POST-CONFLICT DEMOCRATIZATION: PITFALLS OF EXTERNAL INFLUENCE

Democratization efforts are a core element in transition phases after armed conflicts. Often, these are initiated and supported by external actors – with ambivalent results so far. However, democratization will remain an important component of peacebuilding. A review of the problems of external influence in such processes reveals a potential for optimization in three areas: More conscious handling of trade-offs, conceptual precision, and a dynamic conflict analysis are crucial.

Since the 1990s, the number of UN peace operations has been increasing, but at the same time, the nature of these operations has also been undergoing change. While the initial focus was on peacekeeping, UN missions now follow a more comprehensive approach of peacebuilding. This concept not only aims at bringing about a negative peace, i.e., a termination of violence, but strives to create a structural peace by removing the causes of conflict. Peacebuilding consists of a plethora of fields of activity, including economic reconstruction, promoting human rights, fostering the rule of law, the return and integration of refugees, and reconciliation work. The establishment of sustainable peace support structures is intended to prevent backsliding into armed conflict.

Democratization is also a core element of peacebuilding. In post-war transitions, this involves an evolution not only from war to peace, but ideally also from non-democratic governance to more democratic systems. This strategy rests on the assumption that functioning democracies tend to be more peaceful than other forms of government. The liberal peace theory has entered the field of practical politics, including in 1992 with the introduction of the concept of peacebuilding in the “Agenda for Peace”. Since then, fostering democracy has been an important element of peace processes in a variety of contexts including Kosovo, East Timor, and Sierra Leone after 1999 or Afghanistan after 2001.

So far, the results have been ambivalent. Often, instead of democracies with a minimum of functional structures, such processes have brought forth hybrid regimes balanced precariously between autocracies and democracy. International actors have frequently been disenchanted by the lack of successful democratization in cases such as Afghanistan. Recently, the rhetoric of democratization has largely been dismissed; for instance, US President Barack Obama has been avoiding reference to the topic of democracy in important speeches on Afghanistan while the German defense minister has even stated that the country will never become a democracy based on the Western model.

Critics are generally skeptical as to whether Western-style democracy is the appropriate approach in countries that are experiencing, or have recently experienced, armed conflict. This skepticism often refers to deficiencies in economic development, the state of nationbuilding, or in the political culture. Indeed, such countries are often at an auspicious starting position in these regards.

Democratization remains on the agenda

Nevertheless, democratization is not an obsolete model in the context of peacebuilding. On the one hand, aspirations for more democracy will persist at the local level. On the other hand, external actors are not expected to renounce completely their efforts in this area. Peacebuilding in general will remain relevant. International organizations such as the UN, regional organizations, and other country groupings will continue to intervene in internal armed conflicts. Therefore, a demand for peace promotion strategies and measures will persist.

The international engagement is unlikely to be once again relegated to mere peace-
keeping functions, as was the case during the Cold War. Such limited missions tend to freeze the conflict over extended periods of time without bringing about a resolution, as the Cyprus conflict exemplifies. Also, many elements of peacebuilding, including security sector reform, the return and integration of refugees, and human rights protection, are largely uncontroversial.

The often-questioned element of democratization is likely to remain crucial, too. Besides normative issues, the considerations advanced here are related directly to external involvement in internal conflicts. On the one hand, the question of power is frequently at the core of civil wars and armed violence. Unless this issue is resolved, peace processes have little chance of success. So far, there are few sustainable alternatives to a minimum of democratization with regard to involvement of international actors. On the other hand, adherence to post-conflict democratization is also in the interest of missions or states engaged on the ground. In particular, holding elections is an important element of any exit strategy of international organizations and coalitions, since they signal the end of a political transition period. Elections make it possible to transfer power to a government with at least formal legitimacy and thus to justify the end of a mission.

Against the background of the continuing significance of democratization in the context of peacebuilding, it makes sense to take a look at the problems and pitfalls of external involvement in the promotion of democracy. For even though democratization must be a process with internal support, external efforts in post-conflict situations are influential and must be critically considered.

**Goal conflicts in external influence**

The goal conflict between peace and stability on the one hand and democratization on the other poses a crucial contradiction for internal and external actors alike, and has been intensely discussed in recent years. In this debate, the intention of democratization is not fundamentally questioned. Rather, the ambivalent record of democratization efforts to date is attributed to the following dilemma: Measures for democratization can have a destabilizing effect, while conversely, peacebuilding efforts may act as obstacles to democratization.

