مجله مطالعات حقوق بین الملل ایران

Electoral Engineering and Non-Democratic Voting Practices: A Theoretical Review

Nasim Amiri Ghadi [1], Amirali R. Davoudpour [2]

1- Faculty of Anthropology and Cultural Studies, Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznan-Poland
2- Iranian Canon of Medicine and Law, Administrative Wing of Law and Healing Association, Iranian Watchdog of Medicine and Law, Tehran-Iran

Email of the corresponding author: davoudpour@canmedlaw.org

Abstract

Electoral engineering refers to a range of tactics employed by political actors to manipulate election outcomes, undermining the principles of democratic governance. By distorting voter behavior through various means, such as ethnic voting, vote buying, religious influences, and partisan loyalty, electoral engineering poses significant challenges to the legitimacy of elections. This paper offers a comprehensive theoretical review of electoral engineering and its impact on democratic processes. The study identifies and analyzes four main types of non-democratic voting practices and provides a framework for understanding their effects on democracy.

Keywords: Electoral engineering, Politics

Introduction

Democratic elections are designed to reflect the collective will of the people. However, the manipulation of electoral processes, often referred to as electoral engineering, distorts this principle. By manipulating the electoral environment, political elites can consolidate power, undermine public trust, and weaken democratic institutions. Electoral engineering includes a wide array of tactics aimed at skewing the results of elections, from controlling voter behavior to influencing the electoral landscape through districting or disenfranchisement (Birch, 2011). This article focuses on four forms of non-democratic voting practices often employed in electoral engineering: ethnic voting, vote buying, religious voting, and political voting.

The manipulation of electoral outcomes is not a new phenomenon. Scholars have long examined how political actors utilize various tools to secure electoral victories through means that undermine the integrity of the democratic process. Birch (2011) defines electoral engineering as any action taken to manipulate the conditions or the results of an election, often violating the fairness of the electoral process. This manipulation may take place at various stages, from redrawing district boundaries to controlling media narratives. Election manipulation is particularly effective in hybrid regimes, where elections are held but not free from manipulation (Levitsky & Way, 2010).

One of the key ways in which electoral engineering manifests is through non-democratic voting practices. These practices, such as vote buying, ethnic voting, and religious influence, divert elections away from a focus on policy and merit. According to Schedler (2002), electoral authoritarian regimes often rely on a façade of democratic elections to maintain legitimacy while simultaneously manipulating the process to ensure the ruling party's victory. Manipulating voter preferences and behaviors, electoral engineering undermines the very foundation of democracy by negating the idea of free and fair elections (Collier & Vicente, 2012). To understand the non-democratic practices in the electoral engineering an in-depth analysis of the concept of authenticity is evident (Davoudpour, A.R., 2024). Inauthentic votes are not considered a democratic elections by virtue and the countries which practice elections under an influence of inauthentic means are not considered democratic despite their vow for democracy and justice.

Types of Non-Democratic Voting Practices

1. Ethnic Voting

Ethnic voting occurs when voters align themselves with candidates from their own ethnic group, regardless of policy or competence. This form of voting is particularly prevalent in societies with deep ethnic divisions. Scholars such as Horowitz (1985) have demonstrated how ethnic affiliations can become the primary determinant of electoral outcomes in multi-ethnic societies. Ethnic voting contributes to the "ethnicization" of politics, where elections become contests of identity rather than platforms for policy debates (Posner, 2005).

Impact of Ethnic Votes on Democracy:

Ethnic voting promotes division within society and undermines democratic institutions by limiting the competition between candidates based on policy proposals. It also perpetuates political instability, as political parties increasingly cater to ethnic constituencies rather than broader national interests (Chandra, 2004). This fragmentation often results in political gridlock, as coalitions are formed not based on ideological alignment, but on ethnic compromise (Lijphart, 1999).

2. Vote Buying (Bus Votes)

Vote buying is the act of offering money or material incentives in exchange for votes. It is one of the most direct forms of electoral manipulation and is particularly effective in societies with high levels of poverty and inequality (Schaffer & Schedler, 2007). Studies show that vote buying not only distorts the electoral process but also diminishes voter engagement in post-election accountability. Instead of evaluating candidates based on their performance or policy agendas, voters are incentivized by short-term financial gains (Vicente, 2014).

Impact of Bus Votes on Democracy:

Vote buying reduces elections to mere economic transactions, weakening the representativeness of elected officials. It also undermines political accountability, as elected officials may feel less obligated to fulfill campaign promises or respond to the needs of their constituents if their electoral success is tied to financial power rather than voter support (Hicken, 2011). Furthermore, vote buying contributes to entrenched political corruption and perpetuates economic inequality (Stokes, 2005).

3. Religious Voting

Religious voting occurs when voters make decisions based on shared religious affiliations with candidates or religious endorsements. In many countries, religious identity plays a central role in shaping political behavior. Norris and Inglehart (2004) argue that in societies where religion is intertwined with national identity, religious leaders and institutions hold significant sway over voters. This phenomenon is particularly evident in countries with dominant state religions or where religious groups have deep social and political influence.

