CODEBOOK FOR PRESIDENTIAL TERM LIMIT EVASION

Please cite the following article:
Versteeg, Mila, Timothy Horley, Anne Meng, Mauricio Guim, and Marilyn Guirguis. 2020. "The law and politics of presidential term limit evasion." *Columbia Law Review.* 120(1): 1-77.

SAMPLE SELECTION

We used CCP data to identify all countries that had term limits at some point from 2000-onward. Then, we dropped the following countries:

1. Countries that are very small islands (Sao Tome and Principe)
2. Countries that were broken up/ haven't had consistent territorial state, and as a result of that had multiple President (Bosnia & Herzegovia has three)

GENERAL NOTES:

- We record event-year observations. This is for each incumbent, the year that his term limits would have been up. If the constitution allows for more than one term, this is the last year of his second term
  (Of course, in some cases, the incumbent does not complete his first or second term, or gets defeated/ does not run for a second one. In that case, the event is coded as one of understay. Thus, for example, Donald Trump got elected in 2016; his term is set to expire in 2024; if he loses the 2020 election, then he under stayed).
- TL: "term limits"
- If the year of TL expiration hasn't happened yet, then the case can't be coded.
  - This means that current incumbents only enter the dataset when they have stayed passed their term.
  - It also means that we miss a few cases such as China, were term limits were successfully removed before the term was up, but the incumbent has not stayed beyond his term.
  - It term limits get added late, then that's when we start the clock. So ironically, we code Mugabe as a case of understay, because he became subject to term limits only in 2013, when the new constitution was adopted, and he was ousted before his time was up.

VARIABLES:

Cowcode: correlates of war country code.

Country: country name

President: incumbent name at relevant time period

Year_TL_up: year that the existing term limits were set to expire for the current incumbent
Note, if an incumbent successfully overstays and then runs up to a new term limit, he will enter twice. For example, Uribe in Colombia, overstayed his term by amending the constitution. But he then run up to a new term limit, which is the new event. [Same applies to Burkina Faso]

Year_outoffice: year that incumbent actually left office. This can be either before or after the term limits expire. *If current incumbent, code as 3000*
If case a country holds election in one year, and power transfers the next year (like in the U.S., or Mozambique) we use the latter date.

Entry_mode: How did the incumbent INITIALLY come into office? Examples: through an election, via a coup, etc.
Note: we code how leaders "initially" came to powers, because sometimes leaders come into office via a coup and then hold elections later.

1==election,
2==coup,
3== elected by assembly/parliament/ party (e.g., Burundi)
4= took over from predecessor who resigned/ died (e.g., Cameroon)
99== unable to determine

Respect_TL: did the incumbent step down by the year their term was set to expire? If the constitution was amended, but President lost the election, we code as 1 (but not for the subsequent question success).
0== no
1==yes

Understay: If term limits were respected, was this a case of understay (which usually means, some other reason why term was not completed, such as a coup d'etat, or death etc).
0= no (because honored or because overstay)
1= yes, because of some unforeseen circumstances
2= yes, because of deliberate strategy to give party the incumbent advantage (the Botswana model)

Election_scheduled: was there an election scheduled for the year the term was set to expire?
0== no,
1==yes

Evasion_attempt: was there are attempt (either from the incumbent or another group) to remove, change, or evade TL?
Note, to count as an evasion attempt, a real proposal has to be made.

- Trump joking at Mar-a-Lago, or a leader making a comment at a news conference does not count.
    - Or Ahmed Tejan Kabbah of Sierra Leone apparently remarking publicly that he was considering it does not count.
    - Or a proposal by the supporters of President Lula Da Silva proposed a constitutional amendment to allow him to seek a third term, but the proposal never had the president's support.
- By contrast, when formal bill to amend the constitution is proposed in Parliament, that certainly counts.
- But something short of that also can count: for example, in Zambia there was an extended campaign and harassment and intimidation to extend term limits in 2001; the proposal was drafted, but the day before it was introduced, the President realized it might be defeated and withdrew his support. We count such a case as well (also the ongoing debate in South Korea counts).
- When a proposal becomes a real issue, for example because there are massive protests against it, or because there is a broad movement for amendment (and a counter movement), we include it.
    - Koroma is Sierra Leone, whereby some of his proponents advanced all sorts of arguments, including that Koroma deserved a longer tenure as a reward for good governance, and that the Ebola crisis of 2014 prevented Koroma from having a real chance to improve development and thus he should get more time in order to offset this loss.[1] Koroma himself never said he wanted to overstay, and no formal proposal was made.[2] But since it became quite an issue, we coded it.
    - Same for Argentina in 2012, where there were massive street protests.

0== no,
1==yes
2== attempt that is meant to benefit future or past presidents but not the current incumbent

Who: who made the attempt to change TL? It could be the incumbent, the incumbent's party, an allied party, etc.
1==incumbent
2==incumbent's party
3==incumbent supporters
4== A former president or his party, who wanted to get back in power
99==unable to determine
.==Not Applicable, because no evasion attempt was made

Strategy1: Primary strategy. Use following categories:
1==amend

[1] http://www.thecitizen.co.tz/News/Sierra-Leone-on-edge-over-presidential-term-limit/1840340-3894170-k2mp2g/index.html.
[2] Id.

2==new constitution/ blank slate theory
3==some legal theory+courts
4==placeholder president or some other form of continued control while exiting the office (Putin strategy)
5==delay elections
6==ignore
7==other
.==Not Applicable, because no evasion attempt was made

Note: if there is a new constitution that changes term limits, but there's no version of the blank slate theory being pushed, we will treat this as an amendment, even if it is technically replacement.

Note: when courts are used for the blank slate theory, we code it as blank slate and courts secondary.

Note: coded as "some other theory plus courts"—this means it is NOT the blank slate theory.

Strategy 2: If there was a secondary strategy

Strategy 3: If there were a tertiary strategy

Amend_type: If the strategy was amendment, what was amended?
1= term limits scrapped entirely
2= term length extended
3= number of terms extended
4= age limits removed
5= term extended for the current incumbent only, not for future presidents

Success: were the strategies successful? (this question duplicates TL_respect). Note: success does not require that the President actually gets re-elected. He can successfully amend the constitution, but lose the election. Or the constitution may be changed in such a way that ends up benefiting someone else (Costa Rica, where it benefited the ex-President).
0= no
1= yes

Response: General response to evasion strategy.
0== no real public response
1== some popular protests, but not widespread; basically the opposition opposed
2== widespread popular protests (panama style)
3== attempts to litigate and invalidate the strategy (e.g., unconstitutional constitutional amendment doctrine)
4== Strengthened the political opposition, and lost election.

5= No response, because country has bigger problems, like civil war.
.==Not Applicable, because no evasion attempt was made

Failed_reason: ONLY if the attempt failed, what was the main source of the failure?
Categories:

1==popular protests with violence
2==popular protests without violence
3==court strikes down, does not go along
4== cost him the election
5= just not popular enough, so did not get very far
6== coup d'etat
7= control by his party (which has norms of rotating power)
99== unable to establish
. == not applicable, because no attempt was made

Failed_reason2: ONLY if the attempt failed, what was the main source of the failure?
Categories:

1==popular protests with violence
2==popular protests without violence
3==court strikes down
4== cost him the election
5= just not popular enough, so did not get very far
6== coup d'etat
7= informal party norms that require rotation of power within party
99== unable to establish
. == not applicable, because only one reason for failure

formal_TL_change: Did the term limits change in response to this attempt?

0==no
1==yes
.== Not Applicable, because no evasion attempt was made