The goals of building peace, security, and stability on the one hand and fostering democracy on the other hand are not always mutually reconcilable. This is illustrated by two examples: Free elections may be important as part of a liberalization process in order to gain legitimacy for a transformation of the political system. Simultaneously, the political conflicts associated with elections, which produce winners and losers, may be accompanied by violence, as was the case in the Democratic Republic of Congo in 2006. In Angola in 1992, such a process even caused a renewed outbreak of the civil war. Conversely, the involvement of armed groups in negotiation processes may be crucial from the point of view of security. However, it implies the risk of undermining the democratization process at a later date when armed groups undergo a pro-forma transformation into political parties and participate in elections. This occurred with RENAMO in Mozambique in 1994 or with the CNDD-FDD in Burundi in 2005. Such a development can lead to a militarization of politics.

The criticism of external actors is mainly due to the prioritization of peace and stabilization over democracy. The stated goal of democratization is then seen purely as lip service or as justification for the assertion of security interests. Indeed, in Afghanistan, for example, even before the change of rhetoric on the part of the Obama administration, the engagement of the US and most of the other international actors was focused mainly on the security agenda and the stabilization of the country.

This goal conflict, however, is difficult to resolve, and the accompanying prioritization of peace and stability can hardly be changed fundamentally. It is important for the actors involved to be conscious of the dilemma and to choose a strategy that is oriented towards local conditions and a long-term timeframe. This creates the possibility of a contextual sequencing of measures. Thus, there are some advocates who argue, in the face of the potentially destabilizing function of democratization efforts, that functioning structures should be established before a political system is liberalized. In practice, however, a staggered timetable is difficult to realize, not least since elections remain important as an expression of political competition and the participation of the populace, for reasons outlined above. Also, the functioning of state institutions is difficult to imagine in the absence of certain essential elements of democratic governance such as accountability and transparency.

**More conceptual precision needed**

The efforts of international actors for promoting democracy also suffer from the vagueness of the democratization concept and the attendant perception deficits. Measures in the field of security such as demining or disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration of combatants are often better defined than activities in the area of governance and democratization. Additionally, measures such as decentralization, electoral assistance, and fostering civil society are often accounted for separately by donors, although they are important building blocks of democratization (cf. table below). Thus, the substance of democratization often remains elusive, and it is difficult to present evidence of progress.

In this respect, external actors could provide a remedy by defining their understanding of democratization and the measures to be undertaken in this context. This would enhance the coherence and visibility of democratization and contribute to closing the gap between rhetorical bluster and operative obscurity.

**Dynamic conflict analysis and power-sharing**

The often too static analysis of a conflict constellation by external actors, particularly in civil wars, creates another set of problems in post-conflict democratization. Frequently, the changing causes of conflicts and the shifts or overlaps in conflict lines brought about by armed conflict are not taken into account sufficiently. This can have negative effects when it comes to settling the question of political power that often drives civil wars.

External actors tend towards simplification in their conflict analyses. The in-
Measures

Fostering civil society: Support for women’s and youth organizations as well as human rights groups, independent trade unions, and media; political education; exchange programs

There is no need to treat all conflict lines as equally important. Certainly, after ethnic civil wars, it makes sense to arrive at a power-sharing agreement that reflects ethnic divisions. However, in the middle to long term, such divisions may diminish in importance, and other tension areas may become more salient. External efforts at democratization must take such changes into account, or political realities may overtake the institutional arrangement and become its captive. A power-sharing arrangement along ethnic lines may, for instance, be limited in time. Thus, in South Africa after the end of apartheid, a formal power-sharing arrangement guaranteed ethnic inclusion. After a transitional phase, this model was replaced in 1996 by a new institutional arrangement. A precise analysis of how the causes and lines of conflict have changed during armed conflicts may provide external actors with suggestions for more dynamic strategies in post-conflict democratization.

Processes of post-conflict democratization are drawn-out and susceptible to reversals. The very notion of democratization in line with Western models is therefore sometimes questioned. However, this approach will remain relevant in the future due to local demand, the role of external actors, and due to a lack of alternatives. Therefore, optimizing strategies for external involvement is a sensible proposition.
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