



Universiteit Leiden

Analysis of the instrumental variation of  
the EU cooperative pro-democracy strategy  
in Rwanda from 2005 to 2012

---

MA International Relations Thesis

Leticia Garcia – s1748513

05/02/2017

## **Table of contents**

<i>Abbreviations</i>	2
Introduction	3
Literature review	7
The European Union and Democracy promotion	7
<i>Perceptions on EU democracy promotion</i>	8
Democracy promotion in authoritarian regimes	9
<i>Democracy promotion strategies</i>	9
<i>Authoritarian regimes' collaboration with democracy promoters</i>	10
<i>EU pro-democracy response to authoritarian regimes</i>	11
Democracy promotion in Rwanda	13
<i>Authoritarianism in Rwanda</i>	13
<i>The post-conflict situation in Rwanda</i>	14
<i>Rwandan control of aid and the genocide credit</i>	14
Theoretical framework	16
Method	19
Comparative case study – Niger, Guinea and Rwanda	20
Guinea, Niger and Rwanda – An overview (2005-2012)	21
Guinea	21
Niger	22
Rwanda	22
Comparative case study – Stability & Development	23
Stability	23
Development	25
HDI	25
GDP Growth	26
Summary of the comparison	26
Conclusion	28
Bibliography	30

## **Abbreviations**

African, Caribbean and Pacific countries (ACP)

Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC)

European Commission (EC)

European Development Fund (EDF)

European Union (EU)

Gross Domestic Product (GDP)

Human Development Index (HDI)

Non-governmental organization (NGO)

Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF)

United Nations (UN)

## Introduction

The country of Rwanda has been the subject of international attention since the early 1990s. During that decade, an ethnically based civil war was followed by one of the worst genocides in contemporary history. Therefore, modern history in Rwanda has been deeply influenced by those memories; by mid-July 1994, after three months of genocide, more than 800 000 Tutsis and moderate Hutus had been indiscriminately killed by the Hutus involved in the massacre.<sup>1</sup>

Contrary to what one might have expected, Rwanda did not become a failed or fragile state after those events. The Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF), which originated as a *guerrilla* movement, rapidly transformed into a political party and took control of the country, focusing its efforts on ethnic reconciliation.<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, this paramount reconciliation gained priority over the democratic process that started in Rwanda with the Arusha Accords a few years before the start of the civil war.<sup>3</sup> Paul Kagame officially took office in 2000 and under his rule the country has experienced enormous gains in the form of socioeconomic development, gender equality and accountability for genocide perpetrators.<sup>4</sup> However, when asked about the democratization process expected by the international community, some talk in terms of the “Rwandan exception”<sup>5</sup> ; under Kagame’s administration ethnic reconciliation has been prioritized over democracy.<sup>6</sup> Controversial elements surrounding Kagame’s government, such as restricted freedom of speech, repeated human rights violations and a narrow political terrain, have been present since he took power.<sup>7</sup> Altogether, these are undoubtedly constraining people’s liberties. Albeit elections are held, they are considered fraudulent, and control is applied to nearly every facet of society.<sup>8</sup> These elements point to Rwanda as being an authoritarian state.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Phil Clark. “After genocide: democracy in Rwanda, 20 years on”. *Juncture*, vol. 20, 2014. Pg. 308.

<sup>2</sup> Richard Youngs. “A new approach in the Great Lakes? Europe's evolving conflict-resolution strategies”. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 22:3, 2004. Pg.311.

<sup>3</sup> The Arusha Accords in 1990 was a process involving the RPF and other excluded Rwandan political parties aimed to bring shared governance in Rwanda. John H. Stanfield. “Rwanda: Rough Macro- Sociology of Knowledge Notes on a Symbolic Emergence of a Post- Cold War African Nation”. *American Behavioral Scientist*. SAGE Publications, 2012. Pg. 1336.

<sup>4</sup> Clark, Pg. 308.

<sup>5</sup> Youngs, pg, 112.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid, pg, 113.

<sup>7</sup> Rachel Hayman. “Going in the “Right” Direction? Promotion of Democracy in Rwanda since 1990”. *Taiwan Journal of Democracy*, Volume 5, No.1, 2009. Pg. 54.

