CEJISS

What We Talk About When We Talk About Democracy Assistance: The Problem of Definition in Post-Conflict Approaches to Democratisation[1]

Richard Lappin[2]

Introduction

Since the early 1990s, one of the most striking characteristics to emerge in post-conflict peacebuilding has been the prime position assumed by democratisation; an approach we can term post-conflict democracy assistance. This focus has hinged on an unerring belief that democratic governance, provided by periodic and genuine elections, offers the most effective mechanism for managing and resolving societal tensions without recourse to violence (Annan 2001; Boutros-Ghali 1992, 1996). Indeed, the benefits of post-conflict democracy assistance have been promulgated for its capacity to advance peace, development and human rights (Jarstad 2006; Lappin 2009; Rich and Newman 2004), and it has been embraced at the highest stratums of peacebuilding with, for example, Boutros-Ghali declaring that 'peace, development and democracy are inextricably linked' (1996: 116).

Yet despite its growing recognition, the term has rarely been clearly or comprehensively defined. Typically the term is used with the assumption that the reader will automatically understand the meaning; however, such casual usage can cause confusion and lead to serious misconceptions about what the actual practice involves. This article seeks to bring greater clarity to our understanding of post-conflict democracy assistance in the following four sections. The first section begins by tracing the emergence of democracy assistance as

---

1 The title of this article is taken from the title of a short-story collection by Raymond Carver, What We Talk About When We Talk About Love.

2 Richard Lappin is a Ph.D. candidate at the Centre for Peace Research and Strategic Studies at the University of Leuven in Belgium. Richard has participated in over a dozen democracy assistance missions with the UN, EU, OSCE and Carter Center and has recently completed assignments in Sierra Leone, Lebanon and Romania. Richard is currently a visiting scholar at the Faculty of Political Sciences at the University of Belgrade under the JoinEU-SEE programme and can be contacted at: richard.lappin@gmail.com.

a distinct foreign policy instrument, the reasons why its popularity grew after the Cold War and how it has become an embedded feature of post-conflict peacebuilding. Second, the article highlights the unique characteristics of post-conflict democracy assistance as a distinct foreign policy tool and distinguishes it from other approaches linked to democratisation. Third, the core problems that have developed as a direct result of definitional uncertainty over what democracy assistance entails are outlined. Finally, the article concludes by positing that the current ambiguity that surrounds the discourse on democracy assistance threatens not only the credibility of the approach, but that it also reflects a lack of thinking on the part of the international community as to what type of democratic end states are envisioned and what the appropriate means are to best achieve those ends.

The Emergence of Post-Conflict Democracy Assistance

Although democracy assistance did not assume a distinct profile in Western foreign policies until after the Cold War, its roots can be traced back further. Several sources have pointed to US sponsored electoral programmes in the Caribbean following the Spanish-American War in the early 20th century, Woodrow Wilson's promise to 'make the world safe for democracy' in the aftermath of the First World War, and political assistance, such as constitution writing and civic education, to Japan and Germany following the Second World War (Burnell 2000a; Carothers 1999: ch.2). One interesting element of all of these early examples of democracy assistance is that they all occurred in post-conflict contexts.

The period of decolonisation during the 1950s and 1960s provided a further precursor to contemporary democracy assistance, with many European countries exporting their own models of democracy to their former colonies. At the same time several countries began to introduce democracy and human rights clauses into their foreign aid packages, such as 'Title IX' of the 1966 US Foreign Assistance Act, which linked foreign aid to participatory politics. The profile of democracy assistance was significantly enhanced by the election of Ronald Reagan to the US presidency. In 1983 Reagan established the first specific US democracy promotion institution, the National Endowment for Democracy (NED), and consistently spoke with passion about the values of democracy and his vision of a 'global democratic revolution' (Reagan 1988). However, despite the rhetorical enthusiasm of Reagan, perceptions of external support for democracy during the Cold War were typically viewed with pessimism. Samuel Huntington (1984: 218) declared that 'the ability of the US to affect the development of democracy elsewhere is limited,' whilst Robert Dahl (1971: 209-210), argued that:

> Policy makers in a country like the United States who may wish to transform a country from a hegemonic or mixed regime into a polyarchy [i.e. a liberal democracy] face formidable and complex problems, not least of which is our lack of knowledge about the long causal chains running from outside help to internal conditions to changes of regimes.

