# Promoting Democracy in Afghanistan

The top-down or bottom-up approaches of European Union and United States

Qualitative Text Analysis

Author: Enayatulla Adel

Superviser: Eva Hansson

**södertörns**
högskola
SÖDERTÖRN UNIVERSITY

## Abstract

Democracy promotion is a key objective in both US and EU foreign development policy. The study attempts to provide a better understanding of both actors democracy promotion in Afghanistan. The US and the EU are perceived to have different approaches regarding democracy promotion. Therefor the study examines if US used top-down and EU bottom-up approaches respective coercive and persuasive methods. Approaches used by actors are examined in the study regarding democracy promotion in the case of Afghanistan. It is a case study with qualitative text analysis and the theories used are top-down and bottom up channels of democracy, and persuasive and stick methods. The survey has looked at the both actors' commitment in Afghanistan during period of 2001-2014. The result shows that the US and EU have more similarities than differences in the case of Afghanistan and actors have combined both top-down and bottom-approaches in promotion of democracy and focused on cooperation and partnership.

# Table of Contents

## 1.0 Introduction

To understand the role of democracy promotion in democratization process it is important to have a general knowledge about what factors affect democratization. Democratization can be influenced by both internal and external factors. Most scholars have focused on analyzing the impact of internal factors on democratic transition and consolidation. These factors have been regarded as significant in democratization process and therefore the potential impact of external factors have been considered as less important (Mikaelsson, 2008, 35). The academic literature has for long time, therefore focused on internal factors, in terms of economic development of the target country, the existence of active civil society, institutional structure of a state and the capability of state control (ibid).

The role of international or external factors for democratization were paid attention to with emergence of "third-wave" of democracy and the increasing role of powerful actors such as US, EU, and Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) in democratization process in other countries. Academic research on international factors in democratization process also contributed to the importance of external factors for democracy promotion. Studies of predominant scholars such as *The third wave (Huntington, 1991)*, and Pidham's studies *Encouraging Democracy, The international context of regime transition in Southern Europe* (Pridham 1999), and *Building Democracy, The International Dimensions of Democratization in Eastern Europe* (Pidham et al, 1994), emphasized the role of international factors in democratization (Silander, 2005: 84).

In recent time scholar have also debated the relation between US and EU and democracy promotion. Some scholars have argued that there is a rising gap between the US and EU, while other have emphasized the historical and transatlantic relations between two. Scholars such as Kagan (2003) argue that American and Europeans look at international relations in different way; the Europeans would like to build the new world order based on laws, rules and negotiations, use of soft power, while the Americans perceive the new world order as anarchic in nature and use hard politics and act as a superpower with defensive force (Mikaelsson: 143, see also Kagan 2003).

Since I am interested in the democratization process of Afghanistan, where the international community have been engaged in this process after the collapse of Taliban regime in 2001, the study will look at EU and US democracy promotion in Afghanistan.

## 1.1 Research problem

Democracy promotion is part of foreign policy adopted by governments and international organizations that seek to support and spread democracy around the world. Democracy promotion aims to change a political system, that is, the transition to democracy or consolidation of democracy (Huber, 2013: 98).

The European Union (EU) and United States of America (USA) are the world's two biggest international actors and both have long history of acting as democracy promoter across the world, particularly USA, hereafter will be used as US. For decades long, American leaders have seen democracy promotion as an important element in their international role and foreign policy (Carothers, 2006: 3). Democracy promotion and human rights are crucial issues in both actors' foreign policy.

There are perceptions that EU and US are working in different ways in terms of democracy promotion and the difference is also obvious in different regions. For instance it is found that the way US promote democracy in Mediterranean and East Asia is associated with so called "top-down" approach focus on state institutions and EU with "bottom-up" approach focus on civil society support and particularly human rights NGOs (Youngs, 2001: 192). In addition, there were similar patterns of differences between EU and US noted by Jean B. Grugel in research on Latin America (Grugel, 2004: 620). Some scholars argue that US democracy promotion have mainly focused on election process and supporting a top-down approach (Schraeder, 2010: 35). However, there is also research by Thomas Carothers that shows, US may use both "top-down" and "bottom-up" approach in democracy promotion depending on the target country's political situation (Carothers, 2006: 89).

There are also perceptions that US use hard knocks and leans more towards coercion when promoting democracy while the EU is described as harmonies and favor dialog, cooperation and soft tools in democracy promotion.

The paper finds it interesting to investigate how these approaches differ between EU and US in the case of Afghanistan. More specifically the thesis aims at examine what EU and US utilize for methods and through which channels/approaches promote democracy in Afghanistan and if there are any differences in their approach of promotion democracy in Afghanistan.

## 1.2 Relevance and selection of case

The study is relevant for the research partly because the international dimension of democracy promotion is still assumed understudied and not well understood and the international factors have to be scrutinized and study more (Schrader:2010, Carothers, 2006: 8). It is also relevant to examine the subject, given the lack of scientific research on democracy promotion in the case of Afghanistan, and therefore it will be desirous and appropriate to contribute with new knowledge to the gap found in research. The choice of the topic and case is based on the interest for Afghanistan and the huge presence of international community in the country as well as the development and democracy assistance provided to the country after the fall of Taliban 2001.

The paper will look at US and EU democracy promotion efforts in the period of 2001-2014. The motive behind the choice of time-period is the engagement of international community in reconstruction of Afghanistan, in this case US &EU, after the fall of Taliban regime due to US invasion of Afghanistan in post 9/11 era 2001.

As mentioned above the author assume that there are differences in the EU and US approach regarding democracy promotion, therefore it is expected that the US may use top-down approach and the EU may use the bottom-up. To find out difference or similarities between these two actors the empirical data will be collected in the case of Afghanistan.

## 1.3 Purpose & research questions

The central aim of the study is to examine if US and EU do use top-down or bottom-up approaches in promotion of democracy in Afghanistan and which methods they use, coercive or persuasive in democracy assistance in case of Afghanistan. The following questions will be answered to reach the purpose of study.

1. What methods and channels does US use in promotion of democracy in Afghanistan?

2. What methods and channels does EU use in promotion of democracy in Afghanistan?

3. Is there any difference between the US and EU concerning the approaches and methods used in promotion of democracy?

## 1.4 Delimitation

The study have limited time and resources and therefore have to do some restrictions to conduct the purpose of the study. The study not aims at examine the effect of democracy promotion or the impact of international actors on democratization process. The study is neither able to examine if the democracy aid is effective or investigate if democracy promotion efforts are efficient and are conducted in a way that contribute to democratization process. The sole aim is at investigate the different approaches and methods used by US and EU in promotion of democracy in Afghanistan, with the purpose to be able to say something about the general way of EU and US democracy promotion.

## 1.5 Background

*US and democracy promotion:*

US has a historical tradition to the democracy spreading in the world. Since the era of founding fathers, American leaders had a "mission" to promote democracy abroad, but in practice these ambitions has been characterized by self-interest and is linked with American strategic interests in terms of economic and security benefits. The American leaders have more than ever tried to implement this tradition into policies in their foreign affairs to promote democracy abroad (Bouchet, 2013: 32-33).

American foreign policy has been influenced by concept of identity and power and this identity has been shaped by three element of, democracy, liberal rights and capitalism. Thus, the role of democracy promotion in US foreign policy has been affected by three types of pressure, US domestic politico-economic condition, strategic interest and international ideological challenge to the politico-economic model promoted by US-liberal democracy and capitalist economy (Bridoux, 2013: 235).

Democracy promotion has been an important component in US foreign policy for over five decades in modern history of US. After the end of Cold War and end of contradictions with Soviet Union, US democracy promotion has intensified and has attempt to export the American model of liberal democracy based on institutions building, free market, focus on elections, rule of law, civil society support and protection of fundamental rights (ibid: 239). During this time many agencies were established which were involved in various activities of democracy promotion, agencies such as USAID, National Endowment for Democracy (NED),

Asia Foundation, US Institute for peace, US information Agency (USIA), National Security Council, including Department of Defense (Reiffer & Mercer, 2005: 391).

