

# A NEW GENERATION OF DEMOCRACY PROMOTERS?:

EASTERN EU APPROACHES TO SUPPORTING  
DEMOCRATIZATION ABROAD

BY TSVETA PETROVA  
HARVARD UNIVERSITY



EURASIA PROGRAM  
WORKING PAPER SERIES  
**2012-01**

*Funded by the Department of State, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, Office of Outreach Title VIII Program  
for Research and Training on Eastern Europe and Eurasia (Independent States of the Former Soviet Union)*

**A New Generation of Democracy Promoters?:  
Eastern EU Approaches to Supporting Democratization Abroad**

*Tsveta Petrova*  
*Harvard University*  
Davis Center for Russian and Eurasian Studies  
1730 Cambridge St  
Cambridge, MA 02139  
tsveta\_petrova@mac.com  
(607) 351 – 6016

*Paper Prepared for the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association,  
September 1-4, 2011, Seattle, WA*

## **A New Generation of Democracy Promoters?: Eastern EU Approaches to Supporting Democratization Abroad**

Especially since the end of the Cold War, supporting the diffusion of democratic norms and practices has become an important element of the work of many actors in international affairs.<sup>1</sup> This trend has been reflected in the growing body of works on democracy promotion and in the increasing attention the literature on comparative democratization has paid to the role played by external actors in regime change and consolidation.<sup>2</sup> Most of these studies, however, have focused on the democracy support activities of a few Western countries. Yet, while their enthusiasm for such work began to wane in the early and mid-2000s, some of the newest democracies and former recipients of Western democracy assistance – the Eastern European members of the European Union (EU) – have increasingly supported democratization abroad.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, some of these countries have not only become key democracy promotion players in their neighborhood but have also already made some difference there by helping secure some democratization gains in the post-communist space.

Therefore, this paper asks: How are the Eastern EU countries supporting democracy abroad and what factors shape their approaches to democracy promotion? How are the strategies they use different from the ones used by Western donors? The Western approaches to supporting democracy abroad have been criticized by both recipients, including post-communist ones, and Western policy communities.<sup>4</sup> Thus, the activism of and the potential demonstrated by the Eastern EU democracy promoters beg an investigation into their democracy promotion approaches. Although previously overlooked, these countries are an important category of donors to study because their recent transitions give them first-hand experience with democratization and credibility with recipients as well as valuable expertise that other donors do not have. In addition, as former recipients of democracy support and now democracy promoters themselves, these countries have experience with both sides of the donor process.<sup>5</sup> They also have had the opportunity to learn from the successes and mistakes of a number of Western donors offering very different types of democracy support.

This paper finds that the Eastern EU donors tend to export reform best practices from their own recent transitions but out of all such practices, they seek to share those

---

<sup>1</sup> Larry Diamond, *Promoting Democracy in the 1990s: Actors and Instruments, Issues and Imperatives* (New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York, 1995) and Peter Burnell, ed., *Democracy Assistance: International Cooperation for Democratization* (London: Frank Cass, 2000).

<sup>2</sup> On the first trend, Hassan and Ralph, "Democracy Promotion and Human Rights in US Foreign Policy" *International Journal of Human Rights* 15. 4 (2011): 509-519 and Cardwell, "Mapping Out Democracy Promotion in the EU's External Relations" *European Foreign Affairs Review* 16.1 (2011): 21-40.

; On the second trend, Laurence Whitehead, *The International Dimensions of Democratization: Europe and the Americas* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996) and Jan Zielonka, *Democratic Consolidation in Eastern Europe*. Vol. 2 of *Oxford Studies in Democratization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

<sup>3</sup> Laurynas Jonavicius, "The Democracy Promotion Policies of Central and Eastern European States." Working paper, Fundación para las Relaciones Internacionales y el Diálogo Exterior, 2008.

<sup>4</sup> Thomas Carothers, *Aiding Democracy Abroad* (Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1999).

<sup>5</sup> Jacek Kucharczyk and Jeff Lovitt, eds. *Democracy's New Champions: European Democracy Assistance after EU Enlargement* (Prague: PASOS, 2008).

that they understand to fit the recipient's democratization needs, that is to most effectively advance the recipient's transition. Therefore, because they are borrowing from their own transition experience, the Eastern EU democracy promoters have distinctively national approaches to supporting democratization abroad. In that, they are similar to Western donors, whose approaches are also said to have a certain national character since they are mostly based on an export of each Western donor's domestic institutions. However, in contrast to the Western one-size-fits-all and institution-centric approaches, the Eastern European approaches to democracy promotion vary according to the regime type of the recipient and pay more attention to the process of democratization. Therefore, although they are young donors, the Eastern EU countries represent a new generation of democracy promoters that have gotten around some of the mistakes for which Western donors have been criticized.

This paper builds on the existing literature on Western democracy export to define two theoretical approaches to studying a donor's democracy promotion strategy and then uses them to examine the activities of the Eastern EU states. While most existing studies on the external factors in the process of democratization have focused on global players such as the US and the EU, this study sheds light on the activities of little-studied, non-Western, regional actors. Therefore, this paper contributes both theoretically and empirically to previous works on the role of external actors in the process of democratization and on the foreign policy of democracy promotion. Moreover, this study is one of the first to explore of the poorly understood transformation of certain "norm-takers" into "norm-makers:" there has been much work on the diffusion of Western and especially EU liberal norms and practices into Eastern Europe<sup>6</sup> but little attention has been paid to these countries as transmitters of liberal ideas; yet, understanding their democracy promotion approaches and how they compare to Western ones is crucial for understanding how democracy is "translated" and diffused at the regional level and consequently, for understanding the future and the form of the liberal international order, now reinforced and propagated through the efforts of regional actors such as the Eastern European new democracies.

#### NEW DEMOCRACIES AS DEMOCRACY EXPORTERS

Following the third wave of democratization and especially the end of the Cold War, a number of new democracies set out to not only "observe the principles of democracy and human rights at home, but also to propagate them elsewhere."<sup>7</sup> The advocates of such democracy promotion were some of the same civic and political elites who organized the democratic transitions in the second and third worlds as well as their Western allies who provided them with moral, political, financial, and technical help on the road to democracy and who encouraged and supported their transitions from recipients to suppliers of democracy support.<sup>8</sup> As a result of the efforts of such norm

---

<sup>6</sup> Milada Vachudova, *Europe Undivided: Democracy, Leverage, and Integration After Communism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005) and Geoffrey Pridham, *Designing Democracy: EU Enlargement and Regime Change in Post-Communist Europe* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005).

<sup>7</sup> Włodzimierz Cimoszewicz, Information of the Government of the Republic of Poland, Warsaw, January 22, 2003.

<sup>8</sup> Brookings Institution, *The Foreign Policies of Emerging-Market Democracies: What Role for Human Rights and Democracy?* The Brookings Institution, Washington DC, April 14-15, 2011.

entrepreneurs, 106 countries gathered together in Warsaw, Poland in 2000 to discuss a “common interest” in advancing an “international community of democracies.”<sup>9</sup> Fourteen out of the seventeen members of the convening group of the so-called Community of Democracies were new democracies, born after the third wave of democratization.

Such new democracies supporting democratization abroad have been most active at the regional level. They have worked to create formal and informal regional democracy promotion regimes through forums such as the Organization of American States, the Rio Group, Mercosur, the Union of South American Nations, the African Union, the Southern African Development Community, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, the European Union, the Council of Europe, and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.<sup>10</sup> Not only have these regimes been “homegrown projects” rather than Western imports<sup>11</sup> but they have also already proven their usefulness on a number of occasions. The African Union, for example, has suspended all government that came to power unconstitutionally and has put pressure on them to return to constitutional order.<sup>12</sup> And another example: since 1990, Latin American states have been involved in forty-four democratic crises and in forty-one of them, American states have made some effort to help protect democracy, either individually or through multilateral forums,<sup>13</sup> sometimes playing a role in reversing or deterring deterioration of democracy.<sup>14</sup>

In addition to leveraging their membership in regional international organizations to initiate and back multilateral democracy promotion efforts, a number of new democracies have also used “quiet diplomacy” to prevent democratic backsliding and breakdowns and to provide political and moral support to neighboring pro-democratic forces. Brazil, for example, played an important role – both bilaterally and multilaterally – in the democratic stabilization of Paraguay in 1996, Venezuela in 2002, Haiti in 2004, Honduras in 2009, and Bolivia throughout the 2000s, following democratic crises in these countries.<sup>15</sup> South Africa, too, pressured leaders in several African countries to leave

---

<sup>9</sup> Peter Schraeder, ed., *Exporting Democracy: Rhetoric vs. Reality* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2002): 1

<sup>10</sup> Most notably, since the early 1990s, both the Organization of American States and the African Union have made democracy promotion an explicit goal, institutionalized strong anti-coup norms and sanctions for violators, and adopted democratic charters encouraging their members to uphold a range of liberal norms (Legler and Tiekou, What difference can a path make? Regional democracy promotion regimes in the Americas and Africa, *Democratization* 17. 3 (2010): 465–491.). In more institutional terms, the Organization of American States, for instance, has a special Unit for the Promotion of Democracy while the African Union has set up an African Peer Review Mechanism, which allows members to review each other’s governance records and share best practices. In 2008, ASEAN too established an Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights and passed a charter committing participating countries to upholding and promoting democracy, human rights, and good governance but agreed on no sanctions for charter violations (Petcharamesree. *The Human Rights Body: A Test for Democracy Building in ASEAN*, Stockholm Sweden: International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, 2009).

<sup>11</sup> Legler and Tiekou, What difference can a path make? 468.

<sup>12</sup> McGowan, Coups and Conflict in West Africa, 1955–2004, *Armed Forces & Society*, 32.2 (2006).