However, the end of the Cold War (1989-1991), and the seeming triumph of liberal democracy contributed to a widespread ideological consensus that liberal democracy, irrespective of internal preconditions, was the best political system available. As Fareed Zakaria (2004: 13) commented, democracy 'has become the standard form of government for all mankind.' This viewpoint found its most famous expression in Francis Fukuyama's (1992) *The End of History* thesis and, although contentious, its emphasis on democracy as the optimum form of governance was broadly accepted and seamlessly translated into peacebuilding strategies. As Eric Brahm (2004) has written, 'once warring sides have reached a ceasefire, democracy is seen as uniquely suited to provide a peaceful means for power and influence.' Expectations of the central role of democracy in peacebuilding were made evident in a string of policy statements made in both the US and Europe. For example, Bill Clinton (1995) declared that 'ultimately the best strategy to ensure our security and to build a durable peace is to support the advance of democracy everywhere.' In 2001, the EU declared its 'determination to promote stable, democratic environments, founded on the full enjoyment of human rights' (Council of the European Union 2001). Similarly, Kofi Annan (2000) has stated that 'there are many good reasons for promoting democracy, not least – in the eyes of the United Nations – is that, when sustained over time, it is a highly effective means of preventing conflict, both within and between states.' Moreover, these words were supported by formal institutions. The Electoral Assistance Unit was established by the UN in 1991, whilst in 1990 the OSCE created a similar organ, the Office for Free Elections, with an understanding that 'pluralistic democracy [is a prerequisite]… for progress in setting up the lasting order of peace, security, justice and co-operation' in Europe (CSCE 1990).

In turn, theories expounding the role of external democracy promotion became increasingly fashionable. One such argument is that the widespread presence of democracies can serve as agents of diffusion which spread international norms of democracy (Huntington 1991; Starr 1991). The concept of diffusion has been summarised in policy statements, such as George W. Bush's (2003) declaration that 'a new regime in Iraq would serve as a dramatic and inspiring example of freedom for other nations in the region.' Indeed, in an increasingly globalised world of advanced technology, travel and communications, it has become 'increasingly difficult even for highly autocratic regimes to prevent demonstration effects reaching their own society' (Burnell 2000c: 7). Additionally, there has been a notable increase of

literature concerning the value of military intervention to promote democracy, and although some authors are in support of this (Peceny 1999), the majority remain sceptical about the long-term benefits (Bueno de Mesquita and Downs 2006). Moreover, the Westphalian principle of non-interference has been subject to reinterpretation, with rights to democracy and peace now frequently trumping state sovereignty (Buxton 2006). For example, the OSCE declare that 'participating states emphasise that issues relating to human rights, fundamental freedoms, democracy, and the rule of law are of international concern … and do not belong exclusively to the internal affairs of the state concerned' (CSCE 1991). All of these factors have provided a platform for deliberate external efforts to foster democratisation to be pursued more vigorously.

Democracy assistance organisations themselves were also influenced by the wider external context. Democracy was arguably already on the march and Huntington's (1991) 'third wave' thesis famously illustrated how a multitude of states were already taking the democratic leap from as early as 1974. In fact, since the 1960s, it is estimated that there has been more than 120 episodes of democratisation in nearly 90 countries (Kapstein and Converse 2008: 57). This trend is further supported by Freedom House who have measured global trends in freedom and democracy since 1972 and report that both have demonstrated a steady increase in the past 35 years. Accompanying this already existing trend towards democracy, was a growing recognition of individual human rights. Within this area, civil society organisations, such as Amnesty International, have grown exponentially in the past twenty years and have reached across national borders in their efforts to promote the respect of individual rights. The impact was evidenced in international law, with both the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights coming into force in 1976. Similarly, the US, often viewed as a leader of the 'free world,' witnessed a Congress that passed 25 pieces of legislation linking foreign policy to human rights under the presidency of Jimmy Carter (Burnell 2000a: 37). The growing recognition of international human rights is seen by many to provide a solid foundation for democracy assistance. As Hans Peter Schmitz (2004: 408) states, 'transnational activists diffuse democratic principles, support domestic allies, and exert pressure on authoritarian regimes.'

It can therefore be argued that a reverse causation was also occurring with democratic openings challenging established democracies to respond. As Carothers (1999: 44) explains: 'the natural tendency to focus on the effects of democracy aid on democratisation in recipient countries overlooks the equally important causal relationship in the other direction – democratisation producing democracy aid.' Indeed, in many respects the approach of democracy assistance can often be described as reactive rather than proactive. Thus, an understanding of the emergence of democracy assistance requires an appreciation of how

global events cause the democracy assistance community to respond to external stimuli (Burnell 2008: 428).