<sup>8</sup> Stephen Brown. “Well, what can you expect?: donor officials' apologetics for hybrid regimes in Africa”. *Democratization*. (Routledge, Ottawa, 2011). Vol. 18 : 2. Pg. 516.

<sup>9</sup> Hayman, pg. 53.

Although the international community is generally considered to have shown apparent and even deliberate indifference when the killings transpired in 1994, foreign involvement joined the national efforts in the reconstruction of the country during the aftermath of the genocide. Rwanda was deeply harmed economic, social and politically after the horrific event, and had to be rebuilt. Peace, democracy and reconciliation were to be at the cornerstone of Rwanda's future. Among many other actors, it is the specific involvement of the European Union (EU) that is brought into focus in this thesis. The EU is an important international donor, deeply engaged with third countries and considered a normative power in world politics.<sup>10</sup> The Union claims to "be founded on a strong engagement to promote and protect human rights, democracy and rule of law worldwide".<sup>11</sup> It has been present in Rwanda since the late 1980s, and during these years of collaboration, efforts to promote good governance and democratic principles have been implemented.<sup>12</sup>

According to Hackenesch, whose classification model is applied in this thesis, there are three strategies the EU follows when implementing pro-democracy strategies in third countries: cooperation, criticism or confrontation. Over these years of collaboration, the three approaches have been applied to Rwanda. The EU criticised the country in the early 2000s, mainly due to the use of coercive practices by Kagame's administration against political opposition and the civil society. The Union employed an increasingly aggressive stance from 2012 onwards, when a clear confrontation strategy was adopted after the UN published a report accusing Rwanda of being actively involved in the RDC conflict.<sup>13</sup> On the contrary, a mere cooperative strategy was put in practice between 2005 and 2012. The cooperative approach implies a "reluctance to exert pressure but merely relies on political and aid-policy dialogues as well as democracy aid to support reforms".<sup>14</sup> In this case, the EU avoided the use of sanctions and criticism. However, at that moment, the government of Rwanda was employing several low-intensity coercion actions, such as the implementation of restrictive laws or the arrest of defecting RPF members.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Milja Kurki. "Political Economy Perspective" in *The substance of EU democracy promotion: Concepts and Cases*, ed. Anna Wetzel and Jan Orbie. (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015). Pg. 35.

<sup>11</sup> European Union External Action. "Human rights and democracy". Accessed 15 July, 2016. [http://www.eeas.europa.eu/human\\_rights/index\\_en.htm](http://www.eeas.europa.eu/human_rights/index_en.htm).

<sup>12</sup> "Political and economic relation". Delegation of the European Union to the Republic of Rwanda, EEAS. Accessed 30 April 2016. [http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/rwanda/eu\\_rwanda/political\\_economic\\_relations/index\\_en.htm](http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/rwanda/eu_rwanda/political_economic_relations/index_en.htm)

<sup>13</sup> Cristine Hackenesch. "It's Domestic Politics, Stupid! EU Democracy Promotion Strategies Meet African Dominant Party Regimes". *World Development*. Vol. 75, 2015. Pg. 91.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid*, pg. 89.

<sup>15</sup> Hackenesch, pg. 91.

The combination of these elements opens a discussion about the causes of switch in the strategy by the EU. Repressive regime survival practices were employed in Rwanda, nevertheless the EU took another approach this time. Simultaneously, similar situations of government repression in countries such as Guinea and Niger resulted in different responses from the EU during the same time frame.<sup>16</sup> Thus, the research question this thesis aims to answer is: *Why did the EU adopt a **cooperative** pro-democracy strategy in Rwanda from 2005 to 2012?*

The hypothesis of this thesis is that the levels of stability and development in Rwanda during 2005 – 2012 are the main reasons why the EU chose a cooperative strategy. This hypothesis relies on the instrumental variation sometimes present in democracy promotion. This paper understands instrumental variation by the EU as the use or non-use of sanctions to boost democracy depending on the interests of the EU or the specific circumstances of the recipient country.<sup>17</sup> As Karen del Biondo elaborates, “sanctions are more likely in the case of grave violations of democracy and human rights, in countries that are unstable and economically underperforming”.<sup>18</sup>