*EU and democracy promotion:*

EU is a big democracy promoter actor and scholars are agree that the EU promotion of democracy began after the end of Cold War. However, EU has long prioritized development assistance implemented through government developmental agencies such as *Britain's Department for International Development (DFID)*, *Germany's Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ)*, the *Swedish International Development Agency* (SIDA) and other organizations (Lioyd, 2010: 551). Although the European development assistance mainly have focused on combat of poverty, hunger and conflict, many European states included democracy and human rights in their foreign aid (ibid).

Most of the literature on European policies regarding democratization and democracy promotion have been concentrated on EUs southern and Eastern Enlargement process.

In many EU and US policies human rights are interweaved with democracy promotion. Promotion of democracy and human rights are key objective in the EU's foreign and development policies and emphasized in the European Consensus on Development (2005) and European Security Strategy (2003), (Crawford, 2008:1). However, this paper will separate them and use only democracy promotion hereinafter.

The interest in the spread of democracy, and democracy assistance has increased significantly since the end of cold war. The funds dispensed for democracy promotion and good governance by United States Agency for International Development (USAID) worldwide rose from US$ 128 million in 1990 to US$ 817 million in 2003 (Finkel, Perez-Linan and Seligson, 2007: 404-439). While the assistance of European Initiative for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR) rose from €76 million in 1995 to €132 million in 2006 (Huber, 2008: 44).

Although the international assistance for democratization has accelerated in last two decades, there are a huge number of countries in the Gray Zone and did not become a functioning democracies.

*Afghanistan*

Afghanistan is a challenging case to study and have a different context comparing to other countries and moreover, there are also a plenty number of international actors involved in the development, and democratization process of country. It is important to note that the author is

aware about the difficult political and socio-economic situation in Afghanistan and that there is an ongoing war against insurgent groups such as Taliban and that the country lacks a comprehensive peace yet. This may decrease the possibilities for democracy progress when most of aid is directed to security and military activities. However, the aim of study is still examination of different approaches used by EU and US in promotion of democracy in Afghanistan.

The ambition is not to give any detailed historical background but to describe briefly the context of Afghanistan after 2001, therefore it is important to give some basic information about the democracy promotion in Afghanistan post 2001. Much of the democracy promotion efforts of US and EU are linked to the reconstruction and building/rebuilding of Afghan state. After the collapse of the Taliban regime in 2001 due to 9/11 attacks, US invasion of Afghanistan, and following political vacuum in the country, the US and NATO coalition through UN held a meeting on 26 November 2001 in Bonn, Germany, to address the future of Afghanistan related to political situation and establish a legitimate and representative governance (Field & Ahmed, 2011).

The Bonn Conference or Bonn Agreement, established a process of political reconstruction, where Afghan representatives and international community agreed on procedures that established the foundations for future of Afghanistan we have today with the international engagement in the country. The agreement decided to establish a new constitution, launch an Interim regime for sex month with Hamid Karzai as chairman, which would transformed to a transitional authority for two years and later through elections select a democratic government. This led to evolving of new constitution (based on previous constitutions), and presidential election in 2004, as well as National Assembly Election in 2005 (UNDP 2012). Afghanistan has organized two more presidential elections in 2009 and 2014 (not completely free from electoral fraud), as well as parliamentary elections and provincial council elections. There are also developments in educational system, health sector and establishment of Ministries providing basic services to Afghan people and development of media and civil society (USAID, 2015).

In 2006 an international conference was held in London, called Afghanistan Compact, where Afghan authorities and international community agreed on a plan for further democratization and development of Afghanistan. It is a framework of cooperation between Afghanistan and International community, where they pledged to support improvement of security situation,

building of state and social institutions and socio-economic development of Afghanistan (Regeringen, 2014).

Despite many progress in building of central government and state institutions, and improvements in areas of education, healthcare, media development, infrastructure and communication system, much more have to be done. For instance the security situation remains a key challenge for Afghan government. The insurgency of Taliban and instability in provinces, particularly in South and East part of the country is still of main concern (CIA, 2015). The corruption is a big challange for the Afghan government and the state institutions are still weak due to 35 years of war and insurgent violence.

## 1.6 Previous studies

The research on democracy promotion had generally some shortcomings of systematic study on the subject in the early years. It was first after the Cold War that research community paid attention to external dimensions of democratization (Beichelt, 2012). With the fall of Berlin Wall 1989 and the collapse of Soviet Union, increased democracy promotion work, which was followed by increasing research on the subject. Research on democracy promotion has been conducted by two strand of research, international relations and transition studies. International relations focus on international factors and actors involved in democracy promotion. While transition studies focused on characters and changing aspects in domestic political regimes and here is the former one relevant for study (ibid).

 The author realized that previous scientific research on the specific case of democracy promotion in Afghanistan was limited, since Afghanistan is still in an ongoing process of democratization and reconstruction as well as peacebuilding process. Afghanistan have not been a favorable case for academic research, although there have been research conducted on other issues such as peacebuilding, state-building, conflict studies, reconstruction and even democracy related issues. For instance Quie Marissa looks at the external actors' attempt to promote democracy and peacebuilding simultaneously in the case of Afghanistan and the study shows that the convergence of these two objectives often become problematic in practice and lead to conflictual situation and ineffective intervention (Quie, 2012).

However, there were plenty of research at the general level about democracy promotion. For instance Richard Youngs looked at European democracy promotion strategy in Mediterranean and East Asia where EU policies were characterized by critical diplomacy in relation to basic

human rights and states perceived as security threats. The EU did not use coercive actions regarding human rights lacks, without it was critical diplomatic remarks. In some cases development assistance was withdrawn or delayed when dealing with states did not accomplished the reforms. In other cases it rewarded countries such as Morocco who did political reform. EU had a positive approach towards states in this region (Youngs, 2001).

There is critique found against "transition paradigm" and democratization of developing countries toward democracy. The critique is also directed to democracy promoters in West and the model of democracy they exercise and the enthusiasm over third-wave of democracy. Thomas Carothers write in his well-known article (2002) "The End of the Transition Paradigm", that the transition paradigm which is based on idea that countries are in transition to democratic system, is no longer appropriate to assume that. During the 1980s and 1990s many countries in Eastern Europe, Soviet Union, Sub-Saharan Africa and Middle East mad a shift from dictatorial rule toward more liberal or democratic governance. Although these states differentiated in characters and shape, they were considered by many observers, aid practitioners and policy makers in West as a global democratic trend, which Samuel Huntington described as the "third wave" of democracy (Carothers, 2002: 5). Democracy promoters with US in the leading established an analytical model of democratic transition and saw this model as universal paradigm for understanding of democratization and this way of thinking and making policies stayed in U.S. policy, despite political changes around the world. Carothers argue that many countries considered as "transitional" or "in transition to democracy", by democracy promoters, are not in transition to democracy, except a few number (ibid, 6).

According to Carothers a huge number nearly 100 countries are regarded as "transitional" and less than 20 of them are perhaps on the route to become liberal or well-functioning democracies. The majority of transitional or third-wave countries are stuck in the grey zone and have not succeeded in becoming well-functioning democracies or did any adequate democratic progress. He conclude that these countries should not be assumed as "in transition to democracy" and only genuine and regular elections will not lead to deepening and consolidate democracies. It is also not correct to assume that the way to democratization goes through its political elites and their actions (Carothers, 2002: 17).  Numbers of countries in Central Asia, Middle East, Sub-Saran Africa and Latin America belongs to gray zone and have fallen in between dictatorship and liberal democracy (ibid, 9).

Carothers argue that the transition paradigm was useful during third-wave democracy period and the reality does not response to this model and the time of transition paradigm is passed. Democracy promoters and policy makers should focus on every country's political context and not exporting one universal model of institutional form (ibid, 19).

*Instruments of democracy promotion*

External actors use various methods or instruments to promote democracy abroad. Researchers have used different models which external actors use in their way of democracy support (Börzel &Risse 2009, Kubicek 2003, Whitehead 2001, Youngs 2001).