Figure 1: The Global Spread of Democracy (Freedom House 2009)[3]

The Global Spread of Democracy							
Year	Total No. Countries	Free		Partly Free		Not Free	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1972	151	44	29	38	25	69	46
1979	161	51	32	54	33	56	35
1989	167	61	37	44	26	62	37
1999	192	85	44	60	31	47	25
2009	193	89	46	62	32	42	22

Towards an Improved Understanding of Post-Conflict Democracy Assistance

By the end of the 1990s, the term 'democracy assistance' had acquired increased and extensive usage in academic literature and become a natural part of the rhetoric of the development programmes and foreign policies of Western countries. Yet, despite this growing recognition, the term has rarely been clearly or comprehensively defined. Typically, the term is used with the assumption that the reader will automatically understand the meaning; however, such casual usage can cause confusion, especially as other terms can be used to describe similar phenomena, such as the often used umbrella term of 'democracy promotion,' as well as a host of other variants including 'development aid,' 'political aid,' 'democracy support,' 'democracy aid,' and 'support for democratic development' (Burnell 2000c: 3). As such, it is critically important that researchers are cognizant of the breadth of meaning attached to democracy assistance by different people and practice precision in their own usage and definition of the term. Indeed, if we are unable to achieve accuracy in our terminology, the utility of the approach, both in theory and in practice, will ultimately be undermined.

Democracy assistance can be most accurately defined as the non-profit transfer of funds, expertise, and material to foster democratic groups, initiatives and institutions that are already working towards a more democratic society (De Zeeuw and Kumar 2006: 20). These transfers are usually funded through governmental development agencies, such as the United States Agency for

[3] It is widely considered that 'Free' typically correlates to a stable, mature democracy, 'Partly Free' to a partial democracy, and 'Not Free' to an autocracy.

International Development (USAID) the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR), or the UK's Department for International Development (DfID). The programmes themselves are undertaken by a diverse group of inter-governmental organisations (IGOs), non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and, to a lesser extent, through bilateral agreements. Chief amongst the IGOs are the Organisation for Cooperation and Security in Europe (OSCE), the European Union (EU), and the Organisation of American States (OAS). The most prominent NGOs include the Carter Center, the International Foundation for Electoral Systems (IFES) and the Centre for Electoral Promotion and Advice (CAPEL). In addition, within a given country, there will also be a range of local counterparts who receive democracy funding including electoral commissions, state institutions, civil society groups, media groups and political parties.

In defining democracy assistance, it is paramount that the distinction between democracy *assistance* and democracy *promotion* is established. Although democracy promotion is often used interchangeably with democracy assistance, the latter should be recognised as only a small and distinct part of a much broader democracy promotion approach. As the table below illustrates, democracy promotion comprises several instruments, both positive and negative, both explicit and implicit, of which democracy assistance is only one distinct part. On the negative side, there is direct military action, which includes armed intervention to promote democracy and can be either explicit (to install a democratic regime, as in Afghanistan) or implicit (to curb an anti-democratic regime, as in the first Iraq war). In addition, there is also the explicit tool of negative political conditionality, or 'naming and shaming', in which membership from international organisations may be suspended, economic sanctions applied, and embargoes enforced.

On the positive side, there is the implicit instrument of classical development aid which seeks to foster improved socioeconomic conditions which may consequently lead to democratic developments. Additionally, there is the positive instrument of international interim administrations, as was the case in East Timor, where the democratic transition is directly controlled and managed in its entirety by international actors. There is also the explicit instrument of positive political conditionality, which can include offers of membership in intergovernmental organisations, security guarantees, or economic and trade benefits.

Finally, on the positive side, there is the distinct instrument of democracy assistance. Democracy assistance differs from all other forms of democracy promotion in several important ways. First, it is distinct from military action insofar that it does not 'enforce' democracy, and from international interim administration insofar that it does not 'manage' democracy. Second, democracy assistance is directed primarily and exclusively at fostering democracy, as opposed to classical development aid in which democracy is usually only a secondary concern. Third, democracy assistance is distinct from positive political conditionality insofar that it encompasses direct and active measures,

rather than passive tools. Democracy assistance can be further differentiated from political conditionality insofar that it is neither a reward nor a punishment, neither a carrot nor a stick, but rather a 'booster' to internal groups already working towards democratisation. Democracy assistance is not concerned with 'exporting democracy' (Schraeder 2002) or 'spreading democracy' (Hobsbawm 2004) irrespective of the readiness of a given country; rather, democracy assistance explicitly recognises that 'the primary motive force for democratisation is and must be internal to the country in question' (Burnell 2000c: 9), and that the exclusive intention is 'to help domestic actors achieve what they have already decided they want for themselves' (Carothers 2007b: 22). Democracy assistance is therefore a very precise instrument within a broader democracy promotion paradigm.