The time frame of this study is 2005 to 2012. The 2000s were a pivotal decade for Rwanda in terms of democratization. With the new millennium, and after the resignation of President Pasteur Bizimungu, Paul Kagame officially took office in Rwanda.<sup>19</sup> That same year, the Cotonou Agreement<sup>20</sup> was signed, establishing a new framework of collaboration between the EU and African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries.<sup>21</sup> During the transition period (1994 – 2003), the regime was unstable and the government faced constant internal opposition.<sup>22</sup> In the early 2000s, key members of the party defected and tensions between Tutsis arose, which represented a deep political crisis,<sup>23</sup> while the EU was applying a criticism strategy. The first Presidential elections were held, whose result

---

<sup>16</sup> Karen del Biondo. “Norms or Interests? Explaining Instrumental Variation in EU Democracy Promotion in Africa”. *Journal of Common Market Studies*. Volume 53. Number 2, 2015. Pg. 238.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid, pg. 237

<sup>18</sup> Ibid.

<sup>19</sup> “Kagame elected Rwandan president”. BBC News, 17 April 2000. Accessed 23 October 2016. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/africa/716861.stm>.

<sup>20</sup> The Cotonou Partnership Agreement is a treaty between 78 ACP countries and the EU aimed to be the framework for cooperation partnerships treaties during the period 2000 - 2020. Replacing the former Lomé Convention, the Cotonou Agreement had the objective of reducing poverty while focusing on human rights, democratic principles and the rule of law.

<sup>21</sup> Gordon Crawford. “The EU and Democracy Promotion in Africa: High on rhetoric, low on delivery?” in *EU development policy in a Changing World*, ed. Andrew Mold. Amsterdam University Press, 2007. Pg. 174.

<sup>22</sup> Filip Reyntjens. “Rwanda, ten years on: From genocide to dictatorship”. *African studies*. Royal African Society. Published 1 April 2004. Pg. 180.

<sup>23</sup> Reyntjens, pg. 181.

triggered expression of concerns from the EU due to “fraud, intimidation, manipulation of electoral lists, and lack of transparency in the counting procedure”<sup>24</sup>; Paul Kagame was the absolute winner with the 94% of the votes.<sup>25</sup> It is from 2005 when the regime finally stabilizes, partly thanks to the government efforts to avoid opposition<sup>26</sup> and criticism.<sup>27</sup> Here, the EU applied a cooperative strategy. But in 2012 the country faced renewed uncertainty when Kagame’s administration was accused by the United Nations to be actively involved in the DRC conflict.<sup>28</sup> The fact that the period 2005 – 2012 was politically more stable than the previous and the posterior periods is taken as an assumption in this thesis. This paper has selected this time frame owing to the stability of Rwanda during it, justifying the use of the cooperative approach by the EU. Thus, Rwanda is not compared in this thesis to its own past and post situations, but to two other African countries, Niger and Guinea, experiencing similar characteristics during the same time frame.

Coercive practices are another key element of this paper. An authoritarian regime uses different strategies to maintain its position of power, and ensure its political survival. Among others methods, coercion is one of the main practices authoritarian leaders use. Coercion involves formal and informal forms of intimidation of individuals, such as regime critics, or groups, such as the general civil society, along with restriction in the media’s and political opposition freedoms.<sup>29</sup> According to Levitsky & Way, governments can use high levels (brutal repression involving violence) or low levels of coercion (intimidation or media restrictions). As the paper will develop in following sections, the Rwandan government has used a wide range of techniques to secure its position, and its leader has been described by scholars such as Filip Reyntjens as “probably the worst war criminal in office today.”<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> Reyntjens, pg. 186.

<sup>25</sup> James Astill. “Rwandan leader wins 94% of vote”. *The Guardian*, 27 August 2003. Accessed 23 October 2016. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/aug/27/jamesastill>.

<sup>26</sup> The Democratic Republican Front (MDR), the main party in the opposition, was banned in 2003.

<sup>27</sup> Hackenesch., pg. 90.

<sup>28</sup> United Nations, Security Council. “Letter dated 12 November 2012 from the Chair of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1533 (2004) concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo addressed to the President of the Security Council “. S/2012/843. 15 November 2012. Pg. 3.