Peter Schraeder has summarized some of the typical instruments used in democracy promotion: the use of *classic diplomacy,* in forms of promoting democratic values and norms by an executive office and/or sending international election observer to observe elections. External actors provide *foreign aid* to fund various democratic activities such as support to democratic elections and strengthening civil society. Actors may set *political conditionality* to promote democracy, for instance EU set democracy as precondition for EU membership. The use of *economic sanctions* as diplomatic pressure to punish an undemocratic act of authoritarian regimes and push for democratic transitions. Sanctions against Iran, North Korea and recently against Russia are a few of dozen examples of sanctions used by US and EU (BSCN 2015). Democracy promoters may use *covert intervention* against authoritarian regimes in terms of propaganda war, psychological warfare, coup d'état and even secrets plan of assassination of leaders in authoritarian regimes. Some actors use *paramilitary interventions* where guerrilla groups are financed to conquest authoritarian regimes through proxy wars. In some situations actors use *military intervention* to directly overthrow authoritarian or dictatorial regime and replace by a democratic regime (Schraeder, 2003: 26).

Researcher Wolfgang Merkel also use this list but defines these instruments in degree of coercion. For instance Merkel categories diplomacy as least coercive and military intervention as most coercive instrument (Merkel 2010: 456).

Other researchers such as Frank Schimmelfennig and Ulrich Sedelmeier have written about the EU approaches on democracy development and democracy assistant. Their book *Europeanization of Central and Eastern Europe* comprise the role of EU as democracy promoter and its' attempt to exercise external influence on other EU candidate countries. To become an EU-member, EU as a democracy promoter set *development of democratic order* as

conditions for candidate countries to become EU-member (Schimmelfennig & Sedelmeier, 2005).

Peter Burnell in his article "Political Strategies of External Support for Democratization", highlight strategies that are typical for US and EU when support democracy. He describing "pressure" or "diplomatic pressure", "persuasion" (pure diplomacy), as foreign policy instrument used by democracy promoter towards other countries. Although as a political concept, pressure is poor developed theoretically. Burnell argue, though pressure can be seen harmless in more general use, but concepts of "pressure against" and to be "put under pressure", show practice of power and possibly coercive. He means that when pressure is effective, it makes the other part to compromise and do something they usually otherwise not choose to do. Pressure can be seen as something more threatening and challenging than just something simple (Burnell 2005:373).

The "diplomatic pressure" as Burnell mentioned, is then a black box of power relationships, consisted of actions and words ("quiet diplomacy"), and extending from *inducements* (can be desirable) and *incentives* ("positive conditionality") to *binding contracts* and "negative conditionality" (deterrents and punishments). In extremely difficult situations actors can use diplomatic isolation and different kind of sanctions. Other authors such as Ottaway and Mair also saying that even if the aim is to restore the state security in failed state, the options are between co-opting, controlling or fighting non-civil powers (Bunell, 2005: 374) These strategies are familiar in the way USA support democracy abroad. USA is known for coercive way of democratization and practical examples are invasions of Germany and Japan (1945), Iraq (2003) and Afghanistan (2001).

In contrast, according to Ian Manners, EU has focused on normative power where conceptions such as peace, liberty, democracy, rule of law, human rights, and norms such as social solidarity and anti-discrimination has been taken into consideration while promote democracy and support political change (Burnell, 2005:376). For instance the elimination of death penalty in many countries is seen as an example of EU normative power. EU can use different methods to spread its norms and values while support democratization. According to Manners these norms can be diffused by *contagion* (unintended), *informational diffusion* ("strategic communication"), *procedural diffusion* (agreements), *transference* (e.g. technical assistance), *overt diffusion* (presence of EU in organizations or third states), and *cultural filter* (interplay

between the construction of knowledge and the creation of social and political identity). Sometimes EU can use diplomatic pressure, temporary aid sanctions when dealing with some hostile states. But the EU's approach of democratization is associated with values and norms, rather than coercive actions. EU is also associated with enforcement of positive conditionality or preconditions, for instance to access to EU. Burnell concluded that what can be expected is that US tends to take on "hard power" and EU more willing to use "soft power", where US emphasizes on conflict, interests and pressure, while EU use normative power, partnership and social learning.

Another article written by Peter Burnell and Oliver Schlumberger, "Promoting democracy-promoting autocracy? International politics and national political regimes*", discuss if the two decades of international democracy promotion is replacing by promotion of authoritarian rule and if the international factors such as *contagion, diffusion, linkage and leverage and political conditionality* not impacting democratization?, *The main question is if the last tide of democratization been replaced by a new wave of democratic reversal*?

The article highlight the rapid rise of the China in international politics and its' role in world energy market, world trade relations and security relations questions. On the political frontage, many developing countries see the China's rise as convincing representative to Western democracy. The authors argue that due to invasion of Iraq by US and UK, the promotion of democracy lacking in legitimacy internationally and particularly the treatment of prisoners in Guantanamo Bay and Abu Ghraib and how these practices were implemented legally is big question for many. Another subject studied in article is the role of Russia and its *political consolidation* after domestic turbulent during1990s and its successfully rising from economic stagnation (Burnell, 2010).

In an article David Beetham highlights the contradictions of democratization by force where he criticizing the enforcement of democracy from outside by military intervention and why is it likely to fail. The author use Iraq as an example to demonstrate the contradictions integral in the approach of democratization by force used by international actors (in this case USA), (Beetham, 2009: 443). The author argues that forcible democratization is self-contradictory based on two reasons. The first one is the *logic of self-determination*, means that people should determine their own affairs and the idea of sovereignty of a state shared by democracy. Then it is self-contradiction to invade other country and "liberate" them by force.

The second is the *preconditions for democracy,* which are, a state with moderately judicial system function over the country's' territory and an agreement n nationhood. With the

invasion of Iraq the state apparatus was collapsed and caused a vacuum in areas of economic, administration and politics, although the invasion had positive factors such as end of oppression from Saddam regime.

The author response to the existing objections to his assumption about the failure of forcible enforcement of democracy from outside. The first objection is that invasion of Iraq had not any democratization aim but the goal was to remove Saddam's weapons of mass destruction. But plenty of evidence shows that US administration had planned for long time a forcible regime change in Iraq. The US aimed that the installation of democratic regime change in Iraq would secure the US interest (oil security) and reduce the threat to Israel's security, as well as would contribute to diffusion of the idea of democratization in entirely region.  The second objection is that some claim that it is too early to judge the coercive project of democratization in Iraq  as failure and refer to the long drawn process of democratization and 'history' will judge if the invasion of Iraq was a success or failure (ibid). Due to the huge humanitarian costs imposed to all involved and particularly the Iraqi people, the forcible invasion of Iraq is not an ideal example of coercive democratization for future attempt, whatever the Iraqi regime take the form over time. The third objection is that no general conclusions can be drawn from the case of Iraq because it was not a problem in the original concept of forcible democratization, but due to mistakes in implementation (ibid).

## 2.0 Theoretical framework

The theoretical framework will first provide a short definition of democracy as a concept followed by democracy promotion and lastly will be the theoretical approached used in the study presented.

*Democracy*
The word democracy originate from the Greek Words of *Demos,* the people, and *Craits,* to rule. A very simple definition is that democracy refers to a system ruled by people, in contradictions to monarchies, dictatorships and authoritarian regimes ruled by one actor or one party (Epstein, Serafino & Miko, 2007: 3, Mikaelsson, 2008: 24). The term democracy today, has a very comprehensive meaning and the definition has changed over time and difficult to give a simple

definition. However, my intention is not to go in deeply in definition of democracy because it is a debate for itself and the study is not aiming at examine the effect of democratization or the process of democratization. Thus a general definition of democracy is relevant to be given, defined by Robert Dahl as a political regime in which political representatives of the people are selected periodically and free and fair elections are held and respected. In these elections political actors regularly participate in peaceful public debates and are able to discuss controversial subjects for voter support. This democratic system is based to have accountable institutions that guarantee political rights and civil liberties and ensuring of political competition and participation and followed by rule of law (Dahl, 1971:6).