Figure 2: Democracy Promotion Instruments (Table developed from: Huber 2008: 46)

	Explicit Instruments	Implicit Instruments
Positive Instruments	• Democracy assistance • Positive political conditionality • International interim administrations	• Classical development aid
Negative Instruments	• Negative political conditionality • Military action	• Military action

Problems Resulting From Definitional Uncertainty

Establishing the definitional clarity of democracy assistance is an important step towards understanding how three core problems have developed as a direct result of definitional uncertainties in democracy promotion terminology. The resultant problems concern, imprecise democracy assistance data, a neglect of the inherent limitations of democracy assistance, and the fostering of negative perceptions of democracy assistance.

Imprecise Democracy Assistance Data

The lack of definitional concreteness over what may be classified as democracy assistance has meant that 'the available data concerning how much and by whom remains relatively soft, variable in quality and far from complete' (Burnell 2000b: 339). Typically, different countries and organisations use different classifications and indicators to define and record democracy assistance. Moreover, these figures are often merged into standard development projects, thus presenting major complications for the disaggregation of precise and

direct democracy assistance from broad development statistics (Crawford and Kearton 2002; Green and Kohl 2007: 159; Knack 2004: 266). In one of the few detailed cross-national studies of democracy assistance, Richard Youngs *et al*. (2006: 21) lamented that 'no standard or easily comparable classification of political aid existed across states' and, worryingly, that several countries had to compile the data upon request. Therefore, even seemingly comparable data, such as that from the Creditor Reporting System (CRS) of OECD-DAC, can be decidedly misleading due to the inability to accurately disaggregate the data.

Furthermore, as democracy has become increasingly associated with post-conflict peacebuilding, almost any international assistance effort that addresses any development or peacebuilding issues can arguably be labelled as 'democracy assistance.' In their study, Youngs *et al.* (2006: 21), note that 'many states included in their democracy and governance categories aid projects that could not be reasonably said to have any meaningful bearing on political reform.' Whilst Burnell (2000b: 339) has posited that some development agencies simply renamed their traditional development programmes as 'democracy assistance' to demonstrate that they were in tune with fashionable governance themes.

Such fastidiousness on the boundaries of what should be considered as democracy assistance is not to undermine the impact that broader development assistance can have on democratisation. As Steve Finkel *et al.* (2007: 410) explain, indirect assistance 'may promote modernisation, encourage better economic performance, and foster class transformations, all of which may have long-term implications for democratic development.' However, the concern is that such a broad definition can lead to an expansive laundry list of things which 'assist' democracy, such as general poverty alleviation or the building of schools. Burnell (2000c: 12) claims that, although at times beneficial, this is problematic because 'if democracy assistance is defined as whatever helps democratisation directly or indirectly, sooner or later, then our sense of it could be so generous as to undermine the value of the term.' Carothers (2000: 188) offers a route out of this dilemma in his argument that democracy assistance should be considered all aid 'for which the primary purpose, not the secondary purpose or indirect purpose, is to foster democracy in the recipient countries. It does not therefore include economic and social aid programmes.' As it stands though, the lack of consistency in defining democracy assistance means that there is no precise baseline data in which meaningful evaluations of post-conflict democracy assistance can be drawn.

Neglect of the Inherent Limitations of Democracy Assistance

A second problem that has been exacerbated by an inexact usage and understanding of the democracy assistance term has been a neglect of the inherent

limitations of democracy assistance. Democracy assistance terminology has been increasingly employed by foreign policy communities and has created an appearance that it is a much stronger force than it truly is. The high expectations for democracy in helping to foster peace are evident in the very formulation of peace agreements. Many peace agreements, such as the 1992 Chapultepec Agreements of El Salvador and the 2002 Global and All-Inclusive Agreement of the Democratic Republic of Congo, stress the central role of democracy and affirm that elections will be held within a given timeframe as an illustration of a country's transition towards peace. This focus on elections – often at the neglect of issues such as security sector reform, corruption, economic stimulus, or reconciliation – places an unenviable burden on the democratisation process. For their part, democracy assistance organisations, often at short notice and often with little time for preparation, have become the actor of first resort for all prospective transitions, irrespective of the countries suitability or likelihood of sustaining democracy.

