External Actors in Hybrid Regimes – Lost in Translation?

Lisbeth Zimmermann
TU Darmstadt
lzimmermann@pg.tu-darmstadt.de

AFK Nachwuchstagung, “Von Kriegen die keine werden”, Tagungsstätte Villigst
12.-14.06.2009

1. Introduction

In the Western World liberal democracy, justice and modern stateness are often considered to jointly have a peacemaking effect. These norms are expected to produce the same results universally. Therefore, they are considered normatively desirable for the global South[1] and simultaneously supposed to guarantee the security of the Western World. Conflict prevention, in its long-term version, in conflict- and crises-prone states is thus put into practice by a combination of democracy promotion, state-building and development policy.

Fragile states are the primary target of Western risk analysts (EU 2007; USAID 2005d). Such states are characterized by a certain hybridity that is hardly captured by the common categorization of stateness into “strong” or “weak” (Schneckener 2004), neither by the categories of autocracy or democracy (Sartori 1992[1987]). „Hybrid stateness“ (Boege et al. 2008) is the new scientific catch phrase to describe the multiple interdependences between formal and informal institutions in the global South. Such states are most of the time also characterized by a hybrid regime type, found in the grey zone between democracy and autocracy (Rüb 2002; Zinecker 2005). Such hybrids are today found in Asia, the Middle East and dominate the political landscape in Sub-Saharan Africa.[2] Hybrid stateness and hybrid regimes not only seem to bring about each other (Goldstone et al. 2005; Merkel et al. 2003), this double hybridity also is said to be a central risk for violent conflicts (Bodea/Elbadawi 2007; Ellingsen 2000) and civil war (Fearon/Laitin 2003; Hegre et al. 2001).

Although such hybrids seem particularly immune against further development in the direction of democratic (liberal) stateness and pose the greatest challenge to donors (Hüllen/Stahn 2007), they are central recipients of Western development aid and governance activities. Thus, political process and potential conflict escalation in such hybrids seldom happen *in the box* (Grugel 2005), in a nationally delimited setting. Internal and external influences are deeply intertwined.

---

[1] The terms ”the West” and the “global South” are of course problematical categorizations.

[2] Following the Polity IV data for anocracies: http://www.systemicpeace.org/polity/polity4.htm.

The role of international actors in hybrids can be described as highly ambivalent: Critique is voiced that international actors may subvert existing formal or informal institutions with their activities, that local sensitivity and expertise is missing, and that actor's agendas are incoherent: "*In practice the contemporary system of global governance ameliorates some conflicts but exacerbates others*. (…). *Some aspects of globalisation and global governance are themselves among the root causes of local conflicts*" (Miall 2003: 59).

When and why the governance agenda of international actors fails[3] in hybrid regimes is therefore a central question. This question cannot be answered in this paper in-depth. Yet as a first step to a more detailed empirical investigation, the program literature on conflicts and instability in Third World countries by USAID and the EU will be compared. It will be analyzed if "cures" and "recipes" brought forward by these external actors actually reflect the double hybridity of many developing countries and how they present their own role in domestic political processes. It is argued that a serious problem of translation exists and that an understanding for local normative orders is missing. While the EU emphasizes a more cooperative approach based on dialogue at least on paper, a reflection of the own role in hybrid regimes is missing in approaches of both the EU and the U.S.

In a first step, the literature on weak hybrids and their connection with conflict and instability will be introduced. In a second step, international activities in such hybrids (here described as norm promotion activities) and their normative frame will be looked at and possible flaws discussed. In a third step, the approaches of the EU and the U.S. will be compared.

2. Double hybrids – Insights from International Relations, Comparative Politics and Conflict Studies

Although the third wave of democratization in the 1980s and 1990s was accompanied by ever increasing external support and assistance (Schmitter/Brouwer 1999), this shift away from strictly authoritarian regimes did not result in a world populated by consolidated „Western-style" democracies. Instead the grey zone between democracy and autocracy became well populated.

Although some regime opening took place in many states and the number of strictly authoritarian regimes was falling,[4] the majority of transitional states became "stuck" in some kind of double hybridity, a constellation that is said to be fraught with the risk of instability and conflict. The perception of instability and risk of such hybrids was based on research by quantitative Conflict Studies correlating regime characteristics with internal and external conflict and instability events. But quantitative and qualitative research from International Relations, Comparative Politics and Conflict Studies disagrees in the conception of regimes in this grey zone. While International Relations focus qualitatively on the aspect of stateness, Comparative Politics analyzes predominantly the regime type and transition phenomena. Quantitative Conflict Studies, on the other hand, investigate the effects of such regimes, based mostly on problematic data sets with regard to the definition of regimes and stateness.

---

[3] Not having the planned results or even doing harm.

[4] See i.e. the polity IV data: http://www.systemicpeace.org/polity/global2.htm (06.06.2009).

2.1 Regime type – the input side

Many authors from Comparative Politics working qualitatively on regime changes started to look into the obvious deficits of democratization in the 1990s and, thus, focused on the input side[5] of such regimes (Carothers 2002; Collier/Levitsky 1997; Diamond 2002; Hakim/Lowenthal 1991; Karl 1995; Merkel et al. 2003; O'Donnell 1996).[6] The majority of authors attempted to inductively describe different defects, less of the research was based on a “root concept” of democracy to actually define possible “diminished subtypes” (Collier/Levitsky 1997).

Table 1: grey zone conceptions

← Autocoracy	**grey zone**	**Democracy →**
	Hybrid regime (Karl 1995; Zinecker 2004)	
		Illiberal democracies (Zakaria 2003)
		Defect democracy (Merkel 2003) (Exlusive, illiberal, enclave, delegative)
	limited democracy, protected democracy, democracy without law (Morlino 2008)	
Competitive authoritarianism (Levitsky/Way 2002)		
Electoral authoritarianism (Schedler 2006)		
	Anocracy (Polity Project)	
Semi-consolidated autocracy	(Freedom House)	**Semi-consolidated democracy**

---

[5] Such a distinction of an input and an output side of political systems regarding stateness and regime type can be found in Börzel et al. (2008).

[6] A political regime is mostly defined as „*die Zugänge zur politischen Herrschaft ebenso wie die Machtbeziehungen zwischen den Herrschaftseliten und das Verhältnis der Herrschaftsträger zu den Herrschaftsunterworfenen*“, Merkel (1999: 71).

A detailed discussion of these different conceptions of the grey zone is beyond the scope of this paper. Of interest is, however, how such regimes are connected to stateness and conflict. The authors around Wolfgang Merkel, Peter Thiery and Aurel Croissant did extensive qualitative empirical case studies on hybrids in different regional settings (so far Eastern Europe, Asia and Latin America) (Merkel et al. 2006). But violent conflict mattered little to their work; only to such a degree as it was relevant for explaining the development democratic defects.

Their concept of "defect democracies" was contested by Rüb (2002) and Zinecker (2007). Following their arguments, hybrids have distinct regime characteristics, separating them from both autocracies and democracies (Zinecker 2007: 5-9). This is contrary to definitions of such regimes that would mostly describe them as a mixture of democratic and authoritarian authority patterns (e.g. Lauth 2002: 120). Zinecker is one of the few qualitative authors explicitly interested in violent conflict in hybrid regimes, not only at the level of civil war, but also at the level of criminal violence. In Zinecker's approach it is especially fragmented civil societies in connection with rent economies and hybrid institutions that produce violence (2004).

2.2 Stateness – the output side

Stateness, the output side of regimes, is mostly studied in International Relations. Only in the 1990s stateness in other world regions, primarily in Africa, became the subject of extensive research in both African area studies and International Relations.[7] Why states in non-Western world regions suffered of fragility and failure was a problem of increasing interest to researcher (Bayart 1993; Clapham 2004; Herbst 1996/97, 2000; Soerenson 2001).[8] This debate took and takes place, while the main constellation of "modern states" – democracy in combination with rule of law and some kind of welfare (Habermas 1998), assumed model for their weak, pre-modern copies – was already claimed to be in a process of transformation (Rosenau 2005; Zürn 1998, 2002).[9]

---

[7] Research on stateness in the 20th century focused mainly on Europe. How the European constellation of "nation-states" – being ideally characterized by legal-bureaucratic governance and democracy – could develop, was the main question of detailed historic study and analysis, Ertman (2005); prominent Tilly (1990).

[8] Equally relevant was the question, how the "idea of a state" could become so compelling in the global discourse, Schlichte (2005), and if that was actually adequate, Spanger (2002).

[9] But while in the Western world the state is rather subject to „*disaggregation*", Slaughter (2004); Zürn/Leibfried (2006), and less to a fragilization process (directing the discussion to the problem of democratic legitimacy of such new governance constellations), a functional equivalent, let alone a democratically legitimated one, of the state is not in sight in the global South, Bendel/Krennerich (2003: 10); Rüb (2007: 29).