The conception of democracy is also divided into minimalist and maximalist perspective, also called electoral democracies and liberal democracies. In the minimalist perspective democracy is seen as procedural system, where free and fair elections are emphasized, through which politics are institutionalized. Joseph Schumpeter emphasized the minimalist perspective of democracy and is known as a founder of procedural democracy. The democracy is seen as an arena where political elite compete for power and citizens can affect politics through elections, and choose their representatives (Schumpeter, 1992: 269-271).

The maximalist perspective goes beyond free and fair elections and include political institutions and emphasize political rights and civil liberties. This perspective criticize the minimalist perspective with main focus on free and fair election and that states with this system may have serious undemocratic behaviors (Mikaelsson 2008: 28).

*Democracy promotion*

Democracy promotion can be defined as activities or actions of external actors, aims to support democratization in third countries moving towards democracies from authoritarian or less democratic system. Which practically means that they support internal actors to establish and develop democratic intuitions functioning under democratic rules (Grimm& Leininger, 2012: 396). Timm Beichelt define it "as actions of non-domestic actors who intentionally try to overcome authoritarian power, by supporting domestic actors who share the same objective" (Beichelt, 2012). That is to say, an active pro-democratic pressure towards domestic actors.

Traditional democratization theory mainly has focused on influence of different domestic factors possible for democratization (Mikaelsson, 2008: 141). In contrast, International factors favorable for democratization such as the role of international actors and actors' interests have been a core focus in research on International Relations. Since the 1980s with rise of

globalization more and more scholars have focused on international actors and international factors' influence on democratization process (ibid). The motivations behind the external actors' democracy promotion can be rooted in form of security concerns, economic interests, democracy, human rights or historical links with target countries (Silander, 2005: 83).

## 2.1 Theory

Daniel Silander has contributed to a better theoretical understanding of democracy promotion in his dissertation "Democracy from outside-in? The conceptualization and significance of democracy promotion", and has developed an analytical framework of concept of democracy promotion which he has divide in sex steps. These steps are consisted of *actors*, *interests*, *methods*, *channels*, *relations* and *impact* (Silander, 2005: 89). Further was found another research done by Rickard Mikaelsson that illustrates the same phenomena and who also contributed to the analytical framework of democracy promotion and have similar arrangements as Silander, with some title changes and other view of point. To develop the analytical framework for better understanding of the democracy promotion Mikaelsson categorize similar steps by defining *actors*, *relations*, *motives strategies*, *methods*, *channels* and *impac*t (Mikaelsson, 2008: 144). The study will use both Mikaelsson and Silanders' analytical framework.

For this study, *actors, methods* and *channels,* are of relevance and will contribute to fulfill the purpose of the study and will be described below. The reason I did not take other steps is simply because of the lack of time and resources for this thesis. In order to get an overall complete picture of democracy promotion in a country and how international actors affect democratization and the interests and motivations they have for their actions, then one may include all steps in the research. This obviously, requires more research, resources and time to conduct, which is a limitation for this study.

## 2.2 Actors

The study will not dedicate much time to define actors or immerse in the subject, rather to give a very brief definition and actors relevant for this study. Today there are many international actors devoted themselves to promote democracy around the world. In the case of Afghanistan there are multilateral donors involved in the development and democratization

process of Afghanistan. Some of the main donors are United Nations Development Program (UNDP), EU, US, UK, Switzerland, and Nordic countries such as Denmark, Sweden, Norway and Finland (Larson, 2011: 3-7). This study focus on EU and US and their way of promotion democracy. Although, it is almost impossible to make a direct comparison between EU and US different democracy assistance levels and policies, the study will try to give a short contribution to this gap of knowledge in this specific case and will provide a more explicit picture of the different approaches of EU and US democracy promotion.

## 2.3 Methods

International actors use different methods when promoting democracy, the persuasive so called "carrot" or coercive "stick" methods. Persuasive methods include information, assistance and political, economic and security rewards. The coercive one can include use of stick methods, political pressure, economic pressure, military intervention, punishment and/or threat other country (Mikaelsson, 2008: 154-155). Silander has contributed to creation of one more mode of democratization called "conditional cooperation", which is based on the relation between the democracy promoter and recipient country (Silander 2005: 196).

Silander divide these approaches in political, economic and military methods (Silander, 2005: 95), while Mikaelsson categorize them in stick methods, carrot methods and rational persuasive (Mikaelsson, 154-155). The methods used in this paper will be consist of both persuasive and coercive one, described below in detail.

*Political methods,* aims at influence the target country to democratize by supporting political institutions, free and fair elections and/or promote civil society building (Silander, 2005: 196). The support also may include information gathering on democratic conditions of the target country and give advice and recommendations on political reform towards democratization. The support can also be provided in form of institutional assistance, international groups observing elections in first phase of democratization process and electoral aid.  Elections are considered as important step in democratization process (ibid). The promoter may help a transitional country with the *design of the electoral system* and here is the emphasis on the voting methods. To receive foreign aid democracy promoters require recipient countries to do reforms in democratic-related area.

*Stick methods* can be divided in three types of methods, *political pressure*, *economic pressure* and *military intervention*. Political pressure can be used through recipient countries if there are shortcomings in the democratization process, for instance democracy promoters make

statements in terms of critical remarks, critical reports or the political relation between democracy promoter and recipient country became less friendly (Mikaelsson, 154).

*Economic pressure* can be accomplished by denying loans or trade benefits to recipient countries, but it also can be applied by economic sanctions, decreasing or denying of development aid or provide aid by making democratization process as a condition (ibid).

*Military intervention* is the most extreme stick methods used by democracy promoter to remove a dictatorship and install pro-democratic regime. The typical examples are the US military interventions in Germany and Japan 1941- 1945, Panama 1990, Haiti 1994 and Iraq 2003 (ibid). The case of Iraq is complicated issue and there are different arguments if US had a democracy agenda or the intervention was based on remove of Saddam's weapons of mass destruction (Beetham, 2009: 443).

The *carrot methods* based on rewards can also be divided in three types of *political reward, economic* and *security reward.* Political rewards are often applied when recipient country entry the democratization process. Democracy promoters then can officially commend the recipient country for its democratic development and improve political relations with target country. Democratization may also help to entry the international community, international organization such as EU, World Trade Organization (Mikaelsson 155).

*Economic rewards* can be provided in terms of loans and development aid to democratization process in purpose to boost recipient country to democratization development. *Security rewards* are used by democracy promoters to foster democratization process. Strong democratic military or economic powers can facilitate the establishment of relations with countries taking initiative to make transition to democratic system. These great powers can provide military help and strengthen the security position of the target country. One example of security reward can be NATO-membership and the benefits it include (ibid).

The final method conceptualized by Silander is *Conditional Cooperation*, which puts the relationship and cooperation between the parties in center. It presuppose an interest in democratization process by democracy promoters and this interest will lead to do commitments and apply methods favorable for democratization. The relation between two actors is based on a high demand from democracy promoter to help recipient country change in a democratic sphere. The promoter provide high level of support and in turn sets out conditions for recipient for democratization process (Silander, 2005: 196-7).

## 2.4 Channels

The methods used by international actors to promote democracy may be channeled to target states by top-down or bottom-up approach (Silander, 2005: 90, See also Carothers 2006 and Przeworski, 1992: 109).  As discovered in the literature these approaches have different name but same substance (my own assumption). The top-down and bottom-up are also mentioned as *direct* and *indirect* promotion of democracy. They may also be referred as "political" and "developmental" approaches in other literature.

*Top-down channel*

The democracy promotion is directed to regimes and political elite in power. The way of democracy promotion is top-down or direct democracy promotion. The democracy promoters attempt to establish democratic institutions and persuade and train the political elite in democratic manners. The governing institutions are regarded important for the positive process of the democratization, where the political elite is assumed to have the authority to decide and implement democratization and provide domestic policies.  The approach is also called direct democracy promotion because the political power elite is in the focus and the promoters see larger possibilities to achieve democratic result and be effective in democracy promotion ( Silander, 2005: 98, Mikaelsson, 2008: 157).