The imbalanced focus on democracy in post-conflict peacebuilding is amplified by a tendency of democracy assistance organisations to focus on success stories and overestimate their capacity to initiate change. Until recently, the USAID website declared that (quoted in Knack 2004: 252):

> There were 58 democratic nations in 1980. By 1995, this number had jumped to 115 nations. USAID provided democracy and governance assistance to 36 of the 57 nations that successfully made the transition to a democratic government during this period.

Although the need to emphasise the positive aspects of their work in order to secure future funding may be understandable, such statements can severely skew the reality of democracy assistance. As Stephen Knack (2004: 252) explains, 'obviously the fact that many aid recipients have become more democratic does not by itself imply cause and effect.' Indeed, democratisation studies have historically focused on internal considerations as the key factors in a country's democratic transition, with attention given to areas such as: economic modernisation (Lipset 1959: 17; Przeworski et al. 2000); a history of pluralism (Reychler 1999); class structures (Moore 1966; Rueschemeyer et al. 1992); levels of education (Hadenius 1992; Rowen 1995); degree of ethnic fragmentation (Linz and Stepan 1996); religion (Hadenius 1992; Zakaria 2004: 148-150); the legacy of colonialism (Bernhard et al. 2004; Bratton et al. 2004); the prevalence of Western values (Huntington 1997: 6). Democracy assistance, therefore, is rarely the overriding reason, but it can help a country move more quickly in a direction that it is already going. As Carothers (2004: 60) reminds us, democracy assistance 'is at most a facilitator of locally rooted forces for political change, not the creator of them.' These sentiments are particularly salient to collapsed post-conflict states which offer few favourable internal pre-conditions for democratisation.

Additionally, within a post-conflict context, democracy assistance may have to play a subordinate role to the aims of the broader peace process (Lyons 2002: 221). As Krishna Kumar and Jeroen de Zeeuw (2006: 14) stress, 'the promotion of democracy is not necessarily the only goal, and there are circumstances under which the international community has to make compromises in pursuit of competing objectives, such as avoiding a resumption of war.' Indeed, it is worth stressing that although democracy assistance may have assumed a more central and influential role in the foreign policy of western states, it has not become *the* central organising principle (Carothers 1999: 37; Smith 2007: 132). Sometimes, democracy assistance may be complementary to a wider foreign policy, but at times it will also come into competition with other, stronger economic and security interests. For example, in the US, democracy assistance funding remains a fraction of other areas of public spending such as defence,[4] whilst the country maintains strong relations with several undemocratic, but strategically important, regimes such as Saudi Arabia, China and Egypt.

Negative Perceptions of Democracy Assistance

The incoherency and inconsistency of democracy promotion policies in general – and what should qualify as democracy assistance in particular – has led to the intensification of the final problem; negative perceptions of democracy assistance (Smith 2007: 129). Although democracy assistance has become increasingly more visible in foreign policies, it has also been accompanied by a rising suspicion about the motives behind this embracement of democracy. Jennifer Moore (2007) has detailed how the democracy 'brand' has been damaged by people manipulating the name for interests which have very little connection to people power, whilst Carothers (1999: 3) claims that pro-democracy rhetoric 'has sometimes been used deliberately to obscure a contrary reality.' Although applicable to many states and intergovernmental organisations, this critique is most commonly directed at the US. Here, Barbara Rieffer and Kristan Mercer (2005) have documented how the Spanish-American War, the Vietnam War, and the invasion of Iraq, were all justified by the US as being in the name of democracy, precipitating scepticism about external efforts to support democracy both domestically and in target countries. Indeed, Bush's persistent association of democracy assistance with the Iraq War and regime change did much to malign the concept and help to foster a perception in many parts of the world that democracy assistance was a mere euphemism for aggressive US interventionism. As Hobsbawm (2004) acerbically comments, 'one should always be suspicious when military powers claim to be doing favours for their victims and the world by defeating and occupying weaker states.'

[4] The US defence budget is typically estimated at above $400bn, in comparison to the most optimistic estimations of US democracy assistance, which estimate an absolute maximum of $1bn.

