

Voter Tolerance of Institutional Erosion: Causal Evidence on Authoritarian Politics and Democratic Backsliding and Institutional Constraints in the United States

Mohd. Ruhul Amin

Oct 7, 2025

Abstract

This article examines how partisan loyalty and authoritarian political strategies influence voter tolerance of institutional erosion in the United States. It describes democratic backsliding as a gradual process involving selective enforcement, manipulation of appointments, attacks on institutional referees, pressure on information systems, and claims that exceptional action is necessary against political threats. The article mentions that authoritarian politics often operates through coalition management rather than constant mass repression, allowing limited competition while rewarding allies and increasing the costs faced by opponents. Survey experiments and behavioural research can assess whether citizens penalize a preferred candidate for violating democratic rules or excuse the conduct because of party identity and policy agreement. The analysis also emphasizes judicial independence, civil-service protection, election administration, media freedom, transparent procedures, and credible political alternatives. It concludes that democratic constraints become effective when institutional violations produce comparable public and electoral costs regardless of which party or political coalition benefits from them.

Cumulative advantage, institutional asymmetry is important. The main issue relate to the possibility of a violation of rules, referee influencing or critic punishing, by the governing actor at a lower cost than by others.

Residents of a country can often become disaffirmative of democracy in the abstract if they must choose between two competing partisans for their loyalty. Polarization comes in a number of forms, with various scholars proposing different explanations as to why individuals can engage in less than democratic behaviour and not question it, from a preferred side and especially when political conflict is perceived as existential – Milan Svoblik's work is to be credited here. New research in the United States has similarly shown that partisanship and orientations to candidates brims over into a diminished punishment for violations of democracy. Not all individuals are indifferent as indicated in such findings.

They demonstrate this requires competition, information, “elite cues,” and credible alternatives.” The best indicator does not ask for approval of democracy in a generic survey question, but rather if citizens disapprove of a candidate of choice following some act.

The implementation of institutional constraints is related to independence, capacity, transparency and coordination. If a court isn't independent and doesn't have timely access or if there's no enforceable relief, then the court's protection is weak. Unprotected staffing places in the civil service means that the civil service can still be subject to loyalty tests. Election administrators require resources, physical security, legal protection and public confidence in the case of Sri Lankan elections.

Media freedom is a kind of freedom to information, and freedom from retaliatory investigation. The presence of more than one institution capable of identifying, exposing, delaying and remedying abuse makes for a more durable type of constraint. Redundancy also minimizes risk of a single body being taken out taking the entire accountability system down with an out of service.

Below constitutional breaking behavior, behaviours need to be tracked by early warning systems. These signs include partisan replacement of professional officials, selective investigations, threats toward actors in the election process, limits on peaceful assembly and unrestrained, or atypical application of emergency powers, attacks on independent media and a campaign of delegitimization of normal certification. There could be an innocent explanation for each event. The more the indicators move in the same direction, the fewer remedies are available, and the more forcefully unhelpful publicly stated reasons

grow, the greater the risk. Clustering is identifiable through administrative records, court filings, legislative procedures, personnel information, event information and surveys.

Measuring democracy involves complex institutions being transformed into comparable indicators, and in each democracy index, fundamental decisions are made concerning the concept, evidence, aggregation and uncertainty of the measure. The different dimensions are in the Electoral competition, civil liberties, judicial independence, media freedom, participation, equality and deliberation. To address this complexity, V-Dem employs a number of indices and expert coded indicators and other projects have different frameworks. Scores can be used for comparison, but a national score can disguise within-country differences, inequitable citizenship or quick changes in administration. So instead of using the rank itself as the diagnosis, the movement at indicator level, the confidence interval, coding of notes, and corroborating evidence all are considered responsible use.

Fundamental rights are resilient, as protection is durable in the face of uncertainty, fear and a political imbalance. The most difficult instances are when it comes to unpopular communities, controversial speech, migrants, prisoners, protesters, and communities that are security stigmatised. Equal protection has been granted during quiet times – it provides some information regarding the strength of the Constitution. During times of pressure, resilience is manifested by the maintenance of due process, individual assessment, Legal Counsel, review, and reasoned justification in the form of institutions.