The top-down channeling of democracy promotion have five institutional targets towards the political elite. The first is to support *constitution* that is agreed set of rules that govern specific areas or standards of behavior in the political system of a society. The second, third and fourth targets intend to support *judiciaries*, *legislatures,* and *local government* or the *executive branch,* which goes under the area of "rule of law".  The fifth target is to support *civil-military relations* and regulation of the military as an important state institution (Carothers, 2006: 158, Silander 2005: 98).

The judiciary and legislative branch have been the main focus for democracy promotion programs because they are a counterweight to the executive branch, the government. The support to judiciary branch has aimed at establish the rule of law. The programs may support *to rationalize and strengthen the judiciary management*, *increasing the judiciary's budget*, *reforming the judicial selection and judicial career laws*, *training judges and other court personnel* and increasing the availability and the transparency of legal materials and strengthening internal administration (ibid).

The legislative branch is also crucial for democracy promotion program. The aim is to make legislative branch more effective and representative. The programs of support are*: to train legislators, building the capacities of legislators and legislative stuff on democratic substance and democratic methods, provide courses on budget analysis, policy analysis and legislative research to the stuff of legislative branch*. The promotion may also include courses on media relations and bill drafting (Carothers 2006: 179, Silander, 2005: 99).

*Bottom-up channel*

This type of democracy promotion is directed to the society and the population, which is often referred to the civil society and the masses. As the name reveals, the democratization from the below is focused to organizations, associations, and movements to become democratic-oriented. The point is, that pro-democratic civil society can promote democratization through popular organization that raise political awareness among citizens. This requires that civil society is aware about democracy and are willing to work against dictatorial or less-democratic regime to promote democracy. The chances of success of democracy promotion with bottom-up approach requires strong pro-democratic civil society which is active beyond state control and regulation (Silander, 2005: 99).

The bottom-up approach of democracy promotion have many different goals. The first goal of promotion may include *advocacy NGOs* to strengthen them to identify and channel preferences to the political system. They are supposed to express citizens' interest and serve as bridge between people and government. The promoters or aid providers also hope that these NGOs may help to increase citizens' participation in political life and be the sources of pro-democratic values and methods. They may also hold state institutions accountable to norms and standards and are critically tested by NGOs (ibid).

The democracy promotion programs may provide *technical assistance* in form of *training*, *advising* and *informing* NGOs how to become politically powerful and efficient. Technical assistance also provide information about organizational development and management, advocacy methods, fund raising and media relations. The second form of support for advocacy NGOs is direct financial support in terms of equipment such as computers, photocopiers and fax machines (Carothers, 2006: 231, Silander, 2005 99).

They second democracy promotion goal is provision of *civic education* programs aiming at awareness raising among citizens regarding politics and the importance of participation. Civic education aims at teaching citizens about basic knowledge, values and skills relating

democracy and is adapted to what the citizens of the target country have for idea on how democracy work. Many civic education efforts have been focused around elections in target countries and provide teaching sessions on the purpose of elections, the mechanisms of voting and the issues of candidates. Other civic education actions consist of general democracy education, information on human rights, constitutions and democratic procedures.

The third part of support is *assistance to media*. The aim is to strengthen independent television, radio, newspapers and magazines. Media assistance emphasize professionalization of journalists and to improve the quality of news coverage. Training of journalist is main focus of the assistance and consist of many steps. These steps are story writing, editing, objectivity, fact collection, accuracy in reporting and ethics of reporting and journalism. Democracy promoters also provide efforts to encourage the establishment or strengthening journalism association. They may also provide assistance to

## 3.0 Method and materials

### 3.1 Method

Social science is characterized of two kind of research family, positivist and hermeneutic (post-positivist). The positivist research often aims at explaining a subject and ask question of *why,* trying to offer some general forms and universal knowledge while a hermeneutic perspective aim at understanding a particular subject and ask question of *how* to the subject of inquiry. Many scholars find out that it exist an interaction between explaining and understating. Qualitative and quantitative methods may have both explaining as well as describing patterns in their research (Mikaelsson, 2008: 15).

The chosen method in this study is qualitative of hermeneutic type, attempt to describe and bring increasing understanding of different dimensions of democracy promotion. The study is a descriptive case study with comparative design, where the EU and the US are the focus of comparison. The intention is to provide some deeper knowledge about the specific case. The reason why case study is selected, because it is expected that case studies can make it possible for researcher to catch the complexity of a specific case and it increase also the possibilities for giving increasing understanding of specific context. Afghanistan is presenting a case of democracy promotion and because of huge presence of international community including EU

and US, it makes it interesting, specific and important case to study and compare two big democracy promoters.

The collecting data will be analyzed through method of qualitative text-analysis. The point is to read the text active and carefully and examine if the reader or text can give answer to the questions asked in the survey. The study is conducting a descriptive text analysis where the focus is on systematize and clarify the text to highlight the essence of the text (Esaiasson et al, 2012: 210-11). In this study the texts from official documents is analyzed and the important content is selected for answering the questions of the thesis.

## 3.2 Material

There are different ways of collecting data. The empirical material can be collected through experiments, observations, interviews, surveys, documents and literature. The empirical material in this study is based on literature and documents.  Data collection for the study is consisted mainly of official documents from EU, EIDHR, US State Department, USAID, NED and Afghan State Department. The material regarding US approaches is collected from USAID, NED official webpages and US state department webpage. The material and data concerning EU approaches is collected from EU, EC and EIDHR webpages. The material used for collecting data on different methods of US and EU is brought from various international conferences holding on Afghanistan and bilateral agreements. The reason I decided international conferences as data selection is because the US and EU are the big donors at that conference pledging huge amounts of aid to Afghanistan.

It is important to be aware of the authenticity, relevance and impartiality of the sources. The material collected in this study is foremost from the official sources and other scientific articles and regarded as primary sources. The official sources are updated regularly and widely used and reviewed and it increase the credibility and relevance of the material. Since the material is regarded as primary sources the independence should not be a problem.

Validity and reliability are also main criteria in methodology of scientific work. Validity focus on the consistency between theoretical definition and operational indicators and absence of systematic errors and that the study measure what it claims to measure. In this study the theoretical definitions are operationalized in theoretical chapter and the appropriate indicators are analyzed in the chapter of analysis (see section 2.0 and 4.0). The validity is expected to be good in this study. Reliability emphasize the reliability of the study and if the essay can be repeated by someone else and get similar results (Esaiasson, 2012: 61-62). Since the thesis

have right variables in theoretical framework and examined what the aim was to scrutinize, the validity is good. The external validity may be low of this study, since it is hard to generalize the result to bigger context, due to the specific context of Afghanistan as a case.

## 4.0 Analysis

In this chapter the collected data will be presented connected to the conceptions used in theoretical framework that are methods and channels. As mentioned in the introduction the expectation was that US use top-down approach and EU bottom-up.

### 4.1 Channels, US, Top-down or Bottom-up

The democracy promotion activities or democracy assistance of US is mainly managed by USAID and National Endowment for Democracy (NED), thus the most of the data is collected from these sources regarding US democracy promotion. Below will be described efforts made by US and supporting democracy in Afghanistan

Having looking at the projects and programs at the USAID official webpage and NED, one can see that they have combined both top-down and bottom-up approaches, but the most focus have been on the state institutions building. For instance the result data from last four years (2011-2014) shows that the majority of aid in democracy promotion is devoted on area of good governance, e.g. during 2012 there was US 913$ million spent on good governance while 21$ million on civil society (USAID, Dollars to Result, 2012).