Additionally, the consistent prioritisation of economic interests over democracy has also tarnished the image of external assistance. Examples include US commercial cooperation the Argentine junta during the 1970s and 1980s and the EU's Common Agricultural Policy (CAP). As Rieffer and Mercer (2005: 390) comment, Western countries 'benefit from protectionist policies and subsidies even though these policies may hurt the long-term economic viability – and thus democratic prospects – of these partially democratic developing countries.' The continuing positive relations between Western countries and undemocratic regimes have further amplified concerns that the new focus on democracy assistance is essentially a euphemism for traditional realist foreign policies. This is somewhat unfortunate, as just because democracy is a low priority in one country, does not mean that democracy assistance projects in all other countries are not serious or have ulterior motives. Nevertheless, this has resulted in a situation where the overall concept of democracy assistance is often cast in a negative light before the actual substance of a programme is even examined. As Carothers (2007a: 11) notes in respect of the US:

> The sad, mildly ironic reality of the Bush approach to democracy promotion is that it may represent the worst of both worlds: It has soured people all around the globe, and many in the United States as well, on the very legitimacy and value of US democracy promotion, despite having involved only a limited engagement in democracy promotion.

What Model of Democracy (Assistance)?

The definitional ambiguity that surrounds democracy assistance conceals a more profound disagreement over the very nature of democracy itself. If the international community is to address the problems already cited with the democracy assistance terminology, then it is fundamental that they also confront – or at least acknowledge – the problem of defining democracy. For when all is said and done, we still need to be able to answer the question: 'what democracy are we assisting?'

Does the international community favour a minimalist model of democracy based on Joseph Schumpeter's concept of an 'institutional arrangement for arriving at political decisions in which individuals acquire the power to decide by means of a competitive struggle for the people's vote' (1947: 269)? Certainly several other influential authorities favour a minimalist, electoral-based approach (Dahl 1971; Huntington 1991: 7; Przeworski et al. 2000). Or does the international community prefer a more expansive, maximalist definition of democracy which emphasises the normative underpinnings and the substantive virtues of democracy which stresses the importance of participation, citizenship, and political activity (Barber 1984: xiv; Held 1996; Young 2000: 3). We might also ask to what extent is there space for local appropriations

of democracy? And to what extent do these local interpretations skew our (Western) understanding of democracy and the benefits it is intended to bring to peacebuilding? (Karlstrom 1996; Paley 2002)

Naturally, the merits and limitations of the various models of democracy – and how each may contribute to peacebuilding – demands a far greater exploration that goes beyond the remit of this article. However, the values and assumptions that are attached to democracy by international organisations have been left largely unexplored (Jarstad 2006; Lappin 2009). Democracy remains a fundamentally contested term, and one which can have a far reaching impact on post-conflict democracy assistance. As Wim Van Binsbergen (1995: 6) states, if democracy means different things to different people, 'the process of bringing about or enhancing democracy, may refer to distinct and quite different phenomena.' Luc Reychler (2001: 216) concurs, arguing that 'the dispute over the operational definition influences the transformation process to a large extent.' Moreover, the definition of democracy that organisations are working towards can play a significant role in evaluating strategies, establishing funding priorities, and deciding when a country has reached an adequate level of democracy.

Conclusion

This article has examined the emergence of democracy assistance as a distinct foreign policy tool in post-conflict peacebuilding. Moreover, it has shown how definitional confusion between democracy assistance and other democracy-oriented concepts, presents grave problems that threaten to undermine the practice of post-conflict democracy assistance. A lack of clarity, consistency, and consensus, as to what democracy assistance entails has diminished our ability to evaluate democracy assistance effectively (due to imprecise data), has created unrealistic expectations of what democracy can achieve in post-conflict environments (due to a neglect of internal factors of democratisation and broader foreign policy objectives), and has resulted in a general negative perception of democracy assistance (due to the misappropriation of the term to include elements such as military force or economic sanctions). The political consequences of the lack of definitional clarity are therefore considerable. Indeed, not only does it possess the potential to severely undermine the successes and credibility of post-conflict democracy-assistance, but it also reflects a fundamental deficit in our thinking about what type of democracy we are assisting and how we should assist it. If the international community can not articulate the democratic end goals it envisions, the likelihood of formulating effective democratic means will remain improbable.

References

Annan, Kofi. (2000). "UN Secretary General Kofi Annan's Closing Remarks to the Ministerial Meeting, 'Towards a Community of Democracies' Conference."

Annan, Kofi. (2001). Framework for Coopeartion in Peacebuilding. New York: United Nations.

Barber, Benjamin. (1984). Strong Democracy. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Bernhard, Michael, Christopher Reenock and Timothy Nordstrom. (2004). "The Legacy of Western Overseas Colonialism on Democratic Survival." International Studies Quarterly 48(1):225-250.