One central assumption in the field of International Relations is that stateness can be measured and quantified and, thus, that “deficient” or “weak” states can be identified; a categorization with a strongly negative connotation (see also Gledhill).[10] In typologies based on these dimensions it quickly becomes apparent that only a modern OECD democracy could be placed into the category of “strong states” – other states either suffer from under-consolidation or over-extension of their ruling powers. The used definitions are mostly connected to a Western ideal of stateness that equates governance with morally “good governance” (Risse/Lehmkuhl 2007). Furthermore, in these typologies political regimes and stateness are not clearly separated.[11]

The aspect of stateness is not systematically analyzed in Democratization Studies, but most authors in this field would, when discussing it, refer to some idea of an effective legal state apparatus and the strength or capacity of a state’s institutional system (Bunce 2000; Erdmann 2003; O'Donnell 1993; Zinecker 2007), that seems to be missing in hybrids: “*Overall, there is little institutionalization and, above all, organization of the ‘state’, if not a full-blown process of de-institutionalisation*” (Morlino 2008: 8).[12]

More radically, Lauth argues that “deficient” stateness always produces “deficient” regime types (2002: 121), both deficient autocracies and deficient democracies. Erdmann’s research results indicate similarly that the weakness of African states triggered the democratizations in the region as autocratic rule lost its legitimacy in the 1990s. But exactly this weakness also prohibited full democratization (Erdmann 2003: 277-278). How stateness and regime type are connected, and wether, then, hybrid regimes are a product of weak state structures (Lauth, Merkel) or wether hybrid regime structures fuel a process of de-institutionalization (i.e. de-statization) (Morlino), remains unclear.

In the discussion of successful democracy promotion, the importance of a “functioning” state and the problem of an assumed “weakness” of states gained some strength. Some authors even argued that this capacity is a precondition for a democratic political system, strongly expressed in Fukuyamas article “’Stateness’ First” (2005). Such a trend is also mirrored in the composition of the U.S. democracy promotion. It refocused its activities in this field primarily on rule of law projects (Kemmerzell 2009).[13]

---

[10] A widely used model for the measurement of stateness is based on three dimensions: security (security monopoly in a given territory), rule of law, and welfare, Schneckener (2004). Similarly: Rotberg (2004) and Bendel/Krennerich (2003).

[11] The category of rule of law/Rechsstaatlichkeit is an important factor in most non-procedural democracy definitions.

[12] Morlino argues that half of all existing hybrids are the result of the absence of institutions, Morlino (2008).

Not included in this perspective is the question of empirical legitimacy of a state[14], a problem with special importance for both violent conflict and democratization. Legitimacy is the main focus in most stateness concepts used in Comparative Politics that where preoccupied with the relation of nation and state and with the question "what kind of" state/nation was necessary for safe democratization (e.g. Elkins/Sides 2006; Linz/Stepan 1996; Merkel et al. 2003; Rustow 1970). They did not argue that a state has to be based on a nation, rather they pointed out the problems of simultaneous democratization and nation building processes (Bunce 2000; Linz/Stepan 1996; Snyder 2000).

Following Schmitter (2005: 5-6) and Berg-Schlosser (2004: 14), such identity problems cannot be solved by democratic procedures. Thus, they argue, an independently formed nation-state (not only state capacity) is indispensable for successful democratizations. Merkel et al. (2003: 230-233) and Croissant (2005: 106) would not make such a strong argument, but show in their research that the state/nation problem is one important factor hampering democratization and supporting the development of defect democracies/hybrid regimes (Merkel et al. 2003).

This uni-directional view on the connection of nation-state and political regimes is not the only position in the field: As Bratton and Chang show, democratization and stateness (especially rule of law and legitimacy) seem to interact and positively influence each other in a virtuous circle (Bratton/Chang 2006). Whitehead points out that there is no binary coding for both democratization and state formation: "*These are both long-term, complex and potentially contested dynamic processes. There can be no assurance that state formation will be terminated before democratization must begin*" (Whitehead 2004: 38). He argues that a democratic consolidation is possible without solving all problems of state formation.

Avoiding the categorization as "weak states", Boege et al.(2008) try to offer a state conception that does not run into the problem of a normative charged model of strong vs. weak stateness. A hybridity of state structures is postulated and the authors describe a type of stateness characterized by a combination of formal and informal norms and rules. In such countries, state structures are intertwined with non-state types of order and governance. Thus, it is wrong to depict such orders as un-orderly or weak. Normative orders[15] and institutions exist, they just might not resemble Western state structures. This implies that most hybrid regimes are not only neither democratic nor autocratic, but their formal institutional setting is hybrid as well (see also Gledhill 1994).

---

[13] As Rajahopal states: "*Establishing the rule of law is increasingly seen as the panacea for all the problems that afflict many non-Western countries*" Rajagopal (2008: 49).

[14] Which might also influence its effectiveness and thereby stateness.

[15] About normative orders see Arndt et al. (2008).

In summary, the connection of a concept of hybridity and state characteristics (if capacity-wise or identity-wise) results in some serious confusion. While current IR research points out the importance of state capacity, Comparative Politics stress nation-building and regime characteristics. No clear connection of both perspectives exists definition-wise and it remains an open question whether stateness and nation-building have to precede democratization or not. What can summarized, though, from this overview of qualitative research on the topic is, that many states in the global South show characteristics of double hybridity, not necessarily of "weak stateness" or "autocracy". Caution is necessary to avoid a strong normative bias in both state and regime type definition and a conception of such hybrids as chaotic and "unruled". Informal institutional arrangements, neither democratic nor authoritarian, have to be taken into account

However, the confusion with regard to definitions and distinguishing features of stateness and regime type results in some serious mix-up of both aspects in index-oriented projects like the Polity data (see following chapter).

2.3 Hybrids and conflict – Quantitative Conflict Studies

Theoretically, quantitatively-oriented Conflict Studies posed the connection of political regimes and violent conflict in every possible direction (overview see Ellingsen 2000: 236): On one hand autocracy was regarded as the least war-prone regime type, and democracy, because of its openness and encouragement of political activity, as dangerous. On the other hand, democracy was supposed to be the most peaceful regime, because of its non-violent methods, and autocracies were supposed to produce grievance by repression.

The latest empirical results actually support a different perspective when also using the category of anocracy. This name is given to hybrids in the Polity dataset. Anocracy is in the early Polity conceptions defined as "*one which has minimal functions, an uninstitutionalized pattern of political competition, and executive leaders constantly imperilled by rival leaders*", (Gurr 1974: 1487 Fn. 1421), and is *per se* supposed to be weak and conflict-prone (the name anocracy is based on the notion of anarchy or non-rule). Anocracy, also in the later conceptions, is supposed to be very unstable, because of "incoherent authority patterns". A mixture of both democratic elements and autocratic elements is regarded as dangerous and anocracy is equated with poor governance, low "regime quality" and stateness problems (Goldstone et al. 2005).

Anocracies[16] are said to be the most conflict prone states, democracies the most peaceful ones (Krain/Myers 1997), and autocracies somewhere in the middle field regarding the onset of civil war (Ellingsen 2000; Fearon/Laitin 2003; Gleditsch/Ward 1997; Hegre et al. 2001; Sambanis 2001)[17] and violent conflict (Bodea/Elbadawi 2007; Ellingsen 2000).[18] The negative influence of anocracy even persists, according to these studies, when other factors normally associated with violence and civil war are being taken into account: "*We now tend to believe that inflation, over-urbanization, short-term economic reversals, youth bulges and other such factors only act to reveal the level of pre-existing vulnerability or resilience by actualizing 'potential' instability that is already present [in anocracies] and largely determined by other factors*." (Goldstone et al. 2005). Still, some of these results were criticized because of endogenity problems of the Polity dataset and conflicting data.[19] A reliable picture regarding anocracy and conflict does not exist.

But not only internal conflict might render anocracy a "dangerous" regime type, following quantitative studies: Anocracies are prone to state failure (Marshall/Gurr 2004). They raise the probability of inter-state war (Gleditsch/Ward 2000), of revolutions and regime changes (Goldstone et al. 2005). Marshall and Gurr (2004) also found such regimes to be especially short-lived and Gates et al. (2005) full autocracies and full democracies to be the most stable ones. In addition, countries getting stuck as hybrids during a process of democratization are both more prone to inter-state wars (Mansfield/Snyder 2004)[20] and to nationalist or ethnical manipulation of their elites in intra-state conflicts (Snyder 2000). This overview also indicates that anocracies experienced a regime change of some kind lately or are experiencing it at the moment. Morlino assess at least some permanence: The majority of hybrids are older than eight years (2008: 15).

---

[16] Most of the research is based on the Polity data set, but this data set has some serious flaws. Although the Polity data offers a scale between full autocracy and full democracy this scale is neither metric nor ordinal, Gleditsch/Ward (1997). Regimes with quite different regime characteristics can have the same Polity grading. Some of the coding categories are also questionable: Factional participation for example (defined as participation dominated by groups with particularistic agendas), a coding with middle scores between democratic and autocratic aspects, hardly represents a procedural aspect of the political regime, but rather an aspect of civil societal polarization.

[17] One major problem with some of the studies is that they actually encode all polity years as "in transition" or "state collapse" in the category of anocracy, as this category is already supposed to be instable, e.g. Feoron and Laitin 2003 Bodea/Elbadawi (2007: 18).

[18] The violence level in autocratic states is often underestimated in these studies because they are concerned with violenct conflict or civil war between the state and certain societal groups. They do not take state repression into account.