<sup>13</sup> McCoy, International Response to Democratic Crisis in the Americas, 1990–2005. *Democratization* 13.5 (2006): 756–75.

<sup>14</sup> Arcenaux and Pion-Berlin, Issues, Threats, and Institutions: Explaining OAS Responses to Democratic Dilemmas in Latin America, *Latin American Politics & Society* 49.2 (2007): 1–31 and Boniface, “The OAS’s Mixed Record,” in Legler, Lean, and Boniface, eds., *Promoting Democracy in the Americas* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007): 40–62.

<sup>15</sup> McCoy, International Response to Democratic Crisis in the Americas.

office once their terms expired, criticized human rights violations in Nigeria in the mid-1990s, intervened militarily in Lesotho after a coup attempt there in 1998, and played an active role in preventing a coup in Equatorial Guinea and in reversing one in Sao Tome and Principe.<sup>16</sup> And in Asia, Indonesia, for instance, has been at the forefront of the international efforts to put pressure on Myanmar to move toward democratic governance and has further worked to convince Laos and North Korea to implement political liberalization reforms.<sup>17</sup>

Finally, in addition to providing diplomatic democracy support, a number of new democracies have also been offering democracy aid. Some countries, such as South Africa, for instance, have channeled some democracy assistance through their development aid programs – the African Renaissance and International Cooperation Fund was established in 2001 and tasked with “the promotion of democracy [and] good governance” among other development objectives.<sup>18</sup> Similarly, South Korea provides some good governance assistance through its development aid agency, the Korean International Cooperation Agency.<sup>19</sup> Other countries, such as Indonesia, have set up a specialized democracy aid agency: the Institute for Peace and Democracy was created in 2008 as the assistance and implementation arm of the high-level Bali Democratic Forum; it has provided technical assistance related to elections and party development, effective parliaments, independent judiciaries, rule of law human rights and press freedom, among other topics.<sup>20</sup> In addition, many new democracies have further been providing technical assistance through various governmental and quasi-governmental institutions. The Mexican Federal Electoral Institute, for example, has since its founding in 1990 been involved in eighty-seven electoral observation missions in twenty-four countries across the globe and in sixty-one technical assistance missions in thirty-one countries in the Americas, Africa, Asia, and the Middle East.<sup>21</sup> The South Korean Democracy Foundation, set up in 2001 by the Korean parliament, has through its international cooperation programs provided support to pro-democratic networks on Myanmar and North Korea.<sup>22</sup> And a final example: since the mid-2000s, Nigeria’s Head of Civil Service office has been sharing best good governance and civil service reform practices with other West African states.<sup>23</sup>

It should be noted, however, that the capacity of these countries to provide democracy assistance is underdeveloped and the resources devoted to it – still rather modest. Moreover, much like Western support for democracy abroad,<sup>24</sup> the democracy promotion commitments of new democracies have been often been inconsistent, ad hoc, and of low priority. Moreover, their efforts are most frequently limited to concern for the

---

<sup>16</sup> Carothers and Youngs, *Looking for Help: Will Rising Democracies Become International Democracy Supporters?* Carnegie Endowment of International Peace, 2011.

<sup>17</sup> Brookings Institution, *The Foreign Policies of Emerging-Market Democracies*.

<sup>18</sup> Braude et al, *Emerging Donors in International Development Assistance: The South Africa Case*, The South African Institute of International Affairs, 2008.

<sup>19</sup> <http://www.koica.go.kr/english/main.html>

<sup>20</sup> <http://peace.unud.ac.id/eng/>

<sup>21</sup> <http://www.ife.org.mx/portal/site/ifev2>

<sup>22</sup> Interview with A. H., August 12, 2010. Another such Asian agency with an even stronger democracy promotion mission is the Taiwan Foundation for Democracy.

<sup>23</sup> Adegoroye, *Public Service Reform for Sustainable Development: The Nigerian Experience*. The Commonwealth Advanced Seminar, Wellington, New Zealand, 20th Feb. – 3rd March, 2006.

<sup>24</sup> Schraeder, ed., *Exporting Democracy*.

democracy and human rights record of a handful of their neighbors. Perhaps even more important is the fact that they are often hesitant to publicly confronting antidemocratic practices and are often reluctant to publicly embrace a democracy and human rights agenda.<sup>25</sup> However, they are not just wary of undermining bilateral relationships but also generally skeptical of the effectiveness of naming and shaming and isolating authoritarian regimes and prefer instead multilateral involvement and behind-the-scenes bilateral engagement on political reform.<sup>26</sup>

Still, despite these limits and limitations of the democracy promotion efforts of these new democracies, it would be a mistake to overlook their activism. Because it has been influencing and will continue to increasingly influence the diffusion of democracy around the globe, examining their democracy promotion initiatives would allow students of comparative democratization to better understand the role of regional actors in the process of democratization. Moreover, studying their activism would further contribute to a better understanding of the poorly researched transformation of certain “norm-takers” into “norm-makers.” And finally, it would begin exploring the work of a new generation of democracy promoters, whose recent transitions give them first-hand experience with democratization and therefore credibility with recipients as well as valuable expertise that other donors do not have.

Accordingly, this paper sets out to investigate the democracy promotion approaches of some of the most active new democracies exporting democracy abroad - the Eastern European members of the EU.

#### THEORIZING THE APPROACHES TO DEMOCRACY PROMOTION

I define democracy promotion as purposeful actions meant to encourage a transition to democracy or to enhance the quality of regimes that have already moved towards democratic government.<sup>27</sup> Democracy promotion can be pursued through four types of policy instruments: diplomacy, foreign aid, political conditionality, and intervention.<sup>28</sup> Moreover, democracy promotion efforts have tended to include three

---

<sup>25</sup> Carothers and Youngs, Looking for Help.

<sup>26</sup> Frohmann, “Regional Initiatives for Peace and Democracy: The Collective Diplomacy of the Rio Group,” in Kaysen, Pastor, and Reed, eds., *Collective Responses to Regional Problems: The Case of Latin America and the Caribbean* (Cambridge: American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1994): 129-41.

<sup>27</sup> In recent years, the term “democracy promotion” has acquired a somewhat negative connotation. Some have expressed concern that “democracy promotion” implies that democracy can and should be advanced by external actors. Interview with P. D., November 26, 2008. However, I use the term “democracy promotion” with the acknowledgement that “*the primary force for democratization is and must be internal to the country in question.*” (Quote by Burnell.) Moreover, I use democracy promotion interchangeably with support for democracy or democratization abroad and with democracy import/export. The latter terms have also been criticized as implying a mechanistic transplantation of a set of political institutions. However, I use them to indicate the adoption/transmission of a diffusion item without loading these terms with any information about the degree of adaptation of such diffusion items. Lastly, even though the concept of donor has traditionally been used to indicate supplier of development aid, I use it interchangeably with democracy promoter, which I understand to focus specifically on support for democracy and to use other instruments in addition to aid.

<sup>28</sup> After Peter Schraeder, ed., *Exporting Democracy: Rhetoric vs. Reality* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2002).

general categories of initiatives, targeting different sectors of the domestic political order of the recipient:<sup>29</sup> political process, governing institutions, and civil society.

Existing works on Western export of democracy have mostly shied away from articulating competing theoretical propositions about the place of democracy promotion in the foreign-policy process, including donor approaches to supporting democracy abroad.<sup>30</sup> In fact, most of the previous discussions about Western approaches to democracy promotion have been largely inductive. Still, such accounts have produced four important sets of generalizations.

The first generalization is about the impact of the motivations for supporting democracy abroad on the approaches to doing so. Some have found that the democracy promotion approach of each donor reflects the overall character and purpose of the donor's foreign policy. For example, it has been argued that in the pursuit of security interests abroad, the US has focused on political liberalization; Germany has been pursuing economic interests abroad, so its focus has been on good governance; and the Nordic donors have emphasized social liberalization because of their foreign policy attention to humanitarian questions.<sup>31</sup> Similarly, others find that the US promotes a formal electoral model of democracy that dissociates politics from its socio-economic underpinnings, because it advances American economic interests abroad.<sup>32</sup> And a final example: it has been claimed that because key EU members remain wary of unpredictable and rapid political change driven by non-state actors in the Mediterranean, the EU has shied away from assisting political contestation and the full range of civil society organizations in the region.<sup>33</sup>

The second generalization is about the ways in which the donor's domestic values and institutions have shaped its democracy promotion approach. It has been frequently argued that there are distinct national approaches to supporting democracy abroad that are based on the domestic models of democracy of each donor. For instance, the EU is found to emphasize core European democratic values<sup>34</sup> while the aims of American democracy promotion are argued to have changed with the evolution of US democracy.<sup>35</sup> Moreover, it has been pointed out that each national approach centers on a set list of institutions that each donor believes are the constituent elements of democracy at home. "The items on the list are set forward as desired endpoints. Aid providers assess recipient countries in terms of how their major socio-political institutions compare to these endpoints. Aid

---

<sup>29</sup> After Carothers, Thomas. "Taking Stock of US Democracy Assistance," in Michael Cox, G. John Ikenberry, and Takashi Inoguchi, eds., *American Democracy Promotion: Impulses, Strategies, and Impacts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 181–99.

<sup>30</sup> Criticism by Peter Burnell and Peter Calvert, "Promoting Democracy Abroad," *Democratization* 12. 4 (2005): 433–38.

<sup>31</sup> Schraeder. See also Steven Hook, *National Interest and Foreign Aid* (Boulder, CO; London: Lynne Rienner, 1995).

<sup>32</sup> Steve Smith, "US Democracy Promotion: Critical Questions," in Cox, Ikenberry, and Inoguchi.