<sup>29</sup> Hackenesch, pg. 87.

<sup>30</sup> French, Howard. “The case against Rwanda’s president Paul Kagame”. *Newsweek*, 14 January 2010. Accessed 23 October 2016. <http://europe.newsweek.com/case-against-rwandas-president-paul-kagame-63167?rm=eu>.

## Literature review

This section presents a literature review on the existing scholarship relating to the topic of Rwanda and the EU's democracy promotion. Firstly, a general overview of EU democracy promotion will clarify the essence, motivation and characteristics of it. Secondly, attention will be paid to authoritarian regimes and how donors deal with them. Finally, a deeper look into the general democratization trends in Rwanda is undertaken.

### The European Union and Democracy promotion

In order to answer the research question, it is crucial to first understand how EU democratization strategy is conceived and contextualized.

When assessing aid in general terms, the EU is one of the major donors in the world and is considered a positive normative power in World Politics.<sup>31</sup> The reduction of poverty through the implementation of development programs is claimed to be its first objective, although the Union has diversified the distribution of aid by contributing to new sectors, such as democracy promotion. This is claimed to be one of the core objectives of the current EU development policy.<sup>32</sup> Democracy promotion is defined as "aid given with the explicit goal of advancing democracy overseas".<sup>33</sup>

A shift in priorities was implemented with the new century; democracy aid passed from being comparatively small in relative and absolute terms, to a considerable increase of its budgetary volume and range of instruments.<sup>34</sup> According to the OECD Development Assistance Creditor Database, the budget of pro-democracy EU aid to African countries increased from 3% in 1995 to 11% in 2010. This can be translated as an amount of USD 50 million to USD 550 million.<sup>35</sup>

The EU promotes human rights and democracy in third countries through its budget for foreign assistance. This budget is managed by the European Commission (EC) with its Development and Cooperation Aid office. However, the European External Action Service (EEAS), which coordinates EU foreign and security policy, the Parliament

---

<sup>31</sup> Kurki, pg. 35.

<sup>32</sup> European Commission - International Cooperation and Development. "Mission Statement". Accessed 22 January, 2016. [http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/mission-statement\\_en](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/mission-statement_en)

<sup>33</sup> Sarah Sunn Bush. "Introduction and argument". *The taming of democracy assistance: why democracy promotion does not confront dictators*. Cambridge University Press. 2015. Pg. 4.

<sup>34</sup> Hackensch, pg. 86.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid, pg. 94.



and the European Council also play a crucial role in contributing to the diplomatic mechanisms.<sup>36</sup> Subsequently, the EU as a whole is examined in this thesis.

### ***Perceptions on EU democracy promotion***

In order to understand how other actors and public opinion perceive its application, the perception of the policy is also important. EU democracy promotion raises different opinions among scholarship. Many are sceptical about the policy, such as Stephen Hurt in *Understanding EU Development Policy: history, global context and self-interest*. Hurt argues that since the EU development policy emanates from self-interest, trade is prioritized over democracy. Additionally, there is a lack of coherence between the member states' policies and the ones implemented by the Union.<sup>37</sup> Gorm Rye Olsen similarly argues that individual member states' interests in Africa differ from the EU common ones,<sup>38</sup> which can complicate the decision making. Furthermore, Olsen claims that the multiple references to "respect for human rights and democratic principles" made by the EU just serve to enhance its moral profile and reputation as a normative-oriented actor in the international framework. Lastly, it is said that self-interest designs the policy; opinion that is shared by Anne Wetzels and Jan Orbie. They locate security interests at the centre of the motivation to promote democracy. Wetzels and Orbie find support for the fact that security trumps democracy: if security is being threatened by democracy, this last will be undermined.<sup>39</sup> Thus, in the reviewed literature, democracy promotion is a controversial and highly criticized aspect of the European external policy.