[19] There is an endogenity problem regarding the measurement of factionalism in the polity data and its correlation with civil war Gates et al. (2005: 11). Cederman et al. (2007) substitute this data in the Polity data and unravel a significant correlation between democratization and conflict, not between anocracy and conflict.

[20] For a discussion of their theoretical argument and conflicting studies see Zimmermann (2009b).

This quantitative research implies that such “incoherent anocracies” also produce or support weak state structures. This is explained with a rational model of actors using opening regime structures for power struggles and polarization (Goldstone et al. 2005; Snyder 2000) (in contrast to parts of the qualitative research, where in a long-term perspective weak state structures are depicted to weaken democratization processes, see above). This view is supported by an empirical study by Bäck and Hadenius (2008) presenting a J-shaped relationship between political regimes and state capacity. While full democracies score best regarding their administrative capacity, hybrid regimes score worst, strongly authoritarian regimes reach middle figures.

More detailed information on the causal mechanisms that would explain the correlation of anocratic regimes and conflict and instability is missing. Most quantitatively oriented authors single out the unproportionally high rate of factionalism in hybrids (Bodea/Elbadawi 2007; Goldstone et al. 2005; Marshall/Goldstone 2007). Both Goldstone et al. (2005) and Bodea/Elbadawi (2007) show in their quantitative studies that factional partial democracy is the most conflict-prone category.[21] Additionally, for other partial democracies[22] the probability of civil war seems to be not higher than for autocratic regimes (Bodea/Elbadawi 2007). Factionalism “*refers to an advanced, macro-systemic stage of group polarization that transforms political behavior in distinct ways that are both systematic and sustained. Factionalism transforms the conventional politics of deliberation to the unconventional “’anti-system’ politics of disruption*” (Marshall/Goldstone 2007: 8). It is likely to occur in emerging democracies where intermediary institutions are weak (Goldstone et al. 2005). [23]

The quantitative literature does not further discuss whether such factionalism is a product of anocratic regimes or of transitions, if factional tendencies existed before a regime change or whether factional tendencies are already a first step in a qualitative conflict model, not a characteristic of a regime or state structure.

While a connection of hybrid regimes to conflict and instability has strong support in quantitative studies, serious gaps remain in this literature. First, the data basis has conceptual flaws. Second, stateness and regime type characteristics are mixed up and grey zone regimes assumed to be *per se* conflict-prone. Third, some correlation between anocracy and conflict or instability events exists, but some conflict exists about methodological problems of some of the studies. Fourth, little is known about the causal mechanisms between double hybridity and conflict escalation or instability incidents. This shows that we still now very little about the conflict escalation in such double hybrids.

---

[21] Both based on the state failure project data: http://globalpolicy.gmu.edu/pitf/

[22] A subtype of anocratic regimes in the Polity-data, showing scorings higher than 0.

[23] The classification as factional in quantitative studies is based on the coding as factional in the dimension “competitiveness of political participation” in the Polity-data. “*Polities with parochial or ethnic-based political factions that regularly compete for political influence in order to promote particularist agendas and favor group members to the detriment of common, secular, or cross-cutting agendas*.” Polity Coding Book, http://www.systemicpeace.org/inscr/p4manualv2006.pdf, 26.

3. International actors in hybrid

3.1 International norm promotion – a new quality of intrusion?

The perception of such instability and conflict in the global South as a security threat has spread widely in Western development and security policy departments. The challenge to minimize their risk was translated into new governance strategies. Duffield describes the current global governance structures aiming at the reform of the global South as reaching a "new dimension" and quality since contemporary global governance is actually targeted at changing beliefs and behavior of people, not only government behavior. It thereby exceeds the classical internal-external divide (Duffield 2001, 2002). For him, this is a development in the direction of a new liberal imperialism (Duffield 2007: 7).

In contrast, Clapham argues that this kind of governance should not necessarily be classified as "new" (Clapham 2003). The active promotion of certain norms, institutional sets and normative orders[24] by Western states that are supposed to be desirable for non-Western states (from a Western perspective) is certainly not a new phenomenon. During both colonial and Cold-War times, the diffusion and promotion of certain institutional systems was always present (from law systems, political systems, and regional organizational schemes to infrastructural or educational systems).

However, the problem analysis in connection with the situation of global South has been changing as has the conception of the adequate "cure" for such problems: The new aspect of such activities today is that they are framed by the idea of liberal democratic government (2003: 48-49). "*The substantive content of the global governance agenda not only encompassed the belief that states were necessary, but extended to a clear idea of what such states should look like, and how they should be created*" (Clapham 2003: 46). Governance activities are equated with the creation of 'order', 'stability' and 'control', while "*all*

---

[24]

opposition to liberal global governance is by definition disorderly and potentially violent" (Selby 2003: 10).

Yet how such governance activities or political aid in weak hybrids influence domestic political and social processes is a neglected field, although "*[r]ecent research has shown that the donor-recipient relationship is much more interactive [than stated in the literature] and does affect the behaviour, the structure and the political status of the recipient*" (Schmitter/Brouwer 1999: 33). While some effort at least is put into the evaluation of positive or negative outcomes or impacts of programs and projects by the executing organizations, these are seldom analyzed in a broader and more systematic manner. In Conflict Studies, external factors only play a role in connection to the spread of civil war, migration and international criminal networks (Vorrath et al. 2007). While all these factors are important to explain the escalation of violent conflict, Western international actors in the role of democratizers and state-builders are seldom included in a framework to understand domestic politics, although "*Local contexts […] are rendered porous to influence from outside. Political spaces can no longer be shaped exclusively by (local) state actors and are invaded by groups, ideas and networks from outside the nation-state*" (Grugel 2005: 37-38).

This paper frames the activities of Western actors in weak hybrids (including humanitarian relief[25]) as **norm promotion activities**. Western external actors engage in such countries to promote certain norm sets and institutional sets that are associated with stabilization, democratization and economic development; the models being the Western states themselves. For such activities they use mechanisms, such as coercion, conditionality and persuasion to achieve local compliance or they substitute local governance activities altogether (Zimmermann 2009a).[26] The promoted norm sets and the strategies of promotion are changing over time, the changing perspective on conflict and instability in the global South illustrates this very well.

---

[25] A strong argument can be made, that such activities are also connected to the promotion of certain project management and relief strategies.

[26] A state is far from an isolated political arena, although the importance of international influences varies from case to case. To what extent political orders in hybrids are open to transnational influences on governance, institutional settings and norm sets is a relatively young question in Comparative Politics and International Relations. The middle ground between both subfields of Political Science is still small, (Flockhart 2005; Grugel 2005: 24-32; Schmitz 2004). In the 1990s, scholars from Comparative Politics focusing on regime changes increasingly took into account international influences, although mostly based on a rather strict internal-external divide of variables. At the same time norm diffusion processes gained considerable attention with the strengthening of constructivist approaches in International Relations, (Adler 2007; Fearon/Wendt 2007), the emergence of the global governance literature, (Dingwerth/Pattberg 2006; Rosenau 1992, 2005), and the stronger role of transnational non-state actors, (Risse et al. 1999).

3.2 Conflict and instability in donor discourse

3.2.1 "Cure" for conflict and instability in Western donor discourses

While before 1990 internal conflicts in the global South were mostly interpreted and treated using a Cold War lens by Western states, this perception changed radically after 1990. The topic of conflict and instability in the Non-OECD world gained prominence in the policy discourse during the 1990s, creating a thematic intersection between the formerly separate communities of security experts and development/democracy promotion practitioners.[27] The concept of conflict prevention gained momentum with the UN secretary-general's *Agenda of Peace 1992* and the *Brahimi Report 2000*,[28] although rather designed as short-term preventive diplomacy. In the *Preventing Deadly Conflict Report* 1997[29] a distinction between structural and operational prevention[30] was introduced by the Carnegie Commission. Structural prevention was supposed to address the "root causes" of conflict, while security, well-being and justice were defined as central factors for stability and peace. This strategy, thus, encouraged governance activities by external actors such as development aid and careful management of transitions aimed at conflict prevention. Such conflict prevention concepts were widely received and transformed in own strategies by donors.

Following the events of 9/11, the issue of stateness and state failure (and thus a focus on "weak" state capacity) gained an formerly unknown prominence in the strategy building of Western states and was, most outspokenly by the U.S., identified as one of the key threats of the Post-Cold-War world (Council 2006; USAID 2005d). This also led to an even deeper entanglement of a discourse on security with a development/democratization discourse[31] and set new tasks to development aid (primarily fighting terrorism and global criminal networks EU 2007; Tschirgi 2006: 50; USAID 2005d).

Inscribed especially in the second discourse of state failure and fragility were two perspectives: on the one hand an interest in Western security – Western states have to be protected against risks caused by fragile states in the South –, and on the other hand a (normative) conviction that stability and peace can be brought to such states by a combination of democracy promotion, state building and development aid, both as a conflict prevention strategy and as a post-conflict reconstruction strategy. The conviction in most Western states holds, "*[…] that their institutions, rights and practices provide the* ***model*** *that is applicable worldwide*" (Schmitter/Brouwer 1999: 6).[32]

---

[27] This was among other reasons due to violent escalation of conflict in transitional settings such as the Balkans or Ruanda.