<sup>33</sup> Michelle Pace, "Paradoxes and Contradictions in EU Democracy Promotion in the Mediterranean: the Limits of EU Normative Power." *Democratization*. 16.1 (2009): 39-58.

<sup>34</sup> Richard Youngs, "Democracy Promotion: The Case of the European Union Strategy," CEPS Working Document # 167, October 2001 and Tanja Borzel and Thomas Risse, "One Size Fits All! EU Policies for the Promotion of Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law," Paper prepared for the Workshop on Democracy Promotion, Stanford University, 2004.

<sup>35</sup> Nau, Henry. "America's Identity, Democracy Promotion and National Interests: Beyond Realism, Beyond Idealism," in Cox, Ikenberry, and Inoguchi.



programmes are then designed to address the gaps between the idealized endpoints and the actual state of the correspondent institutions and processes in the recipient countries.”<sup>36</sup> As a result, many donors have been criticized for following such cultural scripts, which have produced one-size-fits-all and institution-centric assistance.<sup>37</sup>

The third generalization is about the role of learning and formative experiences in influencing a donor’s democracy promotion approach. For example, some have found that the American democracy promotion approach is a consequence of America’s image of its own success.<sup>38</sup> Others have argued that the democracy promotion strategy followed by the EU developed through an incremental process of “learning by doing” rather than a great master plan.<sup>39</sup> Yet others have maintained that the interpretation of the democratic revolutions in Eastern Europe in 1989, marking the beginning of the post-Cold War era, have shaped the EU’s and the US’ democracy promotion approaches. The US, which used to favor “controlled” transitions in the 1980s in order to guard against radical civil society movements assuming too much influence,<sup>40</sup> shifted its priority in the 1990s to supporting civil society because the US interpretation of 1989 is one of civil society opting for democratic government, overthrowing dictators, and rolling back the state to make room for a market economy. For most European countries, however, the 1989 revolutions were merely the prologue to creating stable institutions of democratic representation in Eastern Europe; accordingly, many European donors have concentrated on strengthening good governance and state capacity.<sup>41</sup> However, the post-WWII reconstruction in Germany and Japan has also been offered as alternative formative experience shaping US thinking about promoting democracy abroad.<sup>42</sup>

There are also those who point to a convergence among different actors as a result of their learning from each other. For instance, it has been noted that taking a page from the Nordic donors, Germany and the US have significantly strengthened their assistance to civil societies in developing countries.”<sup>43</sup> Another example, the US and European aid to the Middle East and North Africa after 9/11 have significantly converged in response to both the changed political realities in the region and to the experience of the other donor. Finally, such “best practices” convergences have perhaps produced over time an international normative consensus about the centrality of certain values and practices – for example, human rights, civil society, and elections – to an universal conception of democracy and thus an international democracy promotion script.<sup>44</sup>

The fourth generalization is about the impact of the identity or “actor-ship” of a donor on its democracy promotion approach. For example, the EU’s preference for

---

<sup>36</sup> Thomas Carothers, "Democracy Assistance: the Question of Strategy." *Democratization*. 4.3 (1997): 109-132.

<sup>37</sup> Philippe Schmitter and Imco Brower, “Conceptualizing, Researching and Evaluating Democracy Promotion and Protection,” EUI Working Paper SPS No. 99/9, European University Institute, 1999.

<sup>38</sup> Jason Ralph, “‘High Stakes’ and ‘Low Intensity Democracy’: Understanding America’s Policy of Promoting Democracy,” in Cox, Ikenberry, and Inoguchi and Michael McFaul, Amichai Magen, and Thomas Risse, *American versus European Approaches* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).

<sup>39</sup> Borzel and Risse.

<sup>40</sup> Youngs.

<sup>41</sup> Jeffrey Kopstein, “The Transatlantic Divide over Democracy Promotion,” *The Washington Quarterly* 29:2 (2006) 85–98.

<sup>42</sup> McFaul, Magen, and Risse.

<sup>43</sup> Schraeder, 243.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*

standardizing its democracy promotion policies has been linked to the Union's attempt to enhance its international legitimacy and credibility as a "normative" power.<sup>45</sup> Middle powers are thought to be carving out an international niche by focusing aid on humanitarian causes.<sup>46</sup> Similarly, differences in American and European attitudes towards multilateral tools for democracy promotion and cooperative/ coercive methods have been attributed to the fact that the former is a global hegemon, whereas the latter is a regional hegemon.<sup>47</sup>

In other words, there are three levels of factors influencing donors' democracy promotion approaches and their divergence / convergence: the recipient's democratization needs, and the values and experiences of individual donors, and the emergence of an international consensus about supporting democratization abroad. Moreover, given the emphasis in the existing literature on best practices and efficiency on the one hand and on cultural scripts and donor identity on the other hand, perhaps a useful way to theorize the importance of these factors is to study them in the context of the rational choice and the culturalist traditions in comparative politics.<sup>48</sup> The former models socio-political actions as choices made because they are the most efficient means to particular ends; the latter models socio-political actions as following normative rules that associate particular identities with particular practices and institutions.

#### HYPOTHESES

Following the rational choice tradition, one might expect that the democracy promotion approach of a donor tends to reflect its understanding of the most effective/efficient way to democratize the recipient. Such calculations could be based on the recipient's democratization needs or on the donor's needs vis-à-vis the recipient's democratization. Donors tailoring their assistance to the democratization needs of recipients might be expected to customize their approach depending on the donor's understanding of the success of democracy/democratization at home or on the donor's understanding of its accomplishments as a democracy promoter. Accordingly, *there would be similarities among the democracy promotion approaches of different donors working in the same recipient because of its particular democratization needs; the divergence in these approaches would likely be around each donor's democratization and/or democracy promotion experience that inform its effectiveness calculations.* Moreover, the democracy promotion approach of a donor might further/instead be expected to be optimized according to the expected benefits of the recipient's democratization for the donor's foreign policy. In view of that, *there would be similarities among a donor's democracy promotion approaches towards recipients that represent a similar type of partner (security, economic, etc) as well as little evolution of the donor's approach towards each type of partner-recipient over time.*

Following the culturalist tradition, one might expect that in supporting democracy abroad, donors tend to follow cultural scripts. To the extent that democracy is "widely regarded as an ideal system of government [...with] near-universal appeal among people

---

<sup>45</sup> McFaul, Magen, and Risse.

<sup>46</sup> Schraeder.

<sup>47</sup> McFaul, Magen, and Risse.

<sup>48</sup> On these traditions, see, for example, Mark Lichbach and Alan Zuckerman, *Comparative Politics: Rationality, Culture and Structure*, Cambridge University Press, 2002.

of every ethnic group, every religion, and every region of the world,”<sup>49</sup> democracy promotion is understood by already democratic countries as an accepted and necessary component of international behavior. Although there is no universally recognized democracy or democracy promotion blueprint, there is something of an international consensus about both. Moreover, donors might further/instead draw inspiration from their domestic experiences, which inform a recognized and legitimate meaning of democracy. Accordingly, *there would be variance in the approaches of different donors but not in the different recipients of the same donor and not even between support for a particular recipient over the short term; the convergence of the democracy promotion approaches of different donors would most likely be around the emerging contours of international democracy promotion agreement.*

It should be noted that these two types of accounts are not necessarily strictly competing. It should be also noted that both these types of accounts acknowledge the significance of domestic experiences (history, norms, and/or institutions) in shaping a donor’s democracy promotion approach. Thus, neither account ignores the important role of ideas and identity in influencing political action. Still, it should be recognized that these two approaches produce very different policies of support for democratization abroad. Therefore, defining the logic behind a democracy promotion approach is important not only for theoretical reasons but also because of the divergent practices of democracy promotion these logic imply and the different patterns of convergence and divergence among different donors.

#### STUDYING THE EASTERN EUROPEAN APPROACHES TO DEMOCRACY PROMOTION

So what is the logic behind the Eastern EU approaches to supporting democracy abroad – a rational choice or a culturalist logic? To answer this question, I follow the consensus in the field on the importance of detailed scrutiny of individual cases.<sup>50</sup> I conduct two sets of paired comparisons: one holding the recipient constant but varying the donor country and the other one – holding the donor constant but varying the recipient context.<sup>51</sup> I compare Poland’s bilateral and multilateral involvement in Ukraine and Belarus to Slovakia’s engagement in these countries. These donors and recipients were selected to maximize the variation on the three factors understood to influence the democracy promotion approach of a donor: the recipient’s democratization needs, the values and experiences of the donor, and the development of an international consensus about supporting democratization abroad.

On the recipient side of the paired comparisons, Ukraine and Belarus have the most comparable geopolitical locations and historical-political development while also being priority recipients for a number of Eastern EU democracy promoters and featuring different regime types and therefore democratization needs. Ukraine has been a hybrid regime with democratic prospects, whereas Belarus – an autocracy.

---

<sup>49</sup> McFaul.

<sup>50</sup> Steven Hook, “Building Democracy Through Foreign Aid: The Limitations of United States Political Conditionalities, 1992–96,” *Democratization* 5, no. 3 (1998): 156–80.

<sup>51</sup> Paired comparisons are an intermediate step between a single case study that suggests general relations and a multi-case analysis that tests or refines a theory. On paired comparisons, see Sidney Tarrow, “The Strategy of Paired Comparisons: Towards a Theory of Practice,” *Comparative Political Studies* 43. 2 (2010): 230–59.

On the donor side, there have been two waves of democratization among the Eastern EU states. In the first wave (1989-1991), a number of countries overthrew communism; in the second wave (1996-98) – pro-democratic forces in countries residing in the gray zone between dictatorship and democracy triumphed over their illiberal post-communist rulers.<sup>52</sup> Thus, each wave faced specific democratization challenges and overcame them with particular democratization innovations. Since those innovations and/or the democratic institutions that built on them could be the foundations of certain democracy promotion scripts, this paper focuses on Poland, which was the leader of the first wave of democratization in Eastern Europe and on Slovakia, which was the front-runner in the second democratization wave in the post-communist space.