Boutros-Ghali, Boutros. (1992). An Agenda for Peace. New York: United Nations.

Boutros-Ghali, Boutros. (1996). An Agenda for Democratization. New York: United Nations.

Brahm, Eric. (2004). "Election Monitoring." Beyond Intractability:http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/election_monitoring/

Bratton, Michael, Robert B. Mattes and Emmanuel Gyimah-Boadi. (2004). Public Opinion, Democracy, and Market Reform in Africa. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce and George W. Downs. (2006). "Intervention and Democracy." International Organization 60.

Burnell, Peter. (2000a). "Democracy Assistance: Origins and Organisations." In Democracy Assistance: International Co-operation for Democratization, ed. Peter Burnell. London: Frank Cass.

Burnell, Peter. (2000b). "Democracy Assistance: The State of the Art." In Democracy Assistance: International Co-operation for Democratization, ed. Peter Burnell. London: Frank Cass.

Burnell, Peter. (2000c). "Democracy Assistance: The State of the Discourse." In Democracy Assistance: International Co-operation for Democratization, ed. Peter Burnell. London: Frank Cass.

Burnell, Peter. (2008). "From Evaluating Democracy Assistance to Appraising Democracy Promotion." Political Studies 56:414-434.

Bush, George W. (2003). "Transcript of Bush's Speech to the American Enterprise Institute." In New York Times.

Buxton, Julia. (2006). "Securing Democracy in Complex Environments." Democratization 13(5):709-723.

Carothers, Thomas. (1999). Aiding Democracy Abroad: The Learning Curve. Washington D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Carothers, Thomas. (2000). "Taking Stock of US Democracy Assistance." In American Democracy Promotion: Impulses, Strategies, and Impacts, eds. Michael Cox, G. John Ikenberry and Takashi Inoguchi. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Carothers, Thomas. (2004). "Ousting Foreign Strongmen: Lessons from Serbia." In Critical Mission: Essays on Democracy Promotion, ed. Thomas Carothers. Washington D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
Carothers, Thomas. (2007a). "Debating Democracy: The Democracy Crusade Myth." The National Interest:8-12.
Carothers, Thomas. (2007b). "How Democracies Emerge: The 'Sequencing' Fallacy." Journal of Democracy 18(1):12-27.
Clinton, Bill. (1995). "A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement."
Council of the European Union. (2001). "Council Conclusions on the European Union's Role in Promoting Human Rights and Democratisation in Third Countries." Luxembourg.
Crawford, Gordon and Iain Kearton. (2002). Evaluating Democracy and Governance Assistance. Leeds: University of Leeds.
CSCE. (1990). "Document of the Copenhagen Meeting of the Conference of the Human Dimension of the CSCE."
CSCE. (1991). "Document of the Moscow Meeting of the Conference on the Human Dimension of the CSCE."
Dahl, Robert A. (1971). Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.
De Zeeuw, Jeroen and Krishna Kumar. (2006). "Democracy Assistance to Postconflict Societies." In Promoting Democracy in Postconflict Societies, eds. Jeroen De Zeeuw and Krishna Kumar. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Reinner Publishers.
Finkel, Steven E., Anibal Perez-Linan and Mitchel A. Seligson. (2007). "The Effects of US Foreign Assistance on Democracy Building, 1990-2003." World Politics 59(3):404-439.
Freedom House. (2009). "Freedom in the World."
Fukuyama, Francis. (1992). The End of History and the Last Man. New York: The Free Press.
Green, Andrew T. and Richard D. Kohl. (2007). "Challenges of Evaluating Democracy Assistance: Perspectives from the Donor Side." Democratization 14(1):151-165.
Hadenius, Axel. (1992). Democracy and development. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Held, David. (1996). Models of Democracy. 2nd Edition. Cambridge: Polity Press.
Hobsbawm, Eric J. (2004). "Spreading Democracy." Foreign Policy(144).
Huber, Daniela. (2008). "Democracy Assistance in the Middle East and North Africa: A Comparison of US and E.U. Policies." Mediterranean Politics 13(1):43-63.
Huntington, Samuel. (1984). "Will More Countries Become Democratic?" Political Science Quarterly 99:192-218.

Huntington, Samuel. (1991). The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century. New York: M.E. Sharpe.

Huntington, Samuel. (1997). "After Twenty Years: The Future of the Third Wave." Journal of Democracy 8(4):3-12.