[28] See also the UN's secretary-general's Agenda for Development 1994

[29] http://www.wilsoncenter.org/subsites/ccpdc/pubs/rept97/finfr.htm.

[30] Taken over by the UN's secretary-general in the "Prevention of Armed Conflict" report 2001.

[31] Although on paper this connection of security and development was close, both policy communities still followed rather different logics, Youngs (2007: 3-5).

But little is known about the precise connection of the three activities democracy promotion, state building and development aid among themselves, and even less with stability and peace in target states. While it is supposed that "all good things go together", several trade-offs might exist (e.g. Stockmeyer 2006: 269). The strongest points of criticism of Western governance activities will be presented, indicating why Western strategies have little success or even negative influences on the global South.

3.2.2 Risks and flaws in norm promotion activities

According to van Hüllen and Stahn, Western and international actors are faced with a serious dilemma in weak hybrids. While strategies are rather clear-cut for young democracies (rewarding reform and cooperation with state actors) and authoritarian regimes (sanctioning human rights abuses; supporting oppositional and non-state actors), in the grey zone between both regime types both strategies can have negative consequences (Hüllen/Stahn 2007: 6). But also apart from such strategic decisions about the mechanisms and target groups of norm promotion, the role of international actors in hybrids can be described as highly ambiguous, although systematic evidence concerning the effects of their activities is missing. Several aspects can be listed that can hamper positive results (peaceful interacion) of international influences or even generate negative ones.

1) *Subversion of existing institutions*: Norm promotion activities of external actors can actually bolster state incapacity (Debiel 2002: 4). The takeover of public tasks, such as the provision of certain services can, in a long-term perspective, undermine state capacities. In most states the capacity is missing to effectively organize the interaction with donors (Tschirgi 2006: 58), which in its most extreme cases can lead to a kind of "governance state" in donor dependency (Harrison 2004).

   Similar problems also arise with regard to the state building agenda of international actors: state building activities by international donors often undermine existing local and informal governance structures (Boege et al. 2008).

---

[32] This assumption about the positive effects of liberal-democratic Western stateness goes to such length as to assume different international orders. Failing states and instable hybrids are stuck in a pre-modern order, (Cooper 2002). Only the inclusion into the post-modern order by the development of coherent and democratic modern national-state order can minimize their risk for the Western states.

2) *Missing ownership:* Although "local ownership" seems to be a popular term in the strategy formulation of external actors (EU 2003: 6; USAID 2006 (revised)), its translation in real political processes is seldom given. The promotion of certain norms or institutions to government actors without local commitment and consensus might exacerbate existing social and political conflicts. Political elites can get caught between the support of local populations and the expectations to conform to certain global norms (Clapham 2003: 46). Well known are such negative effects in regard to liberal reforms promoted by international financial institutions in the 1990s (Miall 2003: 63). Furthermore, instead of "equal partnerships", donor-recipient relations are rather dependency relationships: "*They [recipients] tend to adapt to the discourse of the donors and to pay at least lip service to their values and ideas in order to increase the likelihood of funding*." (Schmitter/Brouwer 1999: 33).
3) *Missing local sensitivity*
    a. *Rejection of non-Western norms and practices*

    The problem of a missing understanding of local norms and practices and the insistence on certain Western institutional settings without the search for functional equivalents arises in all Western-Non-Western partnerships: "*Democracy-building easily elides into a process of domination and a rejection of cultures and norms that are regarded as un- or anti-Western. Actors from outside frequently send unintended mixed messages, due to cultural distance, insensitivity, a failure to understand societies other than their own and the general complexity of interests and belief patterns, their own included*" (Grugel 2005: 39).

    b. *Missing local sensitivity*

    Additionally, this insistence on the promotion of own practices without the reflection of local circumstances might further inhibit any local connectivity. Well known is the critic of rule of law programs that are often planned and implemented without serious inclusion of local experts and knowledge of local rule of law traditions (Carothers 2004; Mani 2008; Stockmeyer 2006: 266-268).

    c. *Mechanical implementation*:

    Problems may also arise from the mechanical application of existing program or project schemes. Although local conditions are said to decide about program planning, the “one size fits all” accusation to donor activities (Börzel/Risse 2004)) still holds regarding the covered topics[33] and regional approaches.

4) *Technocratic approach*: Policies and strategies of external actors are mostly presented as deduced semi-scientific knowledge about the functioning of Non-Western societies. The implementation of such strategies is seldom linked up to an understanding of such activities as political processes connected to societal conflict and contention (Stockmeyer 2006: 8; Tschirgi 2006: 62).
5) *Incoherence*: An often voiced critique is, furthermore, the missing coherence of agendas and activities amongst different external actors and even amongst sectors inside one organization (e.g. trade, migration, foreign investment, environment, development, security) (Cilliers 2006: 101). Although this problem is addressed by all external actors in policy and strategy papers, reaching agreements on activities and joint agendas is more complicated than it seems (Tschirgi 2006: 54-55).
6) *The norm promotion industry:* The growth of governance activities has produced a considerable industry that does not necessarily function in line with needs and wants of recipient states: “[…] *‘state-building’ in fragile states has now become a mini policy industry with various donors designing and implementing programs on constitution making, support to multi-party politics, transparency and anti-corruption programs as well as anti-crime and anti-terrorism measures. A closer look at selected programs, however, reveals that they are quite narrowly conceived and are often shaped by donor capacities rather than recipient country needs*.” (Tschirgi 2006: 57).

We can, therefore, observe a failure of “fit” of the promoted norm sets and local governance structures. A *local translation* and *embedding* is mostly missing. The particular institutional constellation and present normative orders in weak hybrids and their internal political processes do get too little attention.

Localization or lost in translation

Neither gets this problem of translation and embedding much attention in the scientific literature on norm promotion. In the classical norm promotion literature the reaction of norm takers – here weak hybrids – is presented as either an acceptance of promoted norms or a refusal to internalize them. For the analysis of the reactions to democracy promotion, state building and development work this approach falls short of a solid account of micro-processes of localization[34] (see Capie 2008: 638). Everett (1997) tries to create a more detailed picture of local processes of norm interpretation. Using the example of urban planning policy in Bogotá she shows how local actor groups use norm discourses of international actors, take over parts and modify others. She also analyzes how such discourses become part of local power relations.[35] The international discourse on development is, therefore, part of an internal struggle of interpretation and the power of definition is central to its result (Moose 2003).

---

[33] There are certain fashions in the governance industry, such as civil society support in the 1990s and rule of law and security sector reform programs in the last years.

In the constructivist literature on international relations, Acharya notices similar processes. For him "[…] *many local beliefs are themselves part of a legitimate normative order, which conditions the acceptance of foreign norms*" (Acharya 2004: 239). Thus, norms are not promoted in a norm-free environment and not only by transnational actors. While most constructivist IR authors would claim that it is the "normative fit" and the domestic structure that influence whether an international norm is taken over locally – or at least the result of the work of international norm entrepreneurs (Checkel 1999; Cortell/Davis Jr 2000; Finnemore/Sikkink 1998), Archaya argues that international norms have to be actively connected to local normative orders by local actors: "*I define localization as the active construction (through discourse, framing, grafting, and cultural selection) of foreign ideas by local actors, which results in the former developing significant congruence with local beliefs and practices*" (Acharya 2004: 254; see also Capie 2008).

Domestic agency plays a central role in this "localization" process. Foreign norm sets are reconstructed and reshaped locally and integrated into a local norm context. Alternatively, norm sets can completely displace existing norm hierarchies (which is rare and rather connected to imposition) or can be answered by resistance.[36] To understand local reactions on norm promotion in a more precise way than simply diagnosing a failure or compliance, a more complex model has to be developed. Norms are not simply taken over, they are *integrated into existing local normative orders and conceptions of governance and democracy.*

Whether such "translation" problems in connection with weak hybrids find any conceptual echo in the EU and U.S. approaches regarding developing countries will be analyzed in the following section.

---

[34] Localization means the process of integration new institutional/norm sets into existing local normative orders.

[35] E.g. local elites use a discourse to get foreign funding, Everett (1997: 137-138); see also Moose (2003).

[36] While IR scholars frequently refer to the importance of Acharya's concept of localization, they rarely come up with an operationalization. This is probably due to some inevitable conceptual vagueness. Cultural practices and local normative orders are complex and contradictory, a clear conception of localization is, therefore, hardly realizable see also Grugel (2007: 460).

4. EU and U.S. strategies compared

A comprehensive analysis of donor policies of Western states and international organizations with regard to weak hybrids is beyond the scope of this paper. Yet a first comparison of U.S. and EU[37] strategies – two of the major actors in development aid and democracy promotion – will help get an impression of their problem analysis and "cure" conceptions in connection to conflict and instability in the global South. At this point of time, this can only be done with a comparison of headquarter policies and strategies, not of country strategies. The literature (policy papers, strategy papers as well as handbooks) on democracy promotion, governance, conflict prevention and state fragility by the United States Agency for International Development[38] and the EU Commission[39] since 2000 will be analyzed (see annex 1) focusing on the following questions: Which central problems are formulated in connection with states in the global South and what factors are said to cause conflict or instability (a)? What are the options identified in the papers that can help the target state in overcoming and the prevention of conflict and instability (b)? How is the external actor's own role in the domestic processes of such states conceptualized (c)?