Distributional analysis is important because a formally “neutral” rule may have a concentrated impact on those with lower incomes, people with disabilities, immigrants and people living in a particular area, those living with a disability, or who don’t speak the official language of the government, among others, due to the nature of the law or program. Rights protection should therefore not only be addressed in terms of a doctrinal analysis, but also in terms of empirical issues concerning the working of the relevant provisions.

Recovering from a democratic failure is more comprehensive than a simple replacement of the office holder, or the overturning of an order that is challenged as undemocratic. Politicized appointments, reduced watchdogs, changed enforcement procedures, initiated harassment of public servants, and popularly held beliefs that any election can allow for reshaping institutions can be a result of executive overreach. A restoration is thus required, along with investigation and prevention. Independent offices, the secure tenure and resources they need, administrative records that must be preserved, unlawful directives that must be reviewed, and affected groups that must be given remedy.

But reform cannot be populist either as populist "overcorrection" can create a new "winner take all" mentality. Durable recovery provides neutral capacity restoration while proposing future abuse is more challenging between parties.

Focus more on how involved you can get than just participating. Doing extra consultations, hearings, having websites, citizen panels and advisory boards can expand voice without changing who sets the agenda, controls the information, and makes the decisions. Evaluation should question who enters, who speaks, who evidence is given weight and who recommendations changes policy and who groups are excluded and have access to appeal. Participation may be symbolic where participants are chosen for convenience of the officials or asked to comment after key decisions have been made. Good design enables participants to receive the information they need at the right time, to facilitate on their own, to clearly understand who is to respond, and to clearly make the link between deliberation and eventual decision.

Elite cues influence the interpretation of voters towards the behaviors of institutions. Party leaders may portray an abuse as needed, or allege there is no rule or that the opponents committed worse abuse. This framing is down to create a lower level of clarity for electoral sanction. Party members feel strongly about the violation when they are condemned by other parties, resign, and are enforced by other party members.

Independent offices, institutional dissent of within, and media need to be built into institutional design in order to provide room for those signals to arise and be heard. This means that political actors are more inclined to uphold rules if they know and trust that other "good" actors will protect them.

The change of democratic players goes beyond the competition's end. The processes of power organization and contestation among parties are influenced by decision makers who include election administrators, prosecutors, auditors, courts, regulators, and public broadcasters. Indépendance is affected by the appointment rules, the tenure, the budgets, the rules for their removal, transparency and the professional qualifications. Capture may occur through a series of incremental personnel and process changes, instead of a complete repeal and replacement.

Turnover, vacancies, acting engagements, territorial adjustments, and selectivity in the enforcement of the law should thus be monitored. For a referee to be credible, decisions need to be based on consistent criteria and an adverse determination must be equally applied to the actions of those who are being governed.

The belief of a voter depends upon clarity. Often violations can be sneaky, coming bundle-wrapped in arguments over policy, complexity of procedure, or finger pointing. In addition to their own roles of informing the public about the course of their nation's affairs, election officials, courts, journalists, scholars, and civic groups can play an independent role in informing the public about the nature of the democratic stake, thus telling the public how they can best support democracy. Identification of the rule, violation, beneficiary, and long run consequence for competition should be made in a public explanation.

Institutional factors also have distinct impact on voters' decisions because they can affect the credible policy options available. Opposition has the ability to organize and to compete due to media pluralism, fair districting, permission to assemble in lawful protest, neutrality of administration and secure elections. Weakening of those channels heightens a false choice for citizens that running against an abusive incumbent seems less safe. Thus, it is important to protect competition, which enhances institutional and electoral accountability.

danger arises when partisan victory is more important than democratic constraint - polarization. Authoritarian politics plays off of that equation by broadening the rules' scope slowly over time, and by creating a series of rules that are poor on opposition, thus increasing the opposition's price of entry. Both public support, in a 'do the rules work for you too?' sense and institutional independence and ability to act are needed. The best democratic counterpoise is where citizens disapprove of the actions of a favorite party for being out of tune with democracy.

But if not then erosion of constitutional limits is put under pressure by leaders, who find that it does not incur direct electoral consequences. Selective rule enforcement can change the dynamics of competition, without aborting an election. Across the political spectrum, standards increase the political price of the increment erosion of institutions. Neutral administration will safeguard the interests of present minorities, and the interests of the future electoral losers. Cumulative advantage should be considered regardless of how unobjectionable each one of these individual steps may be on their face under the law.