Additionally, having cases from two consecutive waves of recipient-to-donor transformations is also important since the emerging contours of an international consensus about democracy promotion developed over the course of the 1990s.<sup>53</sup> Thus, the Polish democracy promotion tradition was established mostly before while Slovakia's - mostly after such a consensus developed.

At the same time, Poland and Slovakia have different motivations for supporting democracy abroad.<sup>54</sup> In Poland, democracy promotion became an element of a geo-political security strategy to create reliable partners in the country's eastern neighborhood and (thus) to deter Russian aggression. In Slovakia, democracy promotion became the solution to the economic and political destabilization of the neighboring former Yugoslav and Soviet republics.

It should be mentioned that Ukraine and Belarus are a foreign-policy priority for both Poland and Slovakia. The Polish, (Lithuanian), Ukrainian, and Belarusian people had for centuries lived under a common sovereign and later in shared subjugation to the Russian, German, and Austro-Hungarian empires. Poland regained independence in the early 20th century but the Ukrainian and Belarusian nations were included in the USSR. And when it dissolved, these republics became direct Polish neighbors and an important vector in Warsaw's foreign policy.<sup>55</sup> Although Slovakia and Ukraine also became immediate neighbors after the USSR collapsed, these countries (at least initially) played a fairly minor role in each other's foreign policy.<sup>56</sup> However, after the democratic breakthrough in Slovakia in 1998, Bratislava recognized the need to "support the building of Ukraine as a politically and economically stable and prosperous country with transparent market economy and advanced democracy."<sup>57</sup> Thus, Ukraine emerged as a priority in Slovakia's post-EU accession foreign policy. Belarus became another such priority. Although, Slovakia shares no common border with Belarus and Bratislava's relations with Belarus were weak throughout the 1990s, Slovakia has recognized that as the last dictatorship in Europe, Belarus has become a problem immediate neighbor of and

---

<sup>52</sup> Valerie Bunce, Michael McFaul, and Kathryn Stoner-Weiss, *Democracy and Authoritarianism in the Postcommunist World* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

<sup>53</sup> McFaul.

<sup>54</sup> Jonavicius.

<sup>55</sup> Timothy Snyder, *The Reconstruction of Nations: Poland, Ukraine, Lithuania, Belarus, 1569–1999* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003).

<sup>56</sup> Juraj Marusiak et al., "The Foreign Policy and National Security of the Slovak Republic," in *Slovakia 2004: Global Report on the State of Society* (Bratislava: Institute for Public Affairs, 2004).

<sup>57</sup> Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Slovak Republic, *The Main Aims and Interests of Slovakia in Relations with Ukraine* (Bratislava, 2001).

a priority for the EU and therefore for Slovakia, which is now one of the Union's eastern-border members.<sup>58</sup> Still, for historic and geopolitical reasons, Slovakia's engagement in Ukraine and Belarus has been less involved than Poland's.

It should also be noted that this paper focuses on democracy promotion by the Polish and Slovak state. While a number of Polish and Slovak civic organizations have supported democratization abroad, their efforts are embedded in the foreign policy framework of their states and are further usually "in sync" with official democracy promotion.<sup>59</sup> Such civic democracy champions not only advise on the strategy but also participate in the implementation of official democracy promotion by realizing projects through the Polish and Slovak development assistance systems. In addition, according to such activists as well as knowledgeable observers, both civic and governmental democracy promoters are guided by the same national values and experiences.<sup>60</sup> However, since the Eastern EU states have more policy instruments and resources to more fully implement this shared democracy promotion vision, they are prioritized as the objects of this study. Accordingly, this paper examines Polish and Slovak democracy support since these states experienced a democratic breakthrough. The study covers the first twenty years of Polish democracy promotion (1989-2009) and the first ten years of Slovak democracy promotion (1999-2009).

#### THE LOGIC BEHIND THE EASTERN EUROPEAN APPROACHES TO DEMOCRACY PROMOTION

Have the Polish and the Slovak democracy promotion approaches been informed by the effectiveness of particular institutions, processes, and policy instruments, following rational choice predictions, or by institutions, processes, and policy instruments legitimated by practice at home or by the consensus of the international community, thus following culturalist predictions? Poland's Minister of Foreign Affairs from 2007 to present, Radoslaw Sikorski, succinctly summarizes Warsaw's strategy: "We live in a free, sovereign and democratic Poland. We are members of the European Union and NATO. All of us, therefore, have reason to feel satisfied and secure. No one gave this to us. We alone – though with the help of our friends – achieved this. Having done so, Poland [...] has become the standard and model of transformation for our Eastern neighbors."<sup>61</sup> In other words, the Polish approach to democracy promotion is best understood as an export of Poland's democratization and Euro-Atlantic integration experience. However, it is not that these experiences are part of an international script or informed by a legitimate understanding of democratization. Rather, as the quote above illustrates, this export is offered to others because democratization "worked so well" for Poland in creating security and prosperity in the country.<sup>62</sup> Polish democracy promotion is thus based on a strategic calculation about the effectiveness of the Polish experience and therefore its "usefulness" to others. As the promotional materials of the Polish foreign ministry further explain, "Poland has a lot to offer to its closer and further

---

<sup>58</sup> Interview with J.M., November 26, 2008.

<sup>59</sup> Interview with P.K., November 8, 2008.

<sup>60</sup> Interview with P.K., November 8, 2008 and interview with P.D., November 26, 2008.

<sup>61</sup> Radoslaw Sikorski, "On the Republic of Poland's Foreign Policy for 2008," Address to the Polish Parliament, Warsaw, February 17, 2008.

<sup>62</sup> Interview with M.M., October 17, 2008 and interview with G.B., October 24, 2008.

neighbors. This includes, above all, experiences from its successful political transformation, which are extremely useful for the countries of our region.”<sup>63</sup>

Similarly, Slovakia’s Minister of Foreign Affairs from 1998 to 2006, like many other Slovak politicians, takes pride in Slovakia’s transition successes: “It is not a long time ago when Slovakia by its own mistakes put itself into a position of isolation. Only recently we had to face demarches and we were considered the enfant terrible of Central Europe. [...] Today nobody questions that Slovakia is one of the most dynamically developing, democratic, stable, and pro-reform countries on the continent.”<sup>64</sup> Moreover, this Slovak experience is considered by Slovak elites “not an improbable role model” and even an “inspiration” for other post-communist hybrid regimes,<sup>65</sup> precisely because of the success of the Slovak transition and of “how fast Slovakia achieved European integration after having to catch up” with the other Eastern European applicants to the EU and NATO.<sup>66</sup> In other words, rather than informing a normatively scripted or appropriate route to democracy, the sharing of Slovakia’s transition experience is understood as “the means with which to practically achieve and more effectively implement this [Slovak foreign policy] interest [of supporting the democratization of the European neighborhood].”<sup>67</sup>

In sum, when explaining their strategies for supporting democratization abroad, Polish and Slovak diplomats and the written documents produced by them emphasize the performance of their national transitions to market democracy and the resultant stability, prosperity, and peace. Thus, two factors are suggested to have shaped the Polish and Slovak approaches – the national democratization experiences of each donor and its calculations about their effectiveness in constructing thriving and democratic society (at home and abroad). If the democracy promotion rhetoric of the Polish and Slovak diplomats indicates that they are driven by a rational choice logic, based on their understanding of the success of their transitions and of the recipient’s democratization ambitions, what do Warsaw’s and Bratislava’s actions suggest? If their approaches are grounded in their own transition experiences, are there distinctively national features of their approaches to supporting democratization abroad? And if their approaches are guided by the ambition to most effectively help democratize their neighborhood, has their support been tailored to respond to the recipients’ democratization needs? This paper proceeds by briefly summarizing the Polish and Slovak efforts to support the democratization of Ukraine and Belarus.

[Table 1 about here]

## POLAND-UKRAINE

---

<sup>63</sup> PolishAid promotional materials available at <http://www.polishaid.gov.pl/Why,We,Provide,Assistance,204.html>

<sup>64</sup> Kukan, Eduard, “Presentation of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Slovak Republic,” in Slovak Institute for International Studies, *Yearbook of Foreign Policy of the Slovak Republic 2004* (Bratislava, 2005).

<sup>65</sup> First quote by Martina Hovorlova and second quote by Miroslav Lajcak, cited in Slovak Institute for International Studies, *Yearbook of Foreign Policy of the Slovak Republic 2008* (Bratislava, 2009).

<sup>66</sup> Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Slovak Republic, *Annual Report: Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Slovak Republic Foreign Policy in 2007* (Bratislava, Slovakia, 2008).

<sup>67</sup> Ibid.

In Ukraine, Poland's principal objective has been to nurture the development of the Ukrainian democracy from the bottom up and to support the Ukrainian state in creating the necessary institutional and legal framework. To that end, Warsaw has assisted the strengthening of civil society (interest and grassroots groups) and local democracy and has provided diplomatic support and assistance for reforming the Ukrainian state in line with democratic practices and EU membership requirements. Additionally, Poland has also lobbied for Ukrainian membership in the Euro-Atlantic community institutions to provide Kiev with incentives and blueprints for further reform in short-term and lock the country in the club of European democracies in the long run. [See Table 1]

In the early 1990s, Warsaw began supporting the development of local and civic democracy in Ukraine by creating forums for cooperation, including sharing of experiences, between Polish and Ukrainian local governments and civic groups. Moreover, much of the democracy assistance Warsaw began providing to Ukraine in the late 1990s through the Polish-American-Ukrainian Cooperation Initiative and the Polish development assistance system targeted various civic organizations and local communities. [See Table 2.] Poland also launched an ambitious youth scholarship program for Ukraine. And as the capacity of Ukrainian civil society and local governments began improving, Warsaw increasingly focused on supporting the Ukraine's EU integration and their participation in the process.