(a) Risk analysis

While the early literature on conflict prevention found no echo in USAID strategy papers,[40] in 2005 USAID published several papers concerned with fragile states and conflict management. Fragile states were established as a central category to describe the state of many states in the global South and this fragility[41] was identified as a central threat to the U.S. The strengthening of such fragile states is, thus, stated as one of USAID's core goals:

---

[37] Whether the EU can actually be conceptualized as an independent actor with a foreign policy agenda is controversial: „*At one end of the spectrum are those who see the EU as a potential state, or at least the performer of essential state functions in the international political arena. At the other end are those who see the EU as at best a patchy and fragmented international participant, and as little more than a system of regular diplomatic co-ordination between the member states*", Elgström/Smith (2006: 1). I do not claim that foreign policy is a supranational policy field. Yet regarding the field of democracy promotion, development aid and state building activities, the European Union can very well be conceptualized as an independent actor with an own agenda, although its activities have to be analyzed in relation to the activities of its member states.

[38] USAID is the main agency in the field in the U.S.

[39] Most relevant is the DG Development.

[40] Fundamental theme was in the year 2000 still the transition paradigm (echoed in the classical model of liberalization, transition and consolidation during the democratization process) and a classical divide of authoritarian and democratic rule, USAID (2000).

[41] Fragility is used both for vulnerable states ("unable or unwilling to adequately assure the provision of security and basic services to significant portions of their populations and where the legitimacy of the government is in question." USAID (2005d: 1)) and states in crisis ("does not exert effective control over its own territory or is unable or unwilling to assure the provision of vital services to significant parts of its territory, where legitimacy of the governments is weak or nonexistent, and where violent conflict is a reality or a great risk USAID (2005d: 1).

(USAID 2005a: 3)	“Instead of strong, authoritarian states, the most dramatic threats to democracy in the twenty-first century come from transnational terrorist organizations and fragile states."
(USAID 2005c: 3)	"Violent conflict is an expression of state failure, which in turn has allowed sanctuaries for terrorist networks that have attacked U.S. interests and U.S. citizens."
(USAID 2006 (revised): 3)	"[…] supporting transformational development; strengthening fragile states; supporting U.S. geostrategic interests; addressing transnational problems; providing humanitarian relief."

USAID designs a complex model of factors influencing conflict escalation which is well-informed by quantitative U.S. Conflict Studies (USAID 2005b). A combination of structural factors, means and opportunities is presented as factors for violent conflict. Institutions and their ability to address conflict are stylized as part of the opportunity filter for conflict. Weak institutions, which are said to be predominant in transitional states and partial democracies, are identified as central risks for conflict and state failure (USAID 2005b: 26-27).

(USAID 2005d: 2)	"Although conflict is not limited to fragile states, the propensity for a fragile state to experience violent conflict is high."
(USAID 2005d: 3)	“Research indicates that the instability associated with fragile states is the product of ineffective and illegitimate governance.”

The EU strategies offer a very diffuse picture of the precise causes of conflict. In the 2001 Conflict Prevention strategy “least democratized” states are presented as central problems (EU 2001: 13), since the formulation of the European Security Strategy 2003 (Council 2006) the connection of fragility[42] and conflict prevails. Bad governance, a main factor for conflict, is supposed to be rooted in poverty and socio-economic inequalities.

Different types of partnerships are identified (difficult, effective, post-conflict partnership) in the Governance and Development framework (EU 2003), but in the 2007 fragile states strategy the only remaining category is fragility/no fragility (EU 2007). Any reference to the situation of grey zone regimes and hybrid state and regime structures is missing.

(EU 2003: 3)	“Governance is a key component of policies and reforms for poverty reduction, democratisation and global security.”
(EU 2003: 7)	“Security is directly linked to development: there is no development in chronically insecure environments. Conversely governance failures with roots in poverty are a key

---

[42] “Fragility refers to weak or failing structures and to situations where the social contract is broken due to the State’s incapacity or unwillingness to deal with its basic functions, meet its obligations and responsibilities regarding service delivery, management of resources, rule of law, equitable access to power, security and safety of the populace and protection and promotion of citizens’ rights and freedoms” EU (2007: 5).

	contributing factor to outbreaks of violent conflict. “
(Council 2006: 4)	“Conflict can lead to extremism, terrorism and state failure; it provides opportunities for organised crime.”
(EU 2007: 8)	“Fragility is most often triggered by governance shortcomings and failures, in form of lack of political legitimacy compounded by very limited institutional capacities linked to poverty.”
(EU 2001: 9)	“Difficulties in successfully addressing problems such as extreme poverty, inequalities in the distribution of wealth, scarcity and degradation of natural resources, unemployment, lack of education, ethnic and religious tensions, border and regional disputes, disintegration of the State or lack of peaceful means of settling disputes, have plunged whole societies into chaos and suffering”

While state failure is the central scheme discussed in the fragility strategy 2007, the reference to such a phenomenon as a fundamental threat to Western security is less dominant (see e.g. EU 2006: 3).[43] Rather the EU’s responsibility to help fragile states is addressed to justify governance activities (EU 2007).

(b) The “cure”

The USAID strategies since 2005 coherently promote legitimate and effective governance in fragile states. The focus is on the long-term improvement of the strength and quality of (formal) institutions in connection to weak and fragile states. Regarding former USAID strategies it is criticized that these mostly focused on results of weak institutions, not on the root causes of fragility, namely weak institutional capacity (USAID 2005d: 17). While in very fragile situations the “strengthening” of institutions is presented as more important than democratic structures in the Conflict Assessment strategy (USAID 2005b), in the strategy “At Freedoms Frontier” the necessity of democratization for all states, developing, fragile or post-conflict is formulated (USAID 2005a: 6)

(USAID 2005d: 5)	“To the extent possible, programming in fragile states should focus on the underlying sources of fragility – the governing arrangements that lack effectiveness and legitimacy – rather than the symptoms.”
(USAID 2005d: V)	“There are no quick fixes to strengthen governance or build a country’s ability to

---

[43] Although it is presented as a threat in the EU Security Strategy: “Bad governance – corruption, abuse of power, weak institutions and lack of accountability – and civil conflict corrode States from within. In some cases, this has brought about the collapse of State institutions. Somalia, Liberia and Afghanistan under the Taliban are the best known recent examples. Collapse of the State can be associated with obvious threats, such as organised crime or terrorism. State failure is an alarming phenomenon that undermines global governance, and adds to regional instability,” Council (2006: 4).

	improve the lives of its citizens.”
(USAID 2005a: 5)	"[…] democracy, good governance, and development reinforce each other to create a virtuous circle"
(USAID 2005a: 3)	"Good governance encompasses commitment to the rule of law, the public good, transparency and accountability, and effective delivery of public services. While democracy is not essential for good governance - and bad governance can occur under formal democratic structures - democracy and good governance together provide the strongest guarantee of security, justice, and economic development.”

The EU sets its focus on the promotion of “better governance” and democracy. Long-term and short-term prevention strategies are distinguished, but not necessarily clarified.

(EU 2001: 13)	“Countries with conflict potential are usually those where the democratic process is the least advanced and where external support, for obvious reasons, is the most difficult to implement. In such condition, EC support should aim, through targeted actions, at opening the way to a more favourable democratic environment”
(Council 2006: 10)	“Contributing to better governance through assistance programmes, conditionality and targeted trade measures remains an important feature in our policy that we should further reinforce.”
(EU 2007: 8-9)	“Supporting democratic governance, state building, reconciliation processes and human rights protection, as well as promoting political will for reform through dialogue and incentives, rather than through conditionality and sanction, should guide EU action.”
(EU 2001: 10)	“Treating the root causes of conflict implies creating, restoring or consolidating structural stability in all its aspects.” “Characteristics of structural stability are sustainable economic development, democracy and respect for human rights, viable political structures and healthy environmental and social conditions, with the capacity to manage change without to resort to conflict.”

(c) *Role in target state*

USAID states a strong strategic interest. The aim is to support well-doers and geopolitically important states (USAID 2005a: 7, 2005d)

(USAID 2006 (revised): 5)	"Aid levels or program content are mainly determined by foreign policy concerns and considerations rather than by development or fragility criteria"

Local ownership in connection to program design and implementation is named as the first of the nine guiding principles of USAID activities (USAID 2006 (revised): 10), but could rather be interpreted as a well-made analysis of the local situation and local interests, not primarily as a strategy to include local actors in the formulation of programs (e.g. USAID et al. 2009).

(USAID et al. 2009: 5)	"The principles, policies, laws, and structures that form an SSR program must be informed by the host nation's history, culture, legal framework, and institutions. As a result, the needs, priorities, and circumstances driving SSR will differ substantially from one country to another. Accounting for the basic security concerns of the host nation population is essential for attaining buy-in and is essential to the success of SSE programs. To ensure the sustainability of reforms, assistance should be designed to meet the needs of the host national population and to support host nation actors, processes, and priorities. To accomplish this, SSR programs generally should be developed to serve longer-term goals."
(USAID 2005a: 4)	"We strive to tailor our programs to the conditions in each country – mindful of the influence of the regional environment."