The EU defines democracy promotion as "aid given with the explicit goal of advancing democracy overseas", which is a broad concept.<sup>40</sup> Likewise, the type of democracy that it is promoted is suspected to have a (neo)-liberal approach.<sup>41</sup> Gordon Crawford maintains that democracy promotion by the EU is exclusively aimed towards where the Union has economic interests. As a result, the policy is turned into an instrumental rather than a normative element. Crawford also argues that democracy in a

---

<sup>36</sup> Rosa Balfour. "European Union". *Supporting Democracy Abroad: An Assessment of Leading Powers*. The Freedom House, 2012. Pg. 1.

<sup>37</sup> Stephen R. Hurt. *Understanding EU Development Policy: history, global context and self-interest?* *Third World Quarterly*, 31:1, 2010. Pg. 159-168.

<sup>38</sup> Gorm Rye Olsen. "Changing European concerns: security and complex political emergencies instead of development" in *EU development cooperation: From model to symbol*, ed. Karin Arts and Anna K. Dickson. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004. Pg. 96.

<sup>39</sup> Wetzels, Anne and Orbie, Jan. "Introduction". *The substance of EU democracy promotion*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire : Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

<sup>40</sup> Sunn Bush. pg. 4.

<sup>41</sup> Kurki. pg. 38.

country cannot be imposed by external forces: the international actors promoting democracy should only have a supportive role in the process. The instrumental use of democracy promotion by the EU is equally studied by Karen Del Biondo. The reasons given by Del Biondo to justify this instrumental variation lead to the following conclusion: depending on EU interests in each recipient country, but also the specific circumstances surrounding each regime, the use of economic sanctions to boost democracy will be applied or not.

This section elucidates scholarly scepticism about the EU democracy promotion strategy. The supposed instrumentality of the policy, economic and security interests and the often used neo-liberal approach are the main critiques it receives. These general premises support the hypothesis that the EU adapted its democracy promotion strategy to the situation in Rwanda, in relation to the level of stability of the country.

Nevertheless, the framework under which this scholarship has analyzed the EU's democracy promotion suffers from an approach that is too general to allow for consistent conclusions about the case of Rwanda. Therefore, it is crucial to explore how the policy is applied in relation to authoritarian regimes like Rwanda.

### **Democracy promotion in authoritarian regimes**

It might seem self-evident that a pro-democracy policy will be implemented in countries with low democratic standards. Nevertheless, this category of countries might include weak democracies as well as established authoritarian regimes. The category and the specific circumstances surrounding the ruling regime in a country will determine the use of one strategy over another. It is important for this thesis to differentiate the different ways how democracy can be promoted, paying special attention to authoritarian regimes.

#### ***Democracy promotion strategies***

The attitude of the ruling government, the level of civil society liberties and the existence of a consistent opposition are some of the elements that can influence the strategy used by donors dealing with the implementation of democracy in authoritarian regimes. Donors contributing to democracy promotion can combine two approaches during this process: to reward or to punish. Both approaches involve methods differing

from diplomacy to economic sanctions or political conditionality<sup>42</sup>, among others.<sup>43</sup> In addition, sponsored activities and specific projects to promote democracy are implemented by actors such as government agencies, NGOs and multilateral institutions, with the goal of fostering democracy.<sup>44</sup>

### ***Authoritarian regimes' collaboration with democracy promoters***

Promotion of democracy by Western donors often faces reluctance from the governing parties where the democratic system has to be implemented. Some of these regimes might collaborate while others might not, depending on the circumstances. The new EU democracy aid agenda, implemented in 2000, incorporated new instruments and practices, such as aid coordination dialogs with the recipient countries. Consequently, engagement and collaboration of governments when designing aid strategies for each country, especially in Africa, is of paramount importance.<sup>45</sup>

Among the different authoritarianisms, this thesis pays particular attention to dominant party systems; this is the form of governance present in Rwanda under the RPF leadership. In this type of regimes, elections are held and other parties are partly permitted to exist, even though one main party has the complete control of the political arena. In these authoritarian regimes, political leaders naturally seek to maximize their chances to remain in office, and there is a clear relation between regime survival tactics and these governments' willingness to engage with external democracy promotion. The less opposition the regime faces, the more likely it is to accept democratic reforms.<sup>46</sup> The main reason why an authoritarian regime would collaborate with the EU in terms of democratization is to maintain other benefits it can receive from it, such as development aid.<sup>47</sup> This occurs when political conditionality is used as a mean to foster democracy. Political conditionality constitutes a key tool for democratization. However, some African leaders have learnt how to make the minimum required reforms in order to maintain their levels of aid without real democratic commitment<sup>48</sup>, by building a democratic façade. For

---

<sup>42</sup> Political conditionality is defined as “the explicit use of aid to impose political conditions on recipient countries”. Carolyn Baylies. “Political Conditionality and democratization”. *Review of African Political Economy*. ROAPE Publications Ltd. Vol. 65, 1995. Pg. 321.