In addition, since Ukraine's independence in 1991, Warsaw has been investing in persuading, pressuring, and giving incentives to Ukraine's political elites to embrace democracy. In the early 1990s, Poland set up bilateral presidential and parliamentary cooperation mechanisms and began using them to not only build good neighborly relations with Ukraine but also to allow its elites a glimpse of what democracy looks like close to home and to give them encouragement and know-how to move forward with reforms.<sup>68</sup> Moreover, since the mid-1990s, Warsaw has also been actively working to embed Ukraine into the Euro-Atlantic political networks, in which Warsaw became a member – the Council of Europe, the Central European Initiative, NATO, and the EU – so that they can exercise a democratization pull on Ukraine (as they had on Poland).<sup>69</sup> Poland has tirelessly argued for further NATO and especially EU enlargement to Ukraine as well as for enhancing cooperation with Kiev in the meantime. Seeking to leverage the “transformative power” of the EU, Poland has advocated that the Union define clear conditions and precise dates for beginning accession negotiations with Kiev. And given the Union's reluctance to accepting Ukraine, Poland championed and managed to promulgate the so-called Eastern Partnership – a special EU policy for the immediate eastern EU neighbors, including Ukraine, to support their democratization and EU integration through both bilateral and regional political dialogue and assistance.<sup>70</sup>

Warsaw has also created a number of assistance programs to support the Ukrainian state with reform implementation. In the mid- to late 1990s, the Polish government began implementing “twinning” consultancy and training programs at the national and local levels. Warsaw further leveraged the Polish-American-Ukrainian

---

<sup>68</sup> Ryszard Zieba, “The ‘Strategic Partnership’ between Poland and Ukraine,” *Polish Foreign Affairs Digest* 3, no. 4 (2002): 195–226.

<sup>69</sup> Interview with L.A., October 20, 2008.

<sup>70</sup> In 2010, Ukraine was also offered EU membership prospective.

Cooperation Initiative and the Polish development assistance system to share “best practices” from Poland’s “successful transition” to a “liberal, market-oriented democracy” with Ukraine.<sup>71</sup>

Finally, Warsaw was able to build on its day-to-day democracy promotion work to play a crucial role in the Ukrainian electoral revolution of 2004 – an opposition campaign to expose electoral fraud and mobilize the citizenry to defend democracy.<sup>72</sup> The Polish President, who was invited by the warring parties in Ukraine to mediate between them and who had participated in the 1989 Polish roundtable, developed a roundtable plan for Ukraine. He also convinced the Lithuanian President and the EU High Representative for Common Foreign and Security Policy to join him as mediators and to express “support for democratic Ukraine’s European aspirations.”<sup>73</sup> He made the most significant contribution of all the international mediators present at the negotiations, which helped end the electoral crisis and push Ukraine in a more democratic direction.<sup>74</sup>

#### POLAND-BELARUS

In Belarus, Warsaw has focused on providing incentives to the regime to democratize but especially on readying civil society to create a popular mandate for change and to commit the ruling elites to liberalization. So Warsaw has assisted the strengthening of the Belarusian civil society and increasingly over time also the development of independent media and the socialization of the youth and the general public. Poland has also upheld the international sanctions against the Belarusian regime but advocated against isolating the country and practiced critical dialogue instead. [See Table 1]

Initially, Polish democracy promotion in Belarus was similar to the Polish policies towards Ukraine in that Warsaw focused on creating a network of bilateral and multilateral ties that would exercise a democratization pull on Belarus.<sup>75</sup> However, Poland’s policies changed after Alexander Lukashenko was elected president of Belarus in 1994 and soon thereafter became the “last dictator in Europe.” Hoping to reverse the democratic backsliding of Belarus, Poland made several attempts to organize a roundtable in Belarus.<sup>76</sup> Moreover, Poland downgraded its ties with Minsk and began supporting the Belarusian civil society to resist the concentration of power in the Belarusian state.

Initially, Warsaw sponsored informal contacts between the Belarusian opposition and Polish civic organizations led by former Polish dissidents.<sup>77</sup> Also, a number of Polish politicians joined Polish civic groups working in Belarus in training pro-democratic

---

<sup>71</sup> Polish-Ukrainian Cooperation Foundation website: <http://www.pauci.org/en/about/history/>

<sup>72</sup> Centre for Eastern Studies, *The Orange Ribbon: A Calendar of the Political Crisis in Ukraine, Autumn 2004* (Warsaw: Centre for Eastern Studies, 2005).

<sup>73</sup> Ibid.

<sup>74</sup> Steven Pifer, “European Mediators and Ukraine’s Orange Revolution.” *Problems of Post-Communism*. 54.6 (2007): 28-42.

<sup>75</sup> Margarita Balmaceda, James Clem, and Lisbeth Tarlow, eds., *Independent Belarus: Domestic Determinants, Regional Dynamics, and Implications for the West* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002).

<sup>76</sup> Democracy Coalition Project, “Poland,” *Defending Democracy: A Global Survey of Foreign Policy Trends 1992–2002* (Democracy Coalition Project Report, 2002).

<sup>77</sup> Snyder.



political leaders, civil society, and journalists.<sup>78</sup> And when Lukashenko continued consolidating his power in the early and mid-2000s, Warsaw stepped up its assistance to the Belarusian opposition and especially its political and civic leaders by leveraging its development aid system. At the same time, Warsaw has not shied away from speaking against repression and electoral manipulation in Belarus.<sup>79</sup> Poland further unambiguously and publicly supported the Belarusian pro-democratic elites, particularly around the 2004 referendum and the 2001 and 2006 presidential elections in Belarus.<sup>80</sup>

However, after the opposition was again unsuccessful in defeating Lukashenko at the 2006 presidential elections, Warsaw refashioned and reinforced its assistance to target not just Belarusian civic groups but also to reach out to Belarusian society more systematically. Citing the importance of the Polish communist-era underground media, Warsaw launched two state-run media projects – “Radio Racyja” and the “Belsat” TV channel for Belarus – to provide alternatives to the official line in Belarus.<sup>81</sup> Moreover, the Polish development aid system continued to fund Polish NGOs developing the capacity of Belarusian civil society, independent media, and youth. [See Table 2.] The Polish government also set up programs to help those punished by Lukashenko for political reasons.<sup>82</sup> Lastly, Warsaw advocated for increased EU aid for civil society in and people-to-people contacts with Belarus.<sup>83</sup>

At the level of state elites, Warsaw supported the sanctions imposed by the EU and the US against the Belarusian regime in 1999, 2001, 2004, and 2006. However, throughout the 2000s, Polish diplomats advocated that the West “build a dialogue with Belarus so as to overcome its isolation in the European arena and thereby stimulate the development of democracy and the civil society in that country.”<sup>84</sup> Polish elites themselves have worked to convince political elites in Belarus that “democracy is well worthwhile”<sup>85</sup> and that there are “forms and areas of co-operation [with the EU such as economy and culture] that can be developed in the present political reality in Belarus.”<sup>86</sup> Thus, throughout the 2000s, Warsaw opted for a diplomacy of “critical dialogue” with Minsk— Poland has supported the pro-democratic leaders in Belarus and criticized the violations of democracy and human rights in Belarus while also engaging the Lukashenko regime in limited, unofficial, and often non-political ways. Moreover, Poland has advocated that the EU practice a policy of critical dialogue towards Belarus. In part thanks to the Polish efforts, the European Parliament has passed more resolutions condemning democratic violations in Belarus than in any other country and has bestowed the prestigious Sakharov (Human Rights) Prize to Belarusian nationals twice.<sup>87</sup> Poland also worked to convince the EU to admit Belarus it into the Eastern Partnership.

---

<sup>78</sup> Balmaceda, Clem, and Tarlow.

<sup>79</sup> Interview with M.M., October 13, 2008.

<sup>80</sup> Interview with M.J., October 27, 2008.

<sup>81</sup> Interview with M.S., October 13, 2008.

<sup>82</sup> Grzegorz Gromadzki, Wojciech Kononczuk, and Lubos Vesely, *Belarus after the ‘Election.’ What Future for the Lukashenko Regime?* (Warsaw: Stefan Batory Foundation, March 24, 2006).

<sup>83</sup> Interview with J.S.-W., February 25, 2009.

<sup>84</sup> Kwasniewski, “Vision of a United Europe in the 21st Century,”

<sup>85</sup> Cimoszewicz, “The Eastern Policy of the European Union.”

<sup>86</sup> Cimoszewicz and Khvastov, Declaration and Kwasniewski, Statement.

<sup>87</sup> Interview with J.S.-W., February 25, 2009.

[Table 2 about here]

#### SLOVAKIA-BELARUS

In Belarus, Bratislava's goal has been to strengthen the civic and political opposition so it can challenge the regime, define a viable (post-breakthrough) reform agenda, and engage with the citizenry. Slovakia has assisted the development of interest and grassroots groups and independent analytical centers in Belarus as well as provided moral and political support to the political opposition. Moreover, much like Warsaw, Bratislava has upheld the international sanctions against Minsk but has also over time increasing argued that regional European structures not isolate Belarus. [See Table 1]

Shortly after the Slovak democratic breakthrough in 1998, Bratislava began supporting the Slovak non-governmental organizations training the Belarusian opposition to use elections to push their country in a more democratic direction as Slovakia had just done in 1998.<sup>88</sup> And when the Slovak system for official development aid was set up in the mid-2000s, Bratislava started providing democracy assistance to Belarus more systematically. The focus was developing the capacity of independent think tanks, strengthening civic actors, and encouraging public debate in non-political areas such as local environmental, education, and economic development. [See Table 2.] In addition, following its EU accession, Slovakia began to more vocally criticize the undemocratic practices of the Belarusian authorities and to more openly support the civic and political pro-democratic elites in Belarus, especially around the 2004 and 2006 elections.<sup>89</sup> Moreover, Bratislava has worked with Slovak civic activists to shape the EU's response to the direction of political developments in Belarus and to organize the EU to also lend support and legitimacy to the Belarusian opposition by inviting them to do bi-annual briefings in the European Parliament and the European Council.