Jarstad, Anna. (2006). "Dilemmas of War-to-Democracy Transitions." In State, Conflict and Democracy Conference. Lund University.

Kapstein, Ethan B. and Nathan Converse. (2008). "Why Democracies Fail." Journal of Democracy 19(4):57-69.

Karlstrom, Mikael. (1996). "Democracy: Political Culture and Democratisation in Buganda." Africa: Journal of the International African Institute 66(4):485-505.

Knack, Stephen. (2004). "Does Foreign Aid Promote Democracy?" International Studies Quarterly 48(1):251-266.

Kumar, Krishna and Jeroen De Zeeuw. (2006). "Democracy Assistance to Postconflict Societies." In Promoting Democracy in Postconflict Societies, eds. Jeroen De Zeeuw and Krishna Kumar. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

Lappin, Richard. (2009). "What Democracy? Exploring the Absent Centre of Post-Conflict Democracy Assistance." Journal of Peace, Conflict and Development(14):1-32.

Linz, Juan Jose and Alfred C. Stepan. (1996). Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation: Southern Europe, South America, and Post-Communist Europe. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Lipset, Seymour Martin. (1959). "Some Social Requisites of Democracy: Economic Development and Political Legitimacy." The American Political Science Review 53(1):69-105.

Lyons, Terrence. (2002). "The Role of Postsettlement Elections." In Ending Civil Wars: The Implementation of Peace Agreements, eds. Stephen John Stedman, Donald Rotchild and Elizabeth M. Cousens. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

Moore, Barrington. (1966). Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World Boston: Beacon Press.

Moore, Jennifer. (2007). "Democracy Ltd." Canadian Dimension 41(2):56-58.

Paley, Julia. (2002). "Toward an Anthropology of Democracy." Annual Review of Anthropology 31:469-496.

Peceny, Mark. (1999). Democracy at the Point of Bayonets. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Przeworski, Adam, Michael E. Alvarez, Jose Antonio Cheibub and Fernando Linmongi. (2000). Democracy and Development: Political Institutions and Well-Being in the World, 1950-1990. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Reagan, Ronald. (1988). "State of the Union Message to Nation."

Reychler, Luc. (1999). Democratic Peace-Building & Conflict Prevention: The Devil is in the Transition. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Reychler, Luc. (2001). "Monitoring Democratic Transitions." In Peacebuilding: A Field Guide, eds. Luc Reychler and Thania Paffenholz. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Reinner.

Rich, Roland and Edward Newman. (2004). "Introduction: Approaching Democratization Policy." In The UN Role in Promoting Democracy: Between Ideals and Reality, eds. Edward Newman and Roland Rich. Tokyo: United Nations University Press.

Rieffer, Barbara Ann J. and Kristan Mercer. (2005). "US Democracy Promotion: The Clinton and Bush Administrations." Global Society 19(4):385-408.

Rowen, Henry S. (1995). "The Tide Underneath The "Third Wave."" Journal of Democracy 6:52-64.

Rueschemeyer, Dietrich, Evelyne Huber Stephens and John D. Stephens. (1992). Capitalist Development and Democracy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schmitz, Hans Peter. (2004). "Domestic and Transnational Perspectives on Democratization." International Studies Review 6:403-426.

Schraeder, Peter J. (2002). "Promoting an International Community of Democracies." In Exporting Democracy: Rhetoric vs. Reality, ed. Peter J. Schraeder. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Schumpeter, Joseph. (1947). Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Smith, Karen. (2007). "The Role of Democracy Assistance in Future EU External Relations." In Democracy: Europe's Core Value?, eds. Marieke Van Doorn and Roel Von Meijenfeldt. Delft: Eburon.

Starr, Harvey. (1991). "Democratic Dominoes: Diffusion Approaches to the Spread of Democracy in the International System." Journal of Conflict Resolution 35.

Van Binsbergen, Wim. (1995). "Aspects of Democracy and Democratisation in Zambia and Botswana: Exploring African Political Culture at the Grassroots." Journal of Contemporary African Studies 13(1):3-33.

Young, Iris Marion. (2000). Inclusion and Democracy. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Youngs, Richard, Kristina Kausch, David Mathieson, Irene Menendez and Jeroen De Zeeuw. (2006). Survey of European Democracy Promotion Policies 2000-2006. Madrid: FRIDE.

Zakaria, Fareed. (2004). The Future of Freedom: Illiberal Democracy at Home and Abroad. New York: Norton.