42	Amer	democratic transition	1978	2016
DR Congo	490	Africa	democratic transition	2004	2016
Ecuador	130	Amer	democratic transition	1979	2016
El Salvador	92	Amer	democratic transition	1982	2016
Estonia	366	Euro	democratic transition	1991	2016
Ethiopia	530	Africa	democratic transition	1994	2004
Ethiopia	531	Africa	autocratic reversion	2005	2016
Gabon	481	Africa	democratic transition	2009	2016
Georgia	372	Euro	democratic transition	1991	2016
Germany	255	Euro	democratic transition	1990	2016
Ghana	452	Africa	democratic transition	1970	1971
Ghana	452	Africa	autocratic reversion	1972	1977
Ghana	452	Africa	democratic transition	1978	1980
Ghana	452	Africa	autocratic reversion	1981	1995
Ghana	452	Africa	democratic transition	1996	2016
Greece	350	Euro	democratic transition	1974	2016
Guatemala	90	Amer	democratic transition	1986	2016
Guinea-Bissau	404	Africa	democratic transition	1991	2002
Guinea-Bissau	405	Africa	war interruption	1998	1998
Guinea-Bissau	406	Africa	democratic transition	1999	2002
Guinea-Bissau	404	Africa	autocratic reversion	2003	2004
Guinea-Bissau	404	Africa	democratic transition	2005	2016
Haiti	41	Amer	democratic transition	1990	1990
Haiti	41	Amer	autocratic reversion	1991	1993
Haiti	41	Amer	democratic transition	1994	1999
Haiti	41	Amer	autocratic reversion	2000	2003
Haiti	41	Amer	democratic transition	2004	2016
Honduras	91	Amer	democratic transition	1980	2016
Hungary	310	Euro	democratic transition	1989	2016
Indonesia	850	Asia	democratic transition	1999	2016
Iran	630	MENA	democratic transition	1997	2003
Iran	630	MENA	autocratic reversion	2004	2016
Kenya	501	Africa	democratic transition	2002	2016

Transitional Justice Research Collaborative
Supported by National Science Foundation Grant No. 0961226

Kosovo	347	Euro	democratic transition	2008	2016
Kyrgyzstan	703	Asia	democratic transition	2005	2016
Latvia	367	Euro	democratic transition	1991	2016
Lebanon	660	MENA	democratic transition	2005	2016
Lesotho	570	Africa	democratic transition	1993	1998
Lesotho	570	Africa	war interruption	1999	1999
Lesotho	570	Africa	democratic transition	2000	2016
Liberia	450	Africa	democratic transition	2003	2016
Lithuania	368	Euro	democratic transition	1991	2016
Macedonia	343	Euro	democratic transition	1991	2016
Madagascar	580	Africa	democratic transition	1991	2016
Malawi	553	Africa	democratic transition	1994	2016
Mali	432	Africa	democratic transition	1991	2016
Mauritania	435	Africa	democratic transition	2007	2007
Mauritania	435	Africa	autocratic reversion	2008	2016
Mexico	70	Amer	democratic transition	1994	2016
Moldova	359	Euro	democratic transition	1991	2016
Mongolia	712	Asia	democratic transition	1990	2016
Mozambique	541	Africa	democratic transition	1994	2016
Nepal	790	Asia	democratic transition	1990	2001
Nepal	790	Asia	autocratic reversion	2002	2005
Nepal	790	Asia	democratic transition	2006	2016
Nicaragua	93	Amer	democratic transition	1990	2016
Niger	436	Africa	democratic transition	1991	1995
Niger	436	Africa	autocratic reversion	1996	1998
Niger	436	Africa	democratic transition	1999	2008
Niger	436	Africa	autocratic reversion	2009	2009
Niger	436	Africa	democratic transition	2010	2016
Nigeria	475	Africa	democratic transition	1978	1983
Nigeria	475	Africa	autocratic reversion	1984	1998
Nigeria	475	Africa	democratic transition	1999	2016
Pakistan	770	Asia	democratic transition	1973	1976
Pakistan	770	Asia	autocratic reversion	1977	1987
Pakistan	770	Asia	democratic transition	1988	1998
Pakistan	770	Asia	autocratic reversion	1999	2006
Pakistan	770	Asia	democratic transition	2007	2016
Panama	95	Amer	democratic transition	1989	2016
Paraguay	150	Amer	democratic transition	1989	1991
Paraguay	151	Amer	democratic transition	1992	2016
Peru	135	Amer	democratic transition	1979	1991
Peru	135	Amer	autocratic reversion	1993	1999
Peru	135	Amer	democratic transition	2000	2016
Philippines	840	Asia	democratic transition	1986	2016
Poland	290	Euro	democratic transition	1989	2016
Portugal	235	Euro	democratic transition	1974	2016

Transitional Justice Research Collaborative
Supported by National Science Foundation Grant No. 0961226

Romania	360	Euro	democratic transition	1989	2016
Russia	365	Euro	democratic transition	1992	2016
Senegal	433	Africa	democratic transition	2000	2016
Serbia	345	Euro	democratic transition	2000	2005
Serbia	346	Euro	democratic transition	2006	2016
Sierra Leone	451	Africa	democratic transition	2001	2016
Slovakia	317	Euro	democratic transition	1993	2016
Slovenia	349	Euro	democratic transition	1992	2016
South Africa	560	Africa	democratic transition	1992	2010
South Korea	732	Asia	democratic transition	1987	2016
Spain	230	Euro	democratic transition	1975	2016
Sudan	625	MENA	democratic transition	1985	1988
Sudan	625	MENA	autocratic reversion	1989	2016
Taiwan	713	Asia	democratic transition	1992	2016
Thailand	800	Asia	democratic transition	1974	1975
Thailand	800	Asia	autocratic reversion	1976	1977
Thailand	800	Asia	democratic transition	1978	1990
Thailand	800	Asia	autocratic reversion	1991	1991
Thailand	801	Asia	democratic transition	1992	2005
Thailand	802	Asia	autocratic reversion	2006	2007
Thailand	800	Asia	democratic transition	2008	2013
Thailand	801	Asia	autocratic reversion	2014	2016
Timor-Leste	860	Asia	democratic transition	2002	2016
Turkey	640	MENA	democratic transition	1973	1979
Turkey	640	MENA	autocratic reversion	1980	1982
Turkey	640	MENA	democratic transition	1983	2015
Turkey	640	MENA	autocratic reversion	2015	2016
Uganda	500	Africa	democratic transition	1980	1985
Uganda	500	Africa	autocratic reversion	1986	2016
Ukraine	369	Euro	democratic transition	1991	2016
Uruguay	165	Amer	democratic transition	1985	2016
Zambia	551	Africa	democratic transition	1991	2016
Zimbabwe	552	Africa	democratic transition	2009	2016