Citing the negative democratization impact of Slovakia's international isolation before 1998, Bratislava further worked to prevent the international isolation of Belarus.<sup>90</sup> Slovakia has supported the 1999, 2001, 2004, and 2006 EU and US sanctions against Minsk but has also sought to become one of the main agents of the European policy towards Belarus. In 2007, Portugal asked Slovakia to exercise the EU presidency in Belarus. Slovakia effectively mobilized the embassies of member states to increase EU pressure on Minsk, negotiated the opening of a EU Delegation in Belarus, and organized the EU's people-to-people campaign *What the EU Can Bring to Belarus*. And when Slovakia assumed the Presidency in the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe in late 2007, Bratislava worked to bring Belarus closer to membership in the Council of Europe by popularizing the advantages of membership for the both the state (security) and civil society (human rights).<sup>91</sup>

#### SLOVAKIA-UKRAINE

In Ukraine, Bratislava has aimed to help the country democratize by supporting its Euro-Atlantic integration. To that end, Slovakia has assisted the Ukrainian civic actors participating in the public debate about the reforms ahead of Ukraine and holding ruling

---

<sup>88</sup> Interview with P.N., November 11, 2008.

<sup>89</sup> Marusiak et al. 2006.

<sup>90</sup> Interview with J.K., November 27, 2008.

<sup>91</sup> Slovak MFA, *Annual Report 2007*.

elites accountable for implementing such reforms. Slovakia has further helped prepare the Ukrainian state to apply for membership in the EU and NATO and advocated for Ukrainian membership in these organizations to give Kiev incentives and blueprints to speed up the country's transition. [See Table 1]

Slovak support for the democratization of Ukraine emerged slowly and after a period of inconsistent and contradictory diplomacy. After Slovakia's democratic breakthrough, the Slovak government expressed publicly its support for the "democratic development of Ukraine"<sup>92</sup> but the Slovak president kept organizing frequent and warm meetings with Ukraine's illiberal president.<sup>93</sup> However, after 2004, when the Slovak presidency turned over and when a political consensus emerged around Ukraine as a priority for Slovakia's post-EU accession foreign policy, Slovakia began supporting more openly, actively, and consistently the democratization and Euro-Atlantic integration of Ukraine.

To pull Ukraine in a pro-democratic direction, Slovakia called on the country's leaders to launch democratic reforms and offered them diplomatic and technical assistance with improving Ukraine's relations with NATO and the EU. Ahead of the 2004 presidential elections in Ukraine, Bratislava sent election monitors and expressed support for the pro-democratic forces.<sup>94</sup> And when the election was marred by fraud and the opposition mobilized thousands in defense of the existing democratic constitution, a Slovak diplomat serving as the OSCE Secretary General at the time steered the Organization to participate in the round table negotiations and support democracy in Ukraine.<sup>95</sup> After the democratic breakthrough in Ukraine, Bratislava continued advising the new Ukrainian leaders to implement democratization and Euro-Atlantic integration reforms. Slovakia has accordingly supported Ukraine's bid for NATO and EU membership. In 2005, Bratislava started also running annual programs, "Slovak Aid in the Implementation of the Action Plan EU-Ukraine," to share "best practices" in legislation and institutional reform from the EU integration experience of various Slovak institutions with their Ukrainian counterparts. In 2006, the Slovak parliament launched a complementary parliament-to-parliament initiative. And having successfully run to become a NATO contact embassy for 2007-2008, Slovakia's embassy in Ukraine worked to support the political dialogue between Ukraine and the Alliance.<sup>96</sup>

Even more prominent has been Slovakia's support for the development of the Ukrainian civil society and citizen engagement in the reform process.<sup>97</sup> Initially, Slovakia supported the work of Slovak civic organizations sharing their election (monitoring and debate) expertise with Ukrainian non-governmental groups. But over time Bratislava supported the development of a broader sweep of civil society in Ukraine, looking not just to strengthen its capacity but also its ability to use the EU integration process to educate the citizenry about and mobilize support for reforms and hold the government

---

<sup>92</sup> Mikulas Dzurinda, "Presentation of the Prime Minister of the Slovak Republic," in Slovak Institute for International Studies, *Yearbook of Foreign Policy of the Slovak Republic 2003* (Bratislava, 2004).

<sup>93</sup> Juraj Marusiak et al., "The Foreign Policy and National Security of the Slovak Republic," in *Slovakia 2003: Global Report on the State of Society* (Bratislava: Institute for Public Affairs, 2003).

<sup>94</sup> Marusiak et al. 2004.

<sup>95</sup> Centre for Eastern Studies.

<sup>96</sup> Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Slovak Republic, *Annual Report: Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Slovak Republic Foreign Policy in 2008* (Bratislava, Slovakia, 2009).

<sup>97</sup> Kucharczyk and Lovitt.

accountable for their implementation. [See Table 2] Also, the “Slovak Aid in the Implementation of the Action Plan EU-Ukraine” programs and the related parliament-to-parliament initiative were meant to not only further Ukraine’s EU integration but also to improve state-society cooperation in this process. And while serving as a NATO contact embassy in Ukraine, the Slovak embassy awarded small grants to Ukrainian organizations participating in the public debate on Ukraine’s NATO membership and the reforms necessary for it.<sup>98</sup>

#### NATIONAL DEMOCRACY PROMOTION APPROACHES

As the discussion above documented, there are some distinctively national features of the Polish and the Slovak approaches to democracy promotion. Polish policy makers, for example, have on several occasions offered to organize roundtables to precipitate democratic breakthroughs abroad, including in Belarus in the late 1990s and in Ukraine in 2004.<sup>99</sup> Similarly, Slovakia has sought to help a number of opposition movements in post-communist countries with hybrid regimes to prepare electoral breakthroughs, including in Ukraine in 2004 and Belarus in 2001 or 2006.<sup>100</sup> More generally, again as documented above, in supporting democracy in Belarus and Ukraine, Poland has emphasized civil society as de-concentration of power away from the political center as well as preparing the governing elite to embrace political liberalization and follow through afterwards. Slovakia, on the other hand, has focused primarily on supporting politically oriented civil society as bridge between the public and political elites in its priority recipients.

These national features of the Polish and the Slovak approach to democracy promotion mirror the distinctive features of the transition experiences of these countries. In the Polish “negotiated transition,” the communist regime responded to the opposition movement’s calls for political liberalization, backed by popular protest, by inviting the opposition to negotiations in which the outlines of the new political order were agreed upon.<sup>101</sup> The Polish transition thus involved empowering and mobilizing numerous local communities, so that they can bring their illiberal regime to the negotiating table to commit to transformative liberalization and so that later they can become a governance partner to the new democratic state. In contrast, the Slovak “electoral breakthrough” was a campaign, which exposed electoral fraud and used mass protest in defense of the existing democratic constitution in order to defeat the illiberal incumbent and begin a new democratic chapter in the country’s history.<sup>102</sup> Therefore, the Slovak transition required and reinforced the work of civic groups involved in the political process (think tanks, watchdog groups, media and election monitors, etc.) to ensure that democratic principles are observed and later that citizen voices are heard. And to the extent that in supporting democracy abroad, Warsaw has paid more attention than Bratislava to committing the recipient state and political elites to democracy and to broad and

---

<sup>98</sup> Ibid.

<sup>99</sup> The offers to Belarus were rejected but those to Ukraine helped push it in a more democratic direction.

<sup>100</sup> Such Slovak support played a not insignificant role in the democratic breakthrough in Ukraine among others but has not yielded the desired results in Belarus.

<sup>101</sup> Karen Dawisha and Bruce Parrott, eds. *The Consolidation of Democracy in East-Central Europe*. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

<sup>102</sup> Joerg Forbrig and Pavol Demes, *Reclaiming Democracy, Civil Society and Electoral Change in Central and Eastern Europe* (Washington, DC: The German Marshall Fund of the United States, 2007).

decentralized civic development, the Polish approach to democracy promotion resembles the specific features of the Polish transition. Similarly, in its focus primarily on civil society development and especially on political civil society and public debate, the Slovak approach to democracy promotion resembles the characteristic elements of the Slovak transition.