Impact of Religious Votes on Democracy:

While religious voting can reflect deeply held values, it also risks undermining the secular nature of democratic governance. It may marginalize minority religious groups and promote theocratic policies that conflict with pluralistic democratic principles (Philpott, 2007). Religious voting can also lead to the politicization of religious institutions, where religious figures gain undue influence over political outcomes, blurring the line between church and state (Haynes, 2009).

4. Political Voting

Political voting refers to casting votes based solely on party loyalty or ideological alignment, without consideration of the individual candidate's qualifications or local concerns. This form of voting can be particularly problematic in local elections, where voters may be swayed by national political debates rather than the merits of local candidates. Political voting often reinforces partisan divisions, making it difficult to achieve governance consensus, especially at the local level (Cox & McCubbins, 2005).

Impact of Political Votes on Democracy:

Excessive political voting at the local level can undermine the democratic principle of electing competent leaders based on their ability to address local issues. When voters prioritize party affiliation over competence, the quality of governance at the municipal level suffers (Dalton & Wattenberg, 2000). Political voting may also lead to polarization, with elected officials more focused on partisan battles than on solving problems affecting their constituencies (Fiorina & Abrams, 2008).

Conclusion

This review has outlined key forms of non-democratic voting practices used in electoral engineering, including ethnic voting, vote buying, religious voting, and political voting. These practices threaten the foundations of democracy by distorting voter behavior and undermining the integrity of the electoral process. Each of these voting practices reveals different ways in which electoral engineering can manipulate elections to favor specific groups or interests, often at the expense of broader national welfare.

Addressing the challenges posed by electoral engineering requires comprehensive reforms. Legal frameworks must be strengthened to enforce accountability and prevent practices such as vote buying. Civil society must play an active role in educating voters about the importance of informed, independent voting. Ultimately, the success of democracy depends on maintaining free, fair, and transparent electoral processes.

References

1. Birch, S. (2011). *Electoral Malpractice*. Oxford University Press.

2. Buber, M. (1923). *I and Thou*. Scribner.

3. Cameron, J. (Director). (2009). *Avatar* [Film]. 20th Century Fox.

4. Campbell, J. (1949). *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*. Pantheon Books.

5. Chandra, K. (2004). *Why Ethnic Parties Succeed: Patronage and Ethnic Head Counts in India*. Cambridge University Press.

6. Collier, P., & Vicente, P. C. (2012). Violence, Bribery, and Fraud: The Political Economy of Elections in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Public Choice*, 153(1), 117-147.

7. Cox, G. W., & McCubbins, M. D. (2005). *Setting the Agenda: Responsible Party Government in the U.S. House of Representatives*. Cambridge University Press. 8. Dalton, R. J., & Wattenberg, M. P. (2000). *Parties without Partisans: Political Change in Advanced Industrial Democracies*. Oxford University Press.

8. Davoudpour, A. R. (2024). *Challenges of Authenticity in Capitalism: Money and Virtue*. *Journal of Iranian International Legal Studies*, 1(1). https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13213653

9. Durkheim, E. (1912). *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*. Allen & Unwin.

10. Eliade, M. (1987). *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion*. Harcourt.

11. Ferguson, E. (2018). *The Early Church and Its Expansion*. Hendrickson Publishers.

12. Fiorina, M. P., & Abrams, S. J. (2008). Political Polarization in the American Public. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 11, 563-588.

13. Freud, S. (1914). *On Narcissism: An Introduction*. *Standard Edition*, 14, pp. 67-102.

14. Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures*. Basic Books.

15. Haynes, J. (2009). *Religion and Politics in Africa*. Zed Books.

16. Henderson, J. C. (2003). Managing Tourism and Islam in Peninsular Malaysia. *Tourism Management*, 24(4), pp. 447-456.

17. Hicken, A. (2011). Clientelism. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 14, 289-310.

18. Horowitz, D. L. (1985). *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*. University of California Press.

19. Levitsky, S., & Way, L. A. (2010). *Competitive Authoritarianism: Hybrid Regimes after the Cold War*. Cambridge University Press.

20. Lijphart, A. (1999). *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries*. Yale University Press.

21. Norris, P., & Inglehart, R. (2004). *Sacred and Secular: Religion and Politics Worldwide*. Cambridge University Press.

22. Philpott, D. (2007). Explaining the Political Ambivalence of Religion. *American Political Science Review*, 101(3), 505-525.

23. Plantinga, A. (2000). *Warranted Christian Belief*. Oxford University Press.

24. Posner, D. N. (2005). *Institutions and Ethnic Politics in Africa*. Cambridge University Press.

25. Rumi, J. (13th century). *Masnavi*. Various editions.

26. Schaffer, F. C., & Schedler, A. (2007). What is Vote Buying? *Perspectives on Politics*, 5(2), 297-308.

27. Schedler, A. (2002). The Menu of Manipulation. *Journal of Democracy*, 13(2), 36-50.

28. Stokes, S. C. (2005). Perverse Accountability: A Formal Model of Machine Politics with Evidence from Argentina. *American Political Science Review*, 99(3), 315-325.

29. Tillich, P. (1957). *Dynamics of Faith*. Harper & Row.

30. Vicente, P. C. (2014). Is Vote Buying Effective? Evidence from a Field Experiment in West Africa. *Economic Journal*, 124(574), F356-F387.