The own role in fragile states is presented as unambiguously positive. Possible problems in the translation of U.S. conceptions of concepts such as good governance or democracy are not stated, but in connection with the promotion of rule of law, some translation problems are acknowledged regarding different law cultures (common law/civil law). The universality of the concept is not called into question (USAID 2008).

Similarly, the EU paints an unambiguously positive picture of its activities. In contrast to the USAID approach, it promotes a very cooperative strategy. Dialogue and ownership (meaning also joint program formulation) of strategies are centrally covered in almost all analyzed documents (EU 2001: 10, 2003: 6-7). Even for difficult partnership and very fragile states the aim is "to stay engaged" (EU 2003: 20, 2007: 9).

(EU 2006: 10)	„Based on political dialogue with the partner country, the EU needs to ensure that its support matches the needs and wishes of national stakeholders and is provided within the political context of the overall reform process.", 10

Synthesis and cautionary note

The approaches of the U.S. and the EU are close in their analysis. In both perspectives fragile stateness and the risk of conflict was, in the last years, the dominant lens to analyze political processes in the global South and their combat is presented as a top priority of activities. The hybridity of institutions, as stressed in the qualitative literature on regime types and stateness did not find its way into the international actors' analysis. Instead a weakness of institutions and weak legitimacy are identified as prime state characteristics. Similarly, hybrid regime types between autocracy and democracy are not introduced, instead the notion of young, not yet consolidated democracies prevails.

The “cure” for fragility and conflict is seen in “better governance” by a combination of state building and democratization in both approaches. Both actors present such “cures” in a very technocratic way. They do not question their own role as norm promoters in such settings.

Most explicit are the differences of the two approaches in the way interaction is to be designed: while the EU promotes a cooperative frame, based on dialogue and “staying engaged”, the U.S. puts its emphasis on external analysis, little dialogue and support conditioned to foreign policy interests and the reform-mindedness of the target state.

If these overall directions of the two approaches are actually translated into local country strategies, needs further empirical investigation. Some evidence points to a more complicated picture and a less prominent role of fragile states and conflict prevention. A first hint to exercise caution is that governance activities in fragile states and conflict prevention do not play a very prominent role in development aid budgets. Again using the example of the EU, analysis of their activities shows that democracy promotion seldom has been the “prime determinant of strategy” (Youngs 2001: 29). Similarly governance activities forms only 3-4 % of the budgets (Youngs 2007: 17).

The second hint is that, although prevention and long-term involvement are put at center stage in both strategies, most of the governance activities that are executed in this field are actually focused on post-conflict situations, not on conflict prevention (Lekha Sriram 2008: 76; Youngs 2007: 17-18).

Thirdly, the approaches might, in practice, not differ widely regarding the cooperation with local actors. Based on an analysis of democracy promotion policies of the EU and the U.S. Börzel et al. (2008) argue that both approaches are mostly cooperative with regard to the mechanisms used (sanctions vs. positive rewards and persuasion). Further research is needed, though, to analyze if EU dialogue and ownership mechanisms can actually help gain a more detailed picture of local needs and wants than a less cooperative U.S. approach. Although rhetorically the dialogue model is dominant in EU papers, Youngs (2007: 18) depicts a trend of EU development aid in a different direction. With security concerns regarding “fragile states” rising, state-oriented, government-to-government aid is rising, too; dialogue with local elites gains importance, inclusion and plurality loose their status as important concepts.

5. Conclusion

The general question of this paper was when and why the governance agenda aiming at conflict prevention of international actors fails in the global South. In a first step to answering this question EU and U.S. approaches to conflict-prone states were compared analyzing on the one hand the adequateness of their risk analysis and on the other hand their ability to conceive "translation" problems with regard to their promoted norm sets. In a first step the scientific literature on regime types and stateness problems was presented. Hybrids are characterized by both hybrid regime structure (the input side) and hybrid state structure (the output side). Quantitatively, such states are seen as especially conflict- and risk-prone, but serious research gaps exist regarding the (causal) connection of concepts of stateness, regime type and conflict. This perception of risk of such conflict-prone states is shared by the Western security and development community, leading to the formulation of new tasks for development aid in connection with conflict prevention. This perception further increased after 9/11 refocusing attention on "fragile states". While such activities of norm promotion in hybrid regimes do not necessarily present a "new" quality of intrusion in states in the global South, the new overall conception of such activities (the promotion of "liberal democratic stateness") does.

Several risks and flaws are found in these governance activities. Amongst others, local orders are subverted, local sensitivity and an embedding of "universal" strategies in local norm contexts is missing, and the promoted norm sets are presented in a technocratic manner without any understanding for local political conflicts and processes and for local normative orders.

An analysis of USAID and EU program literature on conflict and instability in Third World countries was supposed to shed light on the questions if and how the hybridity of local orders is reflected in the governance approaches and if the own role in domestic political processes is analyzed. In both approaches the hybridity of regime and state institutions gains little attention (although partial democracy and transitional processes are named as special problems in the U.S. approach), fragility, in contrast, is the main perspective in which states are analyzed. Similarly, in both approaches democratization and the strengthening of institutions is seen as the only strategy to minimize conflict risks in the long run. While the EU emphasizes a more cooperative approach based on dialogue, the U.S. relies on external analysis of local problems. The own role in domestic political processes is not questioned in both approaches.

Although further research is needed, this analysis suggests that EU and U.S. problem analyses and strategies are seriously flawed. What is needed is a critical perspective on the own activities on the one hand, and a more detailed understanding of local normative orders and localization processes of promoted norm sets on the other.

Literature

Acharya, Amitav 2004: How Ideas Spread: Whose Norms Matter? Norm Localization and Institutional Change in Asian Regionalism, in: International Organization 58, 239-275.

Arndt, Friedrich/Kemmerzell, Jörg/Marciniak, Angela/Staden, Andreas von/Wallbott, Linda/Zimmermann, Lisbeth 2008: Normative Ordnung(en) aus politikwissenschaftlicher Perspektive, (Workshop "Normative Ordnungen - Interdisziplinäre Annährung", Frankfurt, 12.12.2008), in: http://www.politikwissenschaft.tu-darmstadt.de/fileadmin/pg/cluster/mitarbeiterworkshop/Politikwissenschaft_TUD_FF_3_WS.pdf.

Bäck, Hanna/Hadenius, Axel 2008: Democracy and State Capacity: Exploring a J-Shaped Relationship, in: Governance 21: 1, 1-24.

Bayart, Jean-François 1993: The State in Africa. The Politics of the Belly, London/New York.

Bendel, Petra/Krennerich, Michael 2003: Einleitung: Staat und Rechtsstaat in jungen Demokratien - eine Problemskizze, in: Bendel, Petra/Croissant, Aurel/Rüb, Friedbert W. (Eds.): Demokratie und Staatlichkeit. Systemwechsel zwischen Staatsreform und Staatskollaps, Opladen, 9-34.

Berg-Schlosser, Dirk 2004: Introduction, in: Berg-Schlosser, Dirk (Ed.): Democratization. The State of the Art, Wiesbaden, 13-30.

Bodea, Cristina/Elbadawi, Ibrahim A. 2007: Riots, Coups and Civil War: Revisiting the Greed and Grievance Debate, in: The World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 4397.

Boege, Volker/Brown, Anne/Kevin, Clements;/Nolan, Anna 2008: On Hybrid Political Orders and Emerging States: State Formation in the Context of 'Fragility', in: Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management.

Börzel, Tanja/Pamuk, Yasemin/Stahn, Andreas 2008: The European Union and the Promotion of Good Governance in its Near Abroad: One Size Fits All?, Berlin.

Börzel, Tanja/Risse, Thomas 2004: One Size Fits All!, (Workshop on Democracy Promotion, Standford University, Oct. 4-5, 2004).

Bratton, Michael/Chang, Eric C. C. 2006: State Building and Democratization in Sub-Saharan Africa: Forwards, Backwards, or Together?, in: Comparative Political Studies 39, 1059-1083.

Bunce, Valerie 2000: Comparative Democratization: Big and Bounded Generalizations, in: Comparative Political Studies 33, 703-734.

Capie, David 2008: Localization as Resistance: The Contested Diffusion of Small Arms Norms in Southeast Asia, in: Security Dialogue 39: 6, 637-658.

Carothers, Thomas 2002: The End of the Transition Paradigm, in: Journal of Democracy 13: 1, 6-21.

Carothers, Thomas 2004: Critical Mission: Essays on Democracy Promotion, Washington D.C.

Cederman, Lars-Erik/Hug, Simon/Krebs, Lutz F. 2007: Democratization and Civil War. Empirical Evidence.

Checkel, Jeffrey T. 1999: Norms, Institutions, and National Identity in Contemporary Europe, in: International Studies Quarterly 43: 1, 83-114.

Cilliers, Jakkie 2006: New Interfaces Between Security and Development, in: Klingebiel, Stephan (Ed.): New Interfaces between Security and Development : Changing Concepts and Approaches, Bonn, 93-105.

Clapham, Christopher 2003: Global Governance and State Collapse, in: Cochrane, Faergal/Duffy, Rosaleen/Selby, Jan (Eds.): Global Governance, Conflict and Resistance, Houndsmill/ New York, 41-58.