In sum, Warsaw's and Bratislava's activities are in line with the explanations Polish and Slovak diplomats have given about their approaches to supporting democratization abroad. Both Poland and Slovakia have distinctively national approaches to democracy promotion because they are borrowing from their own transition experiences in finding inspiration for different strategies and in implementing initiatives geared towards the sharing of their transition experience with their recipients. Thus, each transition is based on a particular type of state-society interactions, which produce a particular repertoire of democratization struggle and democratic consolidation and inspire a distinctively national approach to democracy promotion, grounded in the donor's democratization repertoire.<sup>103</sup>

#### RESPONDING TO RECIPIENT DEMOCRATIZATION NEEDS

Still, while both Poland and Slovakia have sought to export their transition experience, they have done so by at least somewhat tailoring their strategies to the democratization needs of their recipients. Instead of following a domestic or international script, Poland and Slovakia have very consciously and purposefully been passing along "lessons" they have learned about "what worked at home and what did not" at their democratization stage understood to correspond most closely to that of their recipients.<sup>104</sup> For example, when accounting for their activities in Belarus, Polish elites often explained that they are drawing in part on the lessons learned during the martial law period in the early 1980s in Poland and the Polish struggle against communism more generally.<sup>105</sup> Warsaw's diplomats also referred to the reforms Poland implemented in the post-communist period as a model for Ukraine.<sup>106</sup> Similarly, when discussing their efforts in Ukraine (most of which dated after 2004), many Slovak democracy promoters emphasized that they were often borrowing from their own experience with Euro-Atlantic integration after the Slovak democratic breakthrough in 1998.<sup>107</sup> Slovak elites also frequently reported thinking about the successes of the Slovak democratization struggle before 1998 when working in Belarus.<sup>108</sup>

---

<sup>103</sup> Moreover, this democracy promotion repertoire has influenced not only the targeted sectors of the domestic political order of the recipient but also the choice of policy instruments used by the donor. Since one of Poland's goals has been to commit recipient political elites to democracy, Warsaw has preferred the use of diplomacy (much more so than Slovakia). Bratislava, on the other hand, has (more) frequently cooperated with and built on the work of the Slovak civic democracy promoters and used assistance, implemented by them, as an instrument of democracy promotion. And finally, because they are borrowing from the same transition experience, consecutive governments in both Poland and Slovakia have adopted very similar democracy promotion approaches.

<sup>104</sup> Interview with V.H., November 30, 2008.

<sup>105</sup> Interview with P.W., October 16, 2008.

<sup>106</sup> Interview with M.M., October 13, 2008.

<sup>107</sup> Interview with A.D., July 27, 2007

<sup>108</sup> Interview with J.K., November 27, 2008.

As the discussion above illustrated, there are distinct differences in the Polish approaches to Ukraine and Belarus as well as in the Slovak approaches to these recipients. In its work with state elites abroad, Polish elites have sought to entice and socialize their Ukrainian counterparts at all levels into accepting democracy as “the only game in town” and to assist them to follow through with the necessary reforms; in Belarus, Warsaw has engaged with the Belarusian leadership in limited ways but to shame and persuade it to liberalize. Polish involvement with civil society in Ukraine has supported more than in Belarus the capacity of grassroots groups and local communities to contribute to democratic governance in their country. Warsaw’s support for non-state actors in Belarus has focused more so than it did in Ukraine on the independent media, the youth, and the general public in an effort to mobilize public demand for and support for democratization. On the other hand, Bratislava has sought to mobilize the Belarusian civil society by supporting the youth, grassroots groups, and think tanks more than in Ukraine where more public debate about the reform agenda and track record of the Ukrainian political leadership has been supported. Bratislava has not engaged the regime in Belarus (but has encouraged the European international organizations to maintain some ties to it); in Ukraine, Slovakia has assisted the reform efforts of Kiev but primarily because and in the context of its role in the EU integration of the country. Such differences in donor approaches to different recipients are in line with the explanations of Polish and Slovak democracy promoters that they are responding to the different democratization needs of their recipients.

There are also many similarities between the Polish and the Slovak approaches in Belarus as well as between the Polish and Slovak approaches in Ukraine. For example, assistance to civic groups and (their interaction with) the youth and the general public in Belarus is a priority for both Slovakia and Poland, as is preventing the international isolation of the country. In Ukraine, both Slovakia and Poland have prioritized supporting the EU integration of the country and improving the capacity of various non-governmental organizations. These similarities again suggest that both Poland and Slovakia are responding to the political realities in each recipient country.

Likewise, the evolution of the Polish and Slovak strategies in Belarus and Ukraine provide further evidence that these donors are responding to the democratization needs of their recipients. For example, the focus of Slovakia’s support to Ukraine evolved from electoral-process assistance in the mid-2000s to reform towards Euro-Atlantic integration after Ukraine’s democratic breakthrough. Similarly, Warsaw enhanced its support to the opposition in Belarus by engaging the Belarusian citizenry in general more and more over time. Since neither donor’s motivations for supporting democracy in these recipients changed over time, such evolution further indicates that the democracy promotion motivations of Poland and Slovakia do not define their approaches. Moreover, Slovakia, which is more interested than Poland in supporting democracy abroad for the sake of economic and political stability in Ukraine and Belarus, has not necessarily paid much more attention to good governance or rule of law issues. The Polish and Slovak motivations for supporting democratization abroad have, nonetheless, left their mark. Warsaw’s advocacy for ending the isolation of Belarus despite its refusal to liberalize and against Western criticism of Kiev’s democracy record even as it was rapidly deteriorating in the early 2000s stem not only from Poland’s concern about the democratization of these countries but primarily from Warsaw’s desire to tear them away from Moscow’s

sphere of influence.<sup>109</sup> Slovakia, on the other hand, has made EU integration, which involves improving governance in applicant countries, a central pillar of its support for Ukraine, in part because of Bratislava's interest in economic expansion abroad.

In sum, the Polish and Slovak approaches to democracy promotion are best understood as an export of their transition experiences at the democratization stage understood to correspond most closely to that of their recipients. The Eastern EU approaches are thus not based on a set of legitimate reform practices but are instead informed by a rational choice logic; this logic is defined first by these donors' understandings of the performance of their own transitions and second by the recipient's democratization needs/ regime type. Poland and Slovakia are generally not providing support that has been formulated according to Ukraine's or Belarus' specific democratization needs; Warsaw and Bratislava are most frequently supporting abroad the kinds of reforms that are recognized to have been successful in constructing thriving and democratic societies in Poland and Slovakia when they were at the democratization level of a specific recipient.<sup>110</sup> Moreover, as many of the elites with first-hand transition experience in these countries retire from politics and as democracy promotion becomes more routinized in Poland and Slovakia, the logic underpinning their approaches to democracy promotion could change. The current considerations about the usefulness and effectiveness the reform practices exported abroad could over time be replaced with a democracy promotion script based on the national democratization experience of each donor and perhaps their subsequent national democracy promotion experience.

#### EASTERN AND WESTERN APPROACHES TO DEMOCRACY PROMOTION COMPARED

A final important question remains: What distinguishes the Polish and Slovak approaches to democracy promotion from the Western ones? In terms of thematic priorities on the ground, except for a few innovative practices – such as Slovak attention to think tanks in Belarus or Polish emphasis on scholarships for the Ukrainian youth – the democracy promotion strategies of the Eastern European actors do not differ much from those of Western players.<sup>111</sup> More generally, both Eastern and Western approaches could be said to have a certain national character since to some extent they are both based on the donor's values and experiences. However, while Western donors have been argued to have relied on “cookie-cutter” and “one-size-fits-all” scripts based on legitimate institutions, Eastern donors have at least somewhat customized their approach to different recipients.

---

<sup>109</sup> Richard Youngs, ed., *Is the European Union Supporting Democracy in Its Neighbourhood?*, ed. (Madrid: FRIDE, 2008), 101–20.

<sup>110</sup> Neither country has formally debated which lessons are the most valuable to export but there is an informal consensus among the political and civic elites involved in democracy promotion about the most successful reforms undertaken in their country. Also, because the Polish and the Slovak democracy promotion approaches vary according to the recipient regime type, there are many similarities, for example, in Bratislava's democracy support towards Serbia and Ukraine: – both are priority recipients for Slovakia, both are hybrid regimes with democratic and European prospects, and in both the Slovak civic approach has emphasized assistance to interest groups and think tanks advocating for EU integration as well as organizing public debates to educate the citizenry about the requirements and benefits of EU membership.

<sup>111</sup> On the Western approaches to Ukraine and Belarus, see Youngs.

What further distinguishes Eastern European democracy promotion is its emphasis on the process of democratization. As the quotes above highlighted, Warsaw and Bratislava are working to share their *transition experience*. When they describe their approach to supporting democratization abroad, the Polish democracy promoters talk about encouraging and supporting others to “travel the Polish path.”<sup>112</sup> Similarly, the Slovak democracy promoters describe their goals as inviting others to follow their “journey”<sup>113</sup> – a set of processes related to turning a transition laggard into a “success story.”<sup>114</sup> In other words, what the Polish and Slovak democracy promoters are passing along are not sets of institutional blueprints but rather “recipes” or sets of steps to follow to defeat authoritarians (breakthrough) or achieve particular reform objectives (consolidation). They often emphasize “demonstrating the progression from conceptualization to execution, the way solutions are developed – by way of example.”<sup>115</sup> Therefore, in contrast to their Western donors, which are said to export their own models of *democracy*, the Eastern European donors have been exporting their own transition process and thus their own models of *democratization*.

An anecdote, not at all an atypical one, illustrates this point well. A group of Ukrainian officials were invited for a study visit to several townships in the US. The Ukrainians reported being in awe of how well the American municipalities worked and strongly wished they could set up a local governance system just like the US one. However, while they felt confident that they knew how a local government should be structured, they were far less certain what steps to take to make that happen. The US hosts could have probably suggested some activities to get their Ukrainian counterparts to build what to the Americans was the core of a local government. However, the Ukrainians got the help they needed from their Polish colleagues who had implemented a very successful decentralization reform not that long ago and who related the process through which they themselves established their own well-functioning local governance system.<sup>116</sup>

#### WESTERN IMPORTS AS EASTERN EXPORTS

Some of the transition lessons Poland and Slovakia are sharing abroad include best practices that were passed along to them by Western democracy promoters. Here is a typical on-the-ground example: One of the Polish civic democracy promoters cooperating with the Polish state through PolishAid to spread democratic norms and practices abroad is the European Meeting Centre – Nowy Staw Foundation.<sup>117</sup> Shortly after the fall of communism, a number of youth meeting centers, such as Nowy Staw, were set up to foster contacts between young people residing in the border regions of Germany and Poland. Such initiatives were part of a larger movement to develop civil society while also strengthening values such as democracy, self-governance, tolerance and solidarity between these nations. The German partners of Nowy Staw organized a variety of study visits to Germany and a meeting/media center in Poland. As a member of the Foundation

---

<sup>112</sup> Statement by Ivan Drach, the leader of the Ukrainian Rukh (Parliament). Cited in Snyder, 263.