*Support to governmental institutions*

USAID has been engaged in Afghanistan since 2002 and have variety of projects and development programs. The top-down democracy assistance is implemented through support Afghanistan by developing the capacity of key electoral, representative, judicial and executive branch institutions. They provide technical assistance and training to Afghan parliament and civil servants in the national, municipal, district and provincial governments. USAID focus on rule of law by supporting judges and courts officials in capacity building and strengthening judicial branch. The support activities consists of training to judges and court administrators on management, leadership and administration work of court (USAID: 2015).

During 2003-2010 a project conducted by USAID, provided strategic support to the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan (GIRoA). The program activities were

directed to the core governmental institutions to strengthen them and making them effective when provide support to office of president. USAID supported with facilities upgrades, information technology, making administration work process more effective and providing training and human resources USAID, 2003-2010).

The US support is also directed to local governance by various programs. A project implemented during 2008-2012 provided support to Sub-national governance institutions. The program activities were to help Provincial Councils around the country to increase citizen representation in government decision-making and increase the transparency of government services, as well as providing regular support and advising councilors in all provinces (USAID, b, 2008-2012). One more project during 2008-2012 were implemented, where USAID supported the capacity of Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MoFA) in performing of diplomacy. The promotion was provided through training the staff, ministry officials, organizational reforms, administration support and improvements in management of embassy issues. The USAID also has provided support to parliament institutions, aiming at improve the political, technical and institutional development (USAID, Database, 2015).

The USAID provide support to Afghan governmental institutions in combat of corruption and support Afghans to educate public about actions to reduce corruption. The assistance is provided to the Afghan Anti-corruption Agency to develop capacity of institutions and technical and administration work (ibid).

*Support to civil society and organizations*

NED have conducted various projects in Afghanistan to support civil society and organizations. NED support Afghan Institute for Strategic Studies and raising awareness on democratic ideas and values through promotion of public policy debates and providing forums for that purpose, as well as give education and information to decision makers about public policy. NED emphasize the rule of law, where it assist Afghan Human Rights Organization with focus on women's rights and gender equality and support awareness-raising campaigns about democratic values related to women's rights (NED, Afghanistan, 2015). NED further support Afghanistan Organization Women Arise, providing civic education in purpose to raise awareness about civic engagement and civic duties. The program activities are to educate homebound women, training community leaders and encourage youths about civic engagement. All these activities showing support to civil society and local organizations which counts under the bottom-up approach.

NED further provide support to media sector, e.g. helping Social Journalism Association and other various media associations aiming at strengthen the role of free and independent media and the assistance is provided in terms of training and education in journalism, reporting and enhance the news coverage in political, social, legal and human rights issues. Further NED support Checked Television to support pro-democracy TV stations and improve civic engagement through citizen journalism (ibid). USAID has also similar projects supporting Afghanistan Media Development, providing technical assistance, equipment upgrades, increase media professionalism, multimedia training and support with facilities (USAID, Database, 2015).

There are also projects supporting NGOs to strengthen the role of civil society in Afghanistan. The aim is to train civil society organizations in project development, better institutionalization and raise funding. The projects are providing technical assistance to civil societies nationwide to encourage Afghan citizens to actively participate in political process (ibid).

## 4.2 Channels, EU, Top-down or Bottom Up

The EU democracy assistance is managed by European Commission (EC), through EU delegation to Afghanistan in Kabul, which in turn is channeled partly through Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund (ARTF). EU is providing both development assistance and humanitarian assistance to Afghanistan, with focus on three major sectors, Governance, Rural development, and Health (EC, Country info, 2015). The support of EU to democratization process in Afghanistan is as US also combined by top-down, supporting state institutions and bottom-up approaches supporting civil society and NGOs.

The EC has a legal and strategic framework for development cooperation consisted of Country Strategy Paper (CSP) and Multiannual Indicative Program (MIP), which describes in detail the priority areas of assistance. The EC's first CSP 2003-2006 for Afghanistan focused much on the promotion of stability and poverty reduction through supporting rural development, food security, establishing new government institutions, public services, infrastructure and health (EC 2012: 2-3). The second CSP 2007-2013 for Afghanistan support similar activities but has emphasized much more on capacity building of Afghan institutions in purpose to become self-sustaining (EC, CTP 2007-2013: 3).

The EC focus on two major areas in democratization process, rule of law - which stress on justice sector, provide support to elections and strengthening of sub-national governance. The

second main area is support to public administration reform (ibid, 22). Between periods of 2002-2005, EU committed €30.45 million for institutional support of which 16.51 were disbursed, while to civil society and media commitment was €42.72 million of which 37.30 million were paid out (ibid,15).

*Support to Policing and Rule of Law*

Support to Justice Sector: The EU has strongly supported the justice sector since 2005 and consider it as one of the foundations of rule of law and security. The EU contributed with €20 million to support justice sector for period of 2008-2010, including support to the National Justice Program (NJP) through the ARTF (€10 million). This aims at strengthening of state justice system and facilitate access to justice for Afghan citizens. EU provide technical assistance to institutions of (Ministry of justice, Attorney General's Office and the Supreme Court) in capacity building aim. The assistance is consisted by activities such as training for Justice Staff and Officials, make reforms in institutions and rationalize the institutional process and system, create legal aid and increase outreach of legal offices across the country. The assistance is also provided to raising awareness of legal aid and the legal system among citizens and EU support such campaigns directed to community members, religious leaders and school children. The EU also provide assistance to Government's National Priority Program (NPP) Law and Justice for all (EU, EU Delegation to Afghanistan, 2015a).

Support to police: The EU has supported Afghan police since 2002 and the assistance have been directed to institutional reform, capacity development, raising skill and competence of police and effectiveness of institutional process in the Ministry of Interior (MoI). The EU also support police salaries and police reform, EU has paid out €282.25 million and in addition to that committed €140 million for year 2011-2013. The support is further provided to building of police officer training centers and accommodation for women police officer. The EU Police Mission in Afghanistan (EUPOL) support police and prosecutors by educating about the law and legal system and better management of cases such as violence against women (ibid).

*Support to Public Administration Reform (PAR)*

EU has supported improvements in reforms of public administration and capacity building. The assistance was provided in terms of training, institutional support to human resource organization and reforms in public sector at provincial level. EU has also supported reforms in institutions at Government Ministries, such as justice and health sector. The support has also been applied on capacity building and strengthening of civil services in purpose to effectively

deliver services across the country. In 2011, EU committed €40 million to support the Capacity Building for Results Facility (CBRF) a part of government's National Priority Program on Efficient and Effective Government (EU, EU delegation to Afghanistan, 2015).

*Support to Sub-national Governance*

The EU-supported Sub-national Governance Program (SGP) is divided in two phases, phase 1 (2006-2010) funded with €5 million and phase 2 (2010-2013) funded with €12 million. The first phase focused on support to develop the capacity of Independent Directorate for Local Governance (IDLG), and the second phase has focused on supporting capacity building of national and sub-national level of institutions with focus on provinces, districts and municipalities. The aim has been to improve the democratic and participative development processes of sub-national governance. Beside this EU supporting rural development programs through National Solidarity Program (NSP). The EU has also supported government consultations, provided support to reconstruction of provincial governance implemented by Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs) funded by €10 million during 2007-2010, as well as reinforcement of provincial and district administrations, and strengthen institutions of judiciary, police and provincial councils (ibid).

*Support to Elections*

EU has contributed with €33 million to elections of 2009, 2010, through basket funding project called Enhanced Legal and Electoral Capacity for Tomorrow (ELECT) managed by UNDP. ELECT support Afghan Independent Electoral Commission (IEC), to build institutional and technical capacity. It also provide information and education on voter registration process and support reforms in electoral process (ibid).

*Support to Human Rights and Civil Society*

The EU support to civil society is implemented through two programs, the Civil Society Organization and Local Authorities (CSO-LA), and the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR). EU have contributed with €15 million to over 24 projects implemented in Afghanistan to date, aiming at strengthen the role of local civil society and NGOs. The projects support local civil society and NGOs in their capacity building and encourage them to be able to perform activities such as defending certain rights, as free and independent media, women's right and strengthen the role of civil society in public domain.