Clapham, Christopher 2004: The Global-Local Politics of State Decay, in: Rotberg, Robert I. (Ed.): When States Fail: Causes and Consequences, Princeton.

Collier, David/Levitsky, Steven 1997: Democracy with Adjectives: Conceptual Innovation in Comparative Research, in: World Politics 49: 3, 430-451.

Cortell, Andrew P./Davis Jr, James W. 2000: Understanding the Domestic Impact of International Norms: A Research Agenda, in: International Studies Review 2: 1, 65-87.

Council, European 2006: A Secure Europe in a Better World: European Security Strategy.

Croissant, Aurel 2005: The Prospects for Democratization in Asia: Findings and Perspectives, in: Waibel, Michael/Kreisel, Werner (Eds.): The Pacific Challenge. Development Trends in the 21st Century, Göttingen, 91-114.

Debiel, Tobias 2002: Do Crisis Regions Have a Chance of Lasting Peace? The Difficult Transformation from Structures of Violence, in: Debiel, Tobias/Klein, Axel (Eds.): Fragile Peace: State Failure, Violence and Development in Crisis Regions, London/ New York, 1-30.

Diamond, Larry 2002: Thinking about Hybrid Regimes, in: Journal of Democracy 13: 2, 21-35.

Duffield, Mark 2001: Governing the Borderlands: Decoding the Power of Aid, in: Disasters 25: 4, 308-320.

Duffield, Mark 2002: Social Reconstruction and the Radicalization of Development: Aid as a Relation of Global Liberal Governance, in: Development and Change 33: 5, 1049-1071.

Duffield, Mark 2007: Development, Security and Unending War. Governing the World of Peoples, Cambridge/Malden, MA.

Elgström, Ole/Smith, Michael 2006: Introduction, in: Elgström, Ole/Smith, Michael (Eds.): The European Union's Roles in International Politics: Concepts and Analysis, London/New York, 1-10.

Elkins, Zachary/Sides, John 2006: The Problem of Stateness, (International Studies Association, San Diego, March 2006).

Ellingsen, Tanja 2000: Colorful Community or Ethnic Witches' Brew? Multiethnicity and Domestic Conflict during and after the Cold War, in: Journal of Conflict Resolution 44: 2, 228-249.

Erdmann, Gero 2003: Apokalyptische Trias: Staatsversagen, Staatsverfall und Staatszerfall - strukturelle Probleme der Demokratie in Afrika, in: Bendel, Petra/Croissant, Aurel/Rüb, Friedbert W. (Eds.): Demokratie und Staatlichkeit. Systemwechsel zwischen Staatsreform und Staatskollaps, 267-292.

Ertman, Thomas 2005: State Formation and State Building in Europe, in: Janoski, Thomas/Alford, Robert R./Hicks, Alexander M./Schwartz, Mildred A. (Eds.): The Handbook of Political Sociology: States, Civil Societies, and Globalization, Cambridge.

EU, Commission of the European Communities 2001: Communication from the Commission on Conflict Prevention, (COM(2001) 211).

EU, Commission of the European Communities 2003: Governance and Development, (COM(2003) 615).

EU, Commission of the European Communities 2006: A Concept for European Community Support for Security Sector Reform, (COM(2006) 253).

EU, Commission of the European Communities 2007: Towards an EU Response to Situations of Fragility. Engaging in Difficult Environments for Sustainable Development, Stability and Peace, (COM(2007) 643).

Everett, Margaret 1997: The Ghost in the Machine: Agency in "Poststructural" Critiques of Development, in: Anthropological Quarterly 70: 3, 137-151.

Fearon, James D./Laitin, David D. 2003: Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War, in: American Political Science Review 97: 1, 75-90.

Finnemore, Martha/Sikkink, Kathryn 1998: International Norm Dynamics and Political Change, in: International Organization 52: 4, 887-917.

Fukuyama, Francis 2005: "Stateness" First, in: Journal of Democracy 16: 1, 84-88.

Gates, Scott/Hegre, Havard/Jones, Mark P./Strand, Harvard 2005: Institutional Inconsistency and Political Instability: Polity Duration, 1800-2000, (PRIO, 11/21/2005).

Gledhill, John 1994: Power and its Disguises. Anthropological Perspectives on Politics, London/ Boulder, CO.

Gleditsch, Kristian S./Ward, Michael D. 1997: Double Take: Reexamining Democracy and Autocracy in Modern Polities, in: Journal of Conflict Resolution 41, 361-383.

Gleditsch, Kristian S./Ward, Michael D. 2000: War and Peace in Space and Time: The Role of Democratization, in: International Studies Quarterly 44: 1, 1-19.

Goldstone, Jack /Bates, Robert H./Gurr, Ted Robert/Lustik, Michael/Marshall, Monty G./Ulfelder, Jay/Woodward, Mark 2005: A Global Forecasting Model of Political Instability. Political Instability Task Force, (American Political Science Association Washington, D.C., September 3, 2005), in: http://globalpolicy.gmu.edu/pitf/PITFglobal.pdf.

Grugel, Jean 2005: The 'International' in Democratization: Norms and the Middle Ground, in: Flockhart, Trine (Ed.): Socializing Democratic Norms. The Role of International Organizations for the Construction of Europe, Houndmills/New York, 23-42.

Grugel, Jean 2007: Democratization and Ideational Diffusion: Europe, Mercosur and Social Citizenship, in: Journal of Common Market Studies 45: 1, 43-68.

Gurr, Ted Robert 1974: Persistence and Change in Political Systems, 1800-1971, in: American Political Science Review 68: 4, 1482-1504.

Habermas, Jürgen 1998: Die postnationale Konstellation und die Zukunft der Demokratie, in: Habermas, Jürgen (Ed.): Die postnationale Konstellation. Politische Essays, Frankfurt am Main, 91-169.

Hakim, Peter/Lowenthal, Abraham 1991: Latin America's Fragile Democracies, in: Journal of Democracy 2: 3, 16-29.

Harrison, Graham 2004: The World Bank and Africa: The Construction of Governance States, London.

Hegre, Havard/Ellingsen, Tanja/Gates, Scott/Gleditsch, Nils Petter 2001: Towards a Democratic Civil Peace? Democracy, Political Change, and Civil War, 1816-1992, in: The American Political Science Review 95: 1, 33-48.

Herbst, Jefferey 1996/97: Responding to State Failure, in: International Security 21: 3, 120-144.

Herbst, Jefferey 2000: States and Power in Africa, Princeton.

Hüllen, Vera van/Stahn, Andreas 2007: Why semi-authoritarian regimes may be more troublesome than autocracies: US and EU strategies of democracy promotion in the

Mediterranean and the Newly Independent States, (Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, 30.09.2007).

Karl, Terry Lynn 1995: The Hybrid Regimes of Central America, in: Journal of Democracy 6: 3, 72-86.

Kemmerzell, Jörg 2009: Ambivalente Universalisierung der Demokratie, Darmstadt.

Krain, Mathew/Myers, Marissa Edson 1997: Democracy and Civil War: A Note on the Democratic Peace Proposition, in: International Interactions 23: 1, 109-118.

Lauth, Hans-Joachim 2002: Regimetypen: Totalitarismus - Autoritarismus - Demokratie, in: Lauth, Hans-Joachim (Ed.): Vergleichende Regierungslehre, Eine Einführung, Wiesbaden, 105-130.

Lekha Sriram, Chandra 2008: Prevention and the Rule of Law: Rhetoric and Reality, in: Hurwitz, Agnès/Huang, Reyko (Eds.): Civil War and the Rule of Law: Security, Development, Human Rights, Boulder/London, 71-90.

Linz, Juan/Stepan, Alfred 1996: Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation. Southern Europe, South Africa, and Post-Communist Europe, Baltimore, London.

Mani, Rama 2008: Exploring the Rule of Law in Theory and Practice, in: Hurwitz, Agnès/Huang, Reyko (Eds.): Civil War and the Rule of Law, Boulder/London, 21-45.

Mansfield, Edward/Snyder, Jack 2004: Electing to Fight: Why Emerging Democracies Go to War, Cambridge, MA/London.

Marshall, Monty G./Goldstone, Jack 2007: Global Report on Conflict, Governance and State Fragility 2007, in: Foreign Policy Bulletin Winter 2007, 3-21.

Marshall, Monty G./Gurr, Ted Robert 2004: Peace and Conflict 2003, College Park, MD.

Merkel, Wolfgang 1999: Systemtransformation, Opladen.

Merkel, Wolfgang/Croissant, Aurel/Puhle, Hans-Jürgen/Eicher, Claudia/Thiery, Peter 2003: Defekte Demokratien. Band 1: Theorie, Opladen.

Merkel, Wolfgang/Puhle, Hans-Jürgen/Croissant, Aurel 2006: Defekte Demokratien. Band 2: Regionalanalysen, Opladen.

Miall, Hugh 2003: Global Governance and Conflict Prevention, in: Cochrane, Faergal/Duffy, Rosaleen/Selby, Jan (Eds.): Global Governance, Conflict and Resistance, Houndmills/ New York, 59-77.