<sup>113</sup> Dzurinda.

<sup>114</sup> Slovak MFA, *Annual Report 2007*.

<sup>115</sup> Grazyna Czubek, *Social Diplomacy: The Case of Poland* (Warsaw: Stefan Batory Foundation, 2002).

<sup>116</sup> Interview with K.F., October 22, 2008.

<sup>117</sup> This case study is based on an interview with A. M., October 8, 2008.



shares, “having learned a lot from them [German partners], we naturally did the same in Belarus, including literally opening meeting/media center.”<sup>118</sup> Like Nowy Staw many of the Polish meeting centers, with assistance from the Polish state among others, soon moved east to Ukraine and in smaller numbers to Belarus. Moreover, as the Ukrainian centers matured, the Polish partners began suggesting that Ukraine export the practice to Russia.<sup>119</sup>

More generally, Warsaw, for example, has chosen to engage in a “critical dialogue” with Minsk because of the perceived success of the Western (German and American) “critical engagement” with the USSR.<sup>120</sup> And another example: acknowledging that the allure and requirements of EU integration differentially empower pro-democratic forces and legitimate democratic practices in applicant countries, both Poland and Slovakia have supported the EU integration of Ukraine. Moreover, after the democratic breakthrough in the country, Bratislava has assisted it, the way Warsaw and Prague assisted Slovakia when after its own breakthrough it was trying to catch up with the Czech Republic and Poland – by sharing best practices in legislation and institutional reform. Thus, because the Polish and the Slovak transition successes are a product of both domestic and external efforts, Warsaw’s and Bratislava’s approaches also refract and integrate the democracy promotion approaches of a number of Western – and more recently Eastern – donors.

Still, the general independence and organic development of the Eastern European movements behind post-communist democracy promotion should not be underestimated. The Eastern EU countries transitioned away from communism very recently and have since then been under intense international pressure to demonstrate their commitment to democracy in order to join the Euro-Atlantic community. So protecting democracy not just at home but also abroad has been argued to be part of the Eastern European project to create and enhance their new democratic identity.<sup>121</sup> Yet, international factors – either as scripts or as best practices – have not played a significant role in shaping the Polish and Slovak approaches. Slovakia’s democracy promotion tradition was established after an international consensus developed around the importance of human rights, elections, and civil society to the practice of democracy and democracy promotion. Yet, Slovakia has paid little attention to supporting human rights abroad and provides elections assistance only to civic groups abroad and only as part of a democratic breakthrough recipe for hybrid regimes rather as a consistent theme throughout different democratization stages and across different recipients.

## CONCLUSION

If the Polish and the Slovak approach to supporting democracy abroad is to export their own model of democratization as appropriate to the regime type of the recipient, how have those approaches affected the Polish and Slovak effectiveness as donors? Their

---

<sup>118</sup> Interview with A.M., October 8, 2008.

<sup>119</sup> Interview with K.F., October 22, 2008. Equally fascinating is the fact that the tradition of the youth meeting centers began in Germany after WWII as a French reconciliation and democratization initiative.

<sup>120</sup> Interview with A.B., October 18, 2008.

<sup>121</sup> Marian Kowalski, “Belarus: Next Generation Democracy,” in Kucharczyk and Lovitt, *Democracy’s New Champions*, 189–215; and Jonavicius, “The Democracy Promotion Policies of Central and Eastern European States.”

first-hand democratization experience provides them with tried breakthrough and reform recipes for a number of transition challenges as well as credibility to advise others struggling for democracy. Recipients and Western donors both report that this expertise and reputation of the Eastern EU democracy promoters have had a positive impact on the receptivity of beneficiaries.<sup>122</sup> A similarly positive effect has had the attention paid by these donors to the democratization needs of their recipients. Besides, to the extent that these donors have tended to work primarily in their neighborhood, they not only know their beneficiaries better but have a lot more knowledge about their recipients' cultural traditions, authoritarian practices or legacies, and local power relations than most of the Western donors working in the same countries. The customization and relevance of Eastern EU democracy promotion is understood by beneficiaries to constitute a "big part" of the "value" of Eastern European support.<sup>123</sup> And since they have not relied on exporting country-specific models of democracy, the Eastern EU donors have left more room for recipients to develop their own forms of democracy.

At the same time, relying on democratization innovations developed to overcome particular transition challenges might limit the relevance of these donors' approaches to a small set of countries within the post-communist space, which further shrinks over time as authoritarianism in the region evolves. The Eastern EU donors also often assume some degree of similarity between their own transitions and those of their recipients because of a shared communist past but even Eastern EU elites themselves admit that such similarity can sometimes be misleading and their knowledge about other post-communist countries – limited. Moreover, because the Eastern EU democracies are still themselves grappling with major issues of internal adherence to democratic norms and practices, some Western donors have raised questions about the quality of democracy the post-communist donors are exporting.<sup>124</sup> Furthermore, as new donors in the democracy domain, their administrative capacity to provide assistance is still underdeveloped and their financial and administrative resources – limited.<sup>125</sup> Additionally, these Eastern European donors, like many Western donors, have often undermined their efforts by prioritized democracy promotion under other foreign policy objectives, such as keeping good and friendly relations with recipients irrespective of their democracy record.

Still, despite these limitations, Poland and Slovakia (and some of the other Eastern European donors) have already shown promise to support the diffusion of democracy in their neighborhood. Recognizing this promise early on, Western and especially American donors have encouraged and supported Eastern EU democracy promotion since the late 1990s and early 2000s. And to the extent that some of the best practices the Eastern EU democracy promoters are exporting abroad have included practices imported earlier in these countries by Western donor, Eastern EU democracy promotion has been – from their perspective of the West – a continuation of their work and realization of their values. Moreover, although it has not been the norm, there are important opportunities and benefits to democracy promotion collaboration between

---

<sup>122</sup> Kucharczyk and Lovitt.

<sup>123</sup> Ibid.

<sup>124</sup> Interview with P.S., August 10, 2010.

<sup>125</sup> Andres Kasekamp and Heiko Pääbo, "Promoting Democratic Values in the Enlarged Europe: The Changing Role of the Baltic States from Importers to Exporters," Papers presented on the International Conference EuroCollege, Tartu, Estonia, 5–6 May 2006.

Eastern and Western donors. Such cooperation to reinforce and propagate the Western liberal order could build on the capacity, power, and democratic traditions of the West and combine them with the credibility, democratization expertise, and local knowledge of the Eastern EU donors.

*Table 1. Polish and Slovak Democracy Promotion Initiatives in Ukraine and Belarus by Targeted Sector and Policy Instrument in Order of Priority*

<b>Recipient</b>	<b>Donor</b>	
	<i>Poland</i>	<i>Slovakia</i>
<i>Ukraine (Hybrid Regime)</i>	<p><u>State &amp; Political Elites: Diplomacy &gt; Conditionality &gt; Assistance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pressure, persuasion, and socialization through bilateral and multilateral ties, leveraging of EU conditionality, and technical aid</li> </ul> <p><u>Civil Society: Assistance &gt; Diplomacy</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assistance and political support for local and civic democracy</li> </ul>	<p><u>Civil Society: Assistance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aid towards civil society and citizen engagement in the reform process and EU and NATO integration</li> </ul> <p><u>State &amp; Political Elites: Assistance &gt; Conditionality &gt; Diplomacy</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for Ukraine’s EU and NATO integration</li> </ul>
<i>Belarus (Autocratic Regime)</i>	<p><u>Civil Society: Assistance &gt; Diplomacy</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aid for independent media, civil society, and people-to-people contacts and support to the opposition</li> </ul> <p><u>State &amp; Political Elites: Diplomacy &gt; Conditionality</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“Critical dialogue” with regime, support for EU sanctions, and advocacy for EU membership prospective for Belarus</li> </ul>	<p><u>Civil Society: Assistance &gt; Diplomacy</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aid towards public debate and citizen participation and political support to the opposition</li> </ul> <p><u>State &amp; Political Elites: Conditionality &gt; Diplomacy</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for EU sanctions, pressure on regional European structures not to isolate Belarus, and criticism of the regime</li> </ul>

*Table 2. Percent of PolishAid / SlovakAid Democracy Assistance Projects Targeting a Particular Sector in Ukraine and Belarus out of All PolishAid / SlovakAid Democracy Assistance Projects Implemented in These Countries, 2004-2008*

<b>Targeted Sector</b>	<b>Donor</b>	<b>Recipient</b>				
		<i>Ukraine</i>		<i>Belarus</i>		
		SK	PO	SK	PO	
Political Process	Elections	6%	-	-	-	
	Parties	3%	-	10%	-	
Governing Institutions	Legislature	-	1%	-	-	
	Executive	9%	9%	-	-	
	Judiciary	-	1%	-	-	
	Local Government	6%	29%	-	6%	
Civil Society	Organized	Interest Groups	29%	25%	30%	28%
		Grassroots Groups	3%	13%	15%	8%
		Think Tanks	9%	2%	15%	-
	Unorganized	Media	-	4%	-	22%
		Youth	9%	7%	15%	17%
		Educators	6%	7%	5%	7%
		General Public	23%	3%	15%	12%

*Note.* Data from author calculations base on official PolishAid and SlovakAid assistance statistics.