<sup>43</sup> Sunn Bush., pg. 6.

<sup>44</sup> Sunn Bush, pg. 7.

<sup>45</sup> Hackenesch, pg. 86.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid, pg. 87.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid, pg. 88.

<sup>48</sup> Stephen Brown. “Foreign Aid and Democracy Promotion: Lessons from Africa”. *The European Journal of Development Research*. Vol.17, No.2, June 2005. Pg. 184.

example, they might allow other parties to exist, but never win; permit some independent press, without being entirely free; allow civil society to organize, but with high restrictions. These practices are used by these regimes as a proof of their implication with the implementation of reforms, while actually resisting democratization.<sup>49</sup> However, despite these implications, conditionality can also achieve the desired effects, since it constitutes a chance to open the political space and to give an opportunity to opposition, while raising the cost of continued authoritarian practices.<sup>50</sup>

### *EU pro-democracy response to authoritarian regimes*

Cristine Hackenesch argues that depending on the response an authoritarian regime gives to democracy promotion, the EU adopts one out of three different strategies: confrontation, criticism or cooperation (See table 1). The “confrontation” strategy involves budget support suspensions and sanctions, which can be applied under the Article 96 of the Cotonou Agreement. “Criticism” concerns “naming & shaming” or shifting aid funds. Public statements can be effective to harm the image of a regime, while the reallocation of aid to some specific sectors can be used to send a clear message about political aspects the EU does not side with. Finally, the “cooperation” approach, mostly employed when the government actively collaborates, relies on political dialogue and democratic aid to support reforms.<sup>51</sup>

Table 1. EU democracy promotion strategies.

Authoritarian domestic politics		EU strategy	Factors influencing EU strategy
Opposition challenge	Government response		
	<i>High-intensity coercion</i>		
<b>Mass Opposition</b>	Unwilling to engage with EU on political reforms	Confrontation	
	<i>Low-intensity coercion</i>		
<b>Elite defection and imminent challenge</b>	Reluctant engagement on political reforms	Criticism or cooperation	Geo-strategic, economic and security interests Development-policy goals and interests Domestic institutions and public opinion
	<i>Low-intensity coercion</i>		
<b>Elite defection but no imminent challenge</b>	Active engagement with EU on political reforms	Criticism or cooperation	

Source: Hackenesch., pg. 87.

<sup>49</sup> Brown, pg. 184.

<sup>50</sup> Brown, pg. 193.

<sup>51</sup> Hackenesch, pg. 88.

At the same time, the level of coercion the regime exerts towards opposition, public opinion or media, with the aim to maintain its position, also influences the EU strategy. High levels of coercion are not easily ignored, and the EU public opinion or member states are more likely to pressure the EU to respond against them.<sup>52</sup> However, low-intensity coercion permits the EU to be more flexible in choosing strategies, because the pressure from other actors is lower.<sup>53</sup> This is particularly relevant in those authoritarian regimes with a democratic façade like Rwanda, covering authoritarianism under democratic institutions or elections. In these cases, the EU is less likely to use confrontation strategies, because it is harder to decide whether the country is evolving to a democratic system or not.<sup>54</sup>