Moose, David 2003: Good Policy is Unimplementable? Reflections on the Ethnography of Aid Policy and Practice, (EIDOS Workshop on "Order and Disjuncture: the Organisation of Aid and Development, SOAS, London, 26-28th September 2003).

Morlino, Leonardo 2008: Hybrid Regimes or Regimes in Transition?, Madrid.

O'Donnell, Guillermo 1993: On the State, Democratization and Some Conceptual Problems: A Latin American View with Glances at Some Postcommunist Countries, in: World Development 21: 98, 1355-1136.

O'Donnell, Guillermo 1996: Illusions about Consolidation, in: Journal of Democracy 7: 2, 34-51.

Rajagopal, Balakrishnan 2008: Invoking the Rule of Law: International Discourses, in: Hurwitz, Agnès/Huang, Reyko (Eds.): Civil War and the Rule of Law: Security, Development, Human Rights, Boulder/London, 49-67.

Risse, Thomas/Lehmkuhl, Ursula 2007: Governance in Räumen begrenzter Staatlichkeit: Anmerkungen zu konzeptionellen Probleme der gegenwärtigen Governace-Diskussion, in: Beisheim, Marianne/Schuppert, Gunnar Folke (Eds.): Staatszerfall und Governance, Baden-Baden, 144-159.

Rosenau, James N. 2005: Governance in the Twenty-first Century, in: Wilkinson, R. (Ed.): The Global Governance Reader, London, New York, 45-67.

Rotberg, Robert I. 2004: The Failure and Collapse of Nation-States: Breakdown, Prevention, and Repair, in: Rotberg, Robert I. (Ed.): When States Fail: Causes and Consequences, Princeton, 1-50.

Rüb, Friedbert W. 2002: Hybride Regime - Politikwissenschaftliches Chamäleon oder neuer Regimetypus? Begriffliche und konzeptionelle Überlegungen zum neuen Pessimismus in der Transitologie, in: Bendel, Petra/Croissant, Aurel/Rüb, Friedbert W. (Eds.): Zwischen Demokratie und Diktatur. Zur Konzeption und Empirie demokratischer Grauzonen, Opladen, 93-118.

Rüb, Friedbert W. 2007: Staatlichkeit, Staatszerfall, "künstliche Staaten" und Staatsbildung. Konzeptionelle Überlegungen zu Problemen und Perspektiven des Staates aus politikwissenschaftlicher Sicht, in: Beisheim, Marianne/Schuppert, Gunnar Folke (Eds.): Staatszerfall und Governance, Baden-Baden, 28-58.

Rustow, Dankwart 1970: Transitions to Democracy: Towards a Dynamic Model, in: Comparative Politics 2: 3, 337-363.

Sambanis, Nicholas 2001: Do Ethnic and Nonethnic Civil Wars Have the Same Causes?, in: Journal of Conflict Resolution 45: 3, 259-282.

Sartori, Giovanni 1992[1987]: Demokratietheorie, Darmstadt.

Schlichte, Klaus 2005: Der Staat in der Weltgesellschaft. Politische Herrschaft in Asien, Afrika und Lateinamerika, Frankfurt; New York.

Schmitter, Philippe C./Brouwer, Imco 1999: Conceptualizing, Researching and Evaluating Democracy Promotion and Protection, San Domenico (FI).

Schmitter, Philippe C./Wagemann, Claudius/Obydenkova, Anastassia 2005: Democratization and State Capacity, (Congreso Internacional del CLAD sobre la Reforma del Estado y la Administración Pública, Santiago, Chile, 18-21 Oct. 2005).

Schneckener, Ulrich 2004: States at Risk - Zur Analyse fragiler Staatlichkeit, in: Schneckener, Ulrich (Ed.): States at Risk. Fragile Staaten als Sicherheits- und Entwicklungsproblem, Berlin, 5-27.

Selby, Jan 2003: Introduction, in: Cochrane, Faergal/Duffy, Rosaleen/Selby, Jan (Eds.): Global Governance, Conflict and Resistance, Houndsmill/ New York, 1-18.

Slaughter, Anne-Marie 2004: Disaggregated Sovereignty: Towards the Public Accountability of Global Government Networks, in: Government and Opposition 39: 2, 159-190.

Snyder, Jack 2000: From Voting to Violence. Democratization and Nationalist Conflict, New York/London.

Soerenson, Georg 2001: War and State-Making. Why Doesn't it Work in the Third World?, in: Security Dialogue 32: 3, 341-354.

Spanger, Hans-Joachim 2002: Die Wiederkehr des Staates. Staatszerfall als wissenschaftliches und entwicklungspolitisches Problem (HSFK-Report), Frankfurt.

Stockmeyer, Albrecht 2006: Governance - aus der Praxis der GTZ, in: Schuppert, Gunnar Folke (Ed.): Governance-Forschung. Vergewisserungen über Stand und Entwicklungslinien, Baden-Baden, 251-274.

Tilly, Charles 1990: Coercion, Capital, and European States, AD 990-1990, Cambridge, Mass.; Oxford.

Tschirgi, Neclâ 2006: Security and Development Policies: Untangling the relationship, Bonn.

USAID 2000: Conducting a DG Assessment: A Framework for Strategy Development, (PN-ACP-338).

USAID 2005a: At Freedom's Frontiers: A Democracy and Governance Strategic Framework, (PD-ACF-999).

USAID 2005b: Conducting a Conflict Assessment: A Framework for Strategy and Program Development.

USAID 2005c: Conflict Mitigation and Management Policy, (PD-ABZ-333).

USAID 2005d: Fragile States Strategy, (PD-ACA-999).

USAID 2006 (revised): USAID Primer: What We Do and How We Do It, in: http://www.usaid.gov/about_usaid/PDACG100.pdf.

USAID 2008: Guide to Rule of Law Country Analysis: The Rule of Law Strategic Framework. A Guide for USAID Democracy and Governance Officers.

USAID/Defense, U.S. Department of/State, U.S. Department of 2009: Security Sector Reform.

Vorrath, Judith/Krebs, Lutz F./Dominic, Senn; 2007: Linking Ethnic Conflict & Democratization. An Assessment of Four Troubled Regions, Zürich.

Whitehead, Laurence 2004: Significant Recent Developments in the Field of Democratization, in: Berg-Schlosser, Dirk (Ed.): Democratization. The State of the Art, WIesbaden, 30-51.

Youngs, Richard 2001: Democracy Promotion: The Case of European Union Strategy.

Youngs, Richard 2007: Fusing Security and Development: Just another Euro-Platitude?

Zimmermann, Lisbeth 2009a: Between Conditionality, Persuasion and Arguing: EU and U.S. Norm Promotion Strategies and Local Reactions in Hybrid Regimes, Darmstadt.

Zimmermann, Lisbeth 2009b: Wann beginnt der (Demokratische) Frieden? Regimewechsel, Instabilitäten, Integration und deren Einfluss auf den Konflikt zwischen Ecuador und Peru, in: Zeitschrift für Internationale Beziehungen 2009/1, 39-74.

Zinecker, Heidrun 2004: Kolumbien und El Salvador im longitudinalen Vergleich - ein kritischer Beitrag zur Transformationsforschung aus historisch-struktureller und handlungstheoretischer Perspektive (Universität Leipzig: Dissertation).

Zinecker, Heidrun 2005: Regime-Hybride und innerstaatlicher demokratischer Frieden, in: Jahn, Egbert/Fischer, Sabine/Astrid, Sahm; (Eds.): Die Zukunft der Friedens 2. Die Friedens- und Konfliktforschung aus der Perspektive der jüngeren Generation, Wiesbaden, 313-336.

Zinecker, Heidrun 2007: Regime-hybridity and Violent Civil Societies in Fragmented Societies - Conceptual Considerations.

Zürn, Michael 1998: Regieren jenseits des Nationalstaats: Globalisierung und Denationalisierung als Chance, Frankfurt am Main.

Zürn, Michael 2002: Zu den Merkmalen postnationaler Politik, in: Jachtenfuchs, Markus/Knodt, Michèle (Eds.): Regieren in internationalen Institutionen, Opladen, 215-234.

Zürn, Michael/Leibfried, Stephan 2006: Transformationen des Staates, Frankfurt/Main.

Annex 1

Table 3: Analyzed papers by USAID and the European Commission (Policies and Strategies: black; handbooks and guidelines: blue)

Year	USAID	European Commission
2009	*With U.S. Department of Defense and U.S. Department of State:* Security Sector Reform	
2008	Guide to Rule of Law Country Analysis: The Rule of Law Strategic Framework. A Guide for USAID Democracy and Governance Officers	
2007		Towards an EU Response to Situations of Fragility - Engaging in Difficult Environments for Sustainable Development, Stability and Peace -
2006	USAID Primer. What We Do and How We Do It	A Concept for European Community Support for Security Sector Reform
2005	At Freedom's Frontiers. A Democracy and Governance Strategic Framework	European Consensus on Development
	Conflict Mitigation and Management Policy	
	Conducting a Conflict Assessment. A Framework for Strategy and Program Development	
	Fragile States Strategy	
2003		European Security Strategy (European Council)
		Handbook on Promoting Good Governance in EC Development and Co-operation
		Governance and Development
2001		Conflict Prevention
2000	Conductiong a DG Assessment: A Framework for Strategy Development	