The CSO-LA program aims at support a wider and inclusive civil society in Afghanistan which has the ability and willingness to cooperate with local communities and Government

authorities on policy, economic and social issues, with aim at advocacy transparency and dialog and hold state institutions accountable to democratic norms. The projects also support communities and citizens to participate in political life and peace building and peace talks, particularly they emphasize women's active participation in political process, peace building and reconciliation efforts and the development of Afghanistan at the local and sub-national levels. EU has allocated €8 million for further supporting of this program for period 2014-2018 (ibid).

The EIDHR programs focus on similar activities but with focus on human rights and democratic reform. This include supporting of transitional justice, political participation of citizen and particularly representation of women and youth in public political life in Afghanistan. The programs empower Afghan women and youth to participate in political life through radio-programming, public discussions and debates, and support the role of independent media with focus on freedom of expression and human rights reports.  The projects also provide support to improve relationship between community-based and state justice mechanisms.  EU plans to allocate €8 million to support of civil society through EIDHR for 2015 and 2016 (ibid).

## 4.3 The US and EU Methods

The study will highlight now the methods US and EU use when promoting democracy in case of Afghanistan. After having looking at different international conferences on Afghanistan and bilateral agreements the US and EU together with other donors put much focus on mutual commitment and cooperation and partnership (EU, Bonn Conference 2011). Below will be given a mix answer of methods.

In the use of political methods, both EU and US has supported and emphasized on the electoral process of Afghanistan. USAID provided technical assistance to the Afghan Independent Election Commission (IEC), the Election Complaint Commission (ECC) and civil society actors to improve voter education, electoral administration and raise the electoral capacity. The project also aimed at improving and increasing of institutional capacity of the IEC and ECC (USAID, 2008-2012).  USAID also provided political party assistance and build up the skills of political stakeholders in organizing of elections and the increase the ability of competing in elections. The aim was at increase of electoral participation (USAID a,

2008-2012). European Commission also had similar projects supporting elections and providing technical assistance to IEC.

Both US and EU have assisted Afghanistan with development aid in purpose to boost democracy in the country. For instance the overall EU aid dedicated to Afghanistan for period of 2002-2013 was €3 billion, including €615 million in humanitarian assistance and of which 81% were paid out i.e. €2.5 billion (EU, Delegation to Afghanistan 2015b). The number of US is much bigger. The US has provided around $52 billion during 2001-2010 in assistance to Afghanistan. It is important to note that nearly 56 % had spent on training and equipment of Afghan force (CRS, 2010: 1). For years 2011-2014 over $2 billion went to democracy and Governance sectors of total ca. $6.6 billion for these four years USAID, Results, 2014).

US have also used strategic rewards to Afghanistan to support democratization process, for instance, on May 2, 2012 US and Afghanistan signed *enduring strategic partnership agreement (SPA),* where US shows its continuing commitment to strengthen Afghanistan's sovereignty, stability and cooperate to defeat Al-Qaida. US president Barak Obama also designated Afghanistan a Major Non-NATO Ally (MNNA), on July 6, 2012, and Afghanistan is the first country to be point out after 2004 (US Department of State, 2014). The MNNA status provide military and financial benefits.

EU and Afghanistan signed Joint Declaration in November 2005, which laid the foundations for political dialog and cooperation between two parties. In the economic field, e.g. EU has given quota and tariff free access for all Afghan goods to European market, however the Afghan export to EU is remaining limited (EC, CPA 2007-2013: 13).

The US and EU relationship to Afghanistan is characterized by cooperation and mutual commitment and accountability. The study encounters no coercive methods in terms of punishments or sanctions, rather a focus is on cooperation and partnership between the actors. However to receive aid, resources and help from US and EU, the Afghan Government is committed to implement certain goals, e.g. fight against terrorism, and promote democracy, combat corruption, respect human rights, and particularly women's rights (NATO, The Afghanistan Compact, 2006: 2).

## 5.0 Findings

After having described the US and EU approaches and what they focus on when promoting democracy in Afghanistan, the study will now look back on the survey questions and answer them below.

1. *What methods and channels does US use in promotion of democracy in Afghanistan?*
   As described in the previous studies and in the introduction of the study, the perception and expectation was that the US would use top-down approach and use coercive methods in promotion of democracy. What the result shows is that US focus much on top-down approach where the political elite and governmental institutions are in the focus, but it also combined with bottom-up approach, where the focus is to support civil society and organizations.

2. *What methods and channels does EU use in promotion of democracy in Afghanistan?*
   EU has supported democratization process in Afghanistan both from bottom-up approach where focus have been on support civil society and NGOs but also have included top-down approach, focused on governmental institutions building and judiciary system.

3. *Is there any difference between the US and EU concerning the approaches and methods used in promotion of democracy?*
   Both the US and EU have combined top-down and bottom-up approaches, although US has focused more on investing in the building of governmental institutions and good governance and in the case of EU it is hard to say if EU has emphasized more on one approach than other. However, both actors focusing much on stability, security and strong governmental institutions in focus on human rights and women's rights. Thus the answer is no, there are no decisive differences.

## 5.1 Conclusion

The analysis of top-down and bottom-up approaches shows that the assumption or notion that the EU and US differ in democracy promotion is not exact in the case of Afghanistan. The results show that both actors have more similarities than differences in their approach. In the case of Afghanistan both EU and US have targeted the political elite in democracy promotion with focus on support to governmental institutions (top-down), as well as directed democratic support to civil society and NGOs (bottom-up). It is difficult to generalize and say that this is

an ideal type of US and EU approach, but a conclusion here is that the US and EU democracy promotion differs from case to case how actors go about and what methods they choose in democracy promotion.

The study provide empirical contribution to the research literature with new knowledge about the democracy promotion in case of Afghanistan and the way EU and US acting in Afghanistan is characterized by similarities than differences. In contrast to previous studies where US is perceived to use coercive methods in promotion of democracy abroad feels not relevant in this case. It is shown that US emphasize much more on cooperation and mutual commitment to Afghanistan. In the case of EU, it is true that the actor use normative power and also emphasize cooperaion and partnership. The US and EU relationship with Afghanistan is characterized by conditional cooperation, where both parts are committed to fulfill the conditions set out in the agreement.

The author would recommend further research is on the subject with a focus on US and EU's impact on democratization process in Afghanistan or examine the effectiveness of democracy aid during the same time of period.

# 6.0 References

*Electronic sources*

Business and Sanctions Consulting Netherlands (BSCN), (accessed 2015-05-13)

<http://www.bscn.nl/sanctions-consulting/sanctions-list-countries >

CIA official webpage, World Fact Book, (accessed 2015-05-19)

<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/af.html>

European Commission Webpage, Country info, Afghanistan 2015, (accessed 2015-05-26)

<http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/countries/afghanistan_en>

European Union, EU delegation to Afghanistan, 2015, (accessed 2015-05-26)

<http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/afghanistan/eu_afghanistan/development_cooperation/democracy_and_accountability/index_en.htm>

European Union, EU delegation to Afghanistan, 2015a, (accessed 2015-05-27)

<http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/afghanistan/eu_afghanistan/development_cooperation/governance/index_en.htm>

EU, Delegation to Afghanistan, Cooperation for Development 2015b (accessed 2015-05-27)

http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/afghanistan/eu_afghanistan/development_cooperation/index_en.htm

European Commission Webpage, Overview of EU's development cooperation, Afghanistan 2012, (accessed 2015-05-26)

<http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/afghanistan/documents/page_content/eu_afghanistan_state_of_play_0712_en.pdf>

European Commission, Country Strategy Paper (CTP), 2007-2013 Afghanistan, (accessed 2015-05-26)

<http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/afghanistan/documents/eu_afghanistan/csp_afg_07-13_en.pdf>

EU, The International Conference on Afghanistan in Bonn, 2011 (accessed 2015-05-27)