Other studies show that democracy assistance does not directly confront dictators, as it used to do in the 1980s.<sup>55</sup> Practices have transformed from challenging autocrats by supporting opposition parties and unions, to a less aggressive approach such as the support of technical programs to improve local governance.<sup>56</sup> Even in countries that have remained authoritarian for an extended time period, confrontational strategies have been generally replaced by activities that emphasize democracy. An illustrative example is a women's representation program: they do not inherently pose a threat for the dictator, but promote gender equality in politics, which is seen as necessary for democracy.<sup>57</sup> In some cases, authoritarian governments have profited from these practices. Democracy assistance programs can play a role into dictator's survival strategies: they can increase the regime's popularity among the population.<sup>58</sup> Therefore regime-compatible programs – not those that challenge the dictator - are more likely to survive. Yet, leaders in non-democratic countries generally try to avoid as much as possible democracy promotion and assistance when they constitute a threat for them, and they have mechanisms to do so, such as imposing legal restriction to foreign aid.<sup>59</sup>

This section has dealt with the topic of authoritarian regimes and democracy assistance. In sum, dealing with dictators is a sensitive task. Both sides' interests meet in the democratization strategies implemented by donors, which often have to be applied in collaboration with the recipient government. Although donors have tools to fight bad

---

<sup>52</sup> Hackenesch, pg. 89.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid.

<sup>54</sup> Ibid.

<sup>55</sup> Sunn Bush, pg.5.

<sup>56</sup> Ibid.

<sup>57</sup> Sunn Bush, pg. 22.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid pg. 23.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid, pg. 43.

practices used by these governments, new trends in democracy promotion avoid the confrontation of dictators when possible. Donors such as the EU adapt their strategies taking into account the domestic politics of the country, but also external elements such as the pressure they receive from other actors. This section is particularly relevant to understand why the EU behaves in a specific way while dealing with authoritarian regimes.

### **Democracy promotion in Rwanda**

Considering the special circumstances surrounding Rwanda, there are case-specific elements that need unravelling in order to draw a clear picture of the situation. These elements are the dominant party system present in the country, the post-genocide situation and the influence the Rwandan government has over aid.

#### ***Authoritarianism in Rwanda***

The “third wave of democratization” in Africa, in the early 1990s, did not hit Rwanda as expected but rather led the country towards authoritarianism in the form of a dominant party system.<sup>60</sup> Rwanda was rebuilt during the transition period under the leadership of the RPF after 1994. In 2000 after the resignation of President Pasteur Bizimungu, Paul Kagame replaced him as president, although he had already been the *de facto* leader of the country for years.<sup>61</sup> Ever since, the RPF controls the political arena in Rwanda, and does not allow real opposition to exist. Elections are held, although they are marred by numerous irregularities, such as the imprisonment of main opposition candidates, as it happened in 2003 and 2010 presidential elections.<sup>62</sup> The ruling party does not tolerate criticism by civil society organizations, other parties or media,<sup>63</sup> and exerts coercion to potential threats to the regime<sup>64</sup>, such as defecting members of the elite.<sup>65</sup> Critics are often persecuted for “genocide ideology” charges<sup>66</sup> and civil liberties are limited.

---

<sup>60</sup> Hackenesch, pg. 85.

<sup>61</sup> “Kagame elected Rwandan president”. BBC News, 17 April 2000. Accessed 23 October 2016. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/africa/716861.stm>.

<sup>62</sup> Brown pg. 516.

<sup>63</sup> Ibid.

<sup>64</sup> Rice, Xan. “Rwandan opposition leader found dead”. *The guardian*, 14 July 2010. Accessed 26 October 2016. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2010/jul/14/rwanda-opposition-politician-found-dead>.

<sup>65</sup> Garrison, Ann. “Kagame arrests Rwandan presidential candidate Bernard Ntaganda”. *Digital Journal*, 24 June 2010. Accessed 26 October 2016. <http://www.digitaljournal.com/article/293800>.

<sup>66</sup> Brown, pg. 516.

### ***The post-conflict situation in Rwanda***

The post-conflict situation in Rwanda is a relevant element not to be disregarded, although this analysis starts more than ten years after the genocide. Political theorists, such as Huntington or Machiavelli, are generally sceptical about the likeliness of democracy arising after a civil war.<sup>67</sup> Post-war democratization is considered a new field, because it joins two previously existing areas: transition from authoritarianism to democracy and transition from war to peace. The researchers involved in a project called *External Democracy Promotion in Post-Conflict Zones: Evidence from Case Studies* by the Free University of Berlin, claim that it is possible that the factors affecting a mere transition to democracy might change in a post-conflict setting. Success in these cases might be disaggregated: it can be translated as an “absence of war” or regarding to the “democratic quality of the regime”.<sup>68</sup> In Rwanda, the genocide marked a rupture in the pro-democracy aid agenda that was led by the Arusha Accords, and the existing external democratic pressures were postponed in favour to the application of urgent humanitarian measures to support those affected by the violence, and reach reconciliation.<sup>69</sup> In consequence, this thesis understands stability as an absence of war, in comparison to Rwanda’s past or other countries in the region.