<http://eeas.europa.eu/afghanistan/docs/2011_11_conclusions_bonn_en.pdf>

Field Mark & Ramsha Ahmed (2011), A Review of the 2001 Bonn Conference and Application to the Road Ahead in Afghanistan, Institution for National Strategic Studies, (accessed 2015-05-24)

<http://ndupress.ndu.edu/Portals/68/Documents/stratperspective/inss/Strategic-Perspectives-8.pdf>

Larson, Anna (2011), Project Report, Assessing Democracy Assistance: Afghanistan, (accessed 2015-05-22)

<http://fride.org/download/assessing_democracy_assistance_afghanistan.pdf|>

NED National Endowment for Democracy, Afghanistan, (accessed 2015-05-27)

<http://www.ned.org/where-we-work/middle-east-and-northern-africa/afghanistan>

NATO, The Afghanistan Compact, London 2006 (accessed 2015-05-27)

<http://www.nato.int/isaf/docu/epub/pdf/afghanistan_compact.pdf>

Swedish Government official webpage, Country info, (accessed 2015-05-19)

<http://www.regeringen.se/sb/d/13247/a/148364>

Tarnoff Curt, (2010), Afghanistan: U.S. Foreign Assistance, *Congressional Research Service*

<https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R40699.pdf>

USAID official webpage, projects Database, 2015 (accessed 2015-05-27)

<http://portfolio.usaid.gov/#>

USAID, Results on Afghanistan, 2014, (accessed 2015-05-27)

<http://results.usaid.gov/afghanistan#fy2014>

USAID official webpage, Afghanistan, (accessed 2015-03-16)

<http://www.usaid.gov/afghanistan/democracy-governance>

USAID a, Support electoral participation in Afghanistan 2008-2012, (accessed 2015-05-23)

<http://portfolio.usaid.gov/PublicProjectDetail?id=a0cd00000011nrqAAA>

USAID b, Support Sub-national Institutions, (accessed 2015-05-23)

<http://portfolio.usaid.gov/PublicProjectDetail?id=a0cd00000011nrvAAA>

USAID, Support to Electoral Process 2008-2012, (accessed 2015-05-24)

<http://portfolio.usaid.gov/PublicProjectDetail?id=a0cd00000011nrrAAA>

USAID, strategic support to GiIROA 2003-2010, (accessed 2015-05-23)

<http://portfolio.usaid.gov/PublicProjectDetail?id=a0cd00000011ns0AAA>

USAID official Webpage, Results of democracy and good governance for 2011, (accessed 2015-05-22)

<http://results.usaid.gov/afghanistan/democracy-and-governance/good-governance#fy2011>

USAID, Dollars to Result 2012, (accessed 2015-05-24)

<http://results.usaid.gov/afghanistan/democracy-and-governance#fy2012>

U.S. Department of State, US relations with Afghanistan, 2014 (accessed 2015-05-22)

<http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/5380.htm>

United Nation Development Program (UNDP) webpage, Afghanistan, (accessed 2015-05-19)

<http://www.af.undp.org/content/afghanistan/en/home/countryinfo/>


***Book & Articles***

Beetham, David (2009), "The contradictions of democratization by force: the case of Iraq", *Democratization*, vol.16, No:3 443-454

Bridoux, Jeff (2013), "US foreign policy and democracy promotion: in search of purpose", *International Relations*, vol.27, no.2: 235-240

Bunell, Peter. J (2005), "Political Strategies of External Support for Democratization". *Foreign Policy Analysis*, vol.1, no.3: 361-381

Burnell, Peter & Schlumberger Oliver (2010), "Promoting democracy-promoting autocracy? International politics and national political regimes*", Contemporary Politics*, vol.16, No.16: 1-15

Bouchet Nicolas (2011), "Barack Obama's democracy promotion at midterm", vol. 15, no.4: 572-588

Börzel, Tanja & Risse, Thomas (2009), "The transformative power of Europe: The European Union and the Diffusion of Ideas", KFG Working Paper, Freie Universität Berlin.

Carothers, Thomas (2006), *Aiding Democracy Abroad: The Learning Curve*. Washington, DC: CEIP, University Press

Carothers, Thomas (2004), *Critical Mission: Essays on Democracy Promotion*, Washington DC: CEIP, The Brookings Institution Press

Carothers, Thomas (2002), "The End of the Transition Paradigm", *Journal of Democracy,* Volume. 13, No. 1: 5-21

Carothers, Thomas (1997), "Democracy Assistance: the Question of Strategy", *Democratization*, vol.4, no.3: 109-132

Carothers, Thomas (2015), "Democracy Aid at 25: Time to Choose", *Journal of Democracy*

Crawford, Gordon (2008), "EU human rights and democracy promotion in Central Asia: From lofty principles to Lowly self-interests", *Perspective on European Politics and Society,* vol. 9, No. 2: 172-191

Dahl, Robert A (1971), Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition*,* New Haven, CT: London, Yale University Press

Esaiasson Peter, Gilljam Mikael, Oskarsson Henrik and Wängnerund (2012), "Metodpraktikan, Konsten att Studera Samhälle, Individ och Marknad", Edition 4.1, Norstedts Juridik AB

Finkel, Steven E, Pérez Linan and Mitchell Seligson (2007),"The Effects of U.S. Foreign Assistance on Democracy Building, 1990-2003." *World Politics* vol.59, No.3: 404-440

Grugel Jean B. (2004), "New Regionalism and Modes of Governance- Comparing US and EU strategies in Latin America", *European Journal of International Relations,* vol.10, No.4: 603-626

Huber Daniela (2013), "US and EU Human Rights and Democracy Promotion since the Arab Spring: Rethinking its' Content, Targets and Instruments", *Italian Journal of International Affairs*, vol. 48, no.3: 98-112

Huber, Daniela (2008), "Democracy Assistance in the Middle East and North Africa: A Comparison of US and EU Policies", *Mediterranean Politics,* vol.13, No. 1: 43-62

Kagan, Robert (2003), *Paradise and Power: America and Europe in the New World Order,* London: Atlantic books.

Kotzian, Peter, Knodt Michéle & Urdze Sigita (2011), "Instruments of the EU's External Democracy Promotion*", Journal of Common Market Studies*, vol. 49, No.5: 995-1018

Kubicek, Paul J. (2003), "International norms, the European Union, and democratization: tentative theory and evidence", In the European Union and Democratization, ed. Paul J. Kubicek. New York: Routledge, pp. 37-74

Lioyd, Lindsay (2010), "European approaches to democracy promotion", *SAGE International Journals,* vol. 65, No. 3: 547-559

Manners, Ian (2002), "Normative Power Europe: a Contradiction in Terms?*" Journal of Common Market Studies*, vol.40, No.2: 235-258

Merkel, Wolfgang, 2010: Systemtransformation. Eine Einführung in die Theorie und Empirie der Transformationsforschung. *Wiesbaden*: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Mikaelsson Rickard (2008), "Promoting Democracy: Sweden and the democratization process in Macedonia", Academic Dissertation, Linköping Studies in Arts and Science

Ottaway, Marina (2004)," Democracy and Constituencies in the Arab World", Carnegie Paper, no.48, Washington DC: CEIP

Quie Marissa, 2012. "Peace-building and democracy promotion in Afghanistan: the Afghanistan Peace and Reintegration Programme and reconciliation with the Taliban", *Democratization,* vol. 19, no. 3: 553-574

Rieffer Barbara Ann J. & Mercer Kristan (2005), "US democracy promotion: The Clinton and Bush administrations", *Global Society,* vol.19, no.4: 385-408

Schraeder, Peter J. (2003), "The state of the Art in International Democracy Promotion: Results of a Joint European-North American Research Network", vol. 10, no. 2: 21-44

Schumpeter, A. Josef (1992), *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy,* New Edition, Routledge, London

Silander, Daniel (2005), "Democracy from the Outside-In? The Conceptualization and Significance of Democracy Promotion", Academic Dissertation, Acta Wexionesia, National Library of Sweden

Youngs, Richard (2001), *The European Union and The promotion of Democracy: Europe's Mediterranean and Asian Policies*, Oxford University Press