### ***Rwandan control of aid and the genocide credit***

The Rwandan government is considered to have a strong ownership in the implementation of aid strategies<sup>70</sup>, and also to be able to lead the aid coordination process with positive results.<sup>71</sup> Rwanda has exceptional control over aid compared to other African countries such as Ghana, Mali or Mozambique<sup>72</sup>. This is partly thanks to the use the country makes of Western feelings of guilt for not intervening during the genocide, which has allowed considerable independence from donors.<sup>73</sup>

Rwanda is considered a regime not to be pushed, and the “genocide credit” is often used as an excuse to legitimize the government, while also serving as resistance to criticisms. Although Hayman concludes that “Rwanda is continuing down a path toward

---

<sup>67</sup> Christoph Zuercher. “An Introduction To The Project” in *External Democracy Promotion in Post-Conflict Zones: Evidence from Case Studies: Rwanda*. Rachel Hayman. Freie Universität Berlin. 2010. Pg. I.

<sup>68</sup> Zuercher, pg. II.

<sup>69</sup> Rachel Hayman. “Going in the “Right” Direction? Promotion of Democracy in Rwanda since 1990”. *Taiwan Journal of Democracy*, Volume 5, No.1, 2009. pg. 64.

<sup>70</sup> Rachel Hayman. “From Rome to Accra via Kigali: Aid effectiveness in Rwanda”. *Development policy review*. Vol. 27:5. 2009. Pg. 581.

<sup>71</sup> M. Carbone. "Between EU Actorness And Aid Effectiveness: The Logics Of EU Aid To Sub-Saharan Africa". *International Relations* 27 (3), 2003. Pg. 349.

<sup>72</sup> Hayman, pg. 591.

<sup>73</sup> Hackenesch, pg. 90.

democracy”<sup>74</sup>, she agrees with Stephen Brown and Andreas Schedler in defining the government as a “hegemonic electoral authoritarian regime”, where elections are held even though they are considered to be fraudulent. Likewise, the regime is also a “dominant party system”, since one political party, the RPF, dominates the political terrain. Brown points out that Western governments often tend to maintain support to sub-Saharan countries lacking real democratic systems. With regards to this, the Rwandan case is presented in his article *Well, what can you expect?: donor officials’ apologetics for hybrid regimes in Africa*, where according to them, criticism is not tolerated and the “genocide ideology” is with ease used against those challenging the regime<sup>75</sup>, under the generally permissive look of these Western donors. The genocide credit is a relevant element which could give an alternative answer to the research question of this study. However, it has been disregarded due to the complexity of its quantification.

---

<sup>74</sup> Hayman, pg. 74.

<sup>75</sup> Brown., pg. 516.



## **Theoretical framework**

This thesis analyzes the reasons why the EU used a cooperative pro-democracy strategy during a specific period of time in Rwanda, given the circumstances that were taking place. The following theoretical framework serves to guide the answering of the research question by narrowing down the research while providing a theoretical pathway. This section first presents the EU-Rwanda relation terms, and the democratization strategies classification, followed by the time frame. Finally, the comparison with Guinea and Niger is contextualized with an explanation of the indicators to be compared.

The two actors involved in the research question are the EU and the Government of Rwanda. On the one hand, the EU is a supranational organization which, among many other activities, provides pro-democracy support to third countries. On the other hand, the country of Rwanda, one of the EU aid recipient countries, is an authoritarian regime. The relation between the EU and Rwanda is an important aspect to understand why the EU used a specific democratization strategy. In the previous section, the literature review has provided the clues about this relation. The programs towards Rwanda are designed and implemented by the EC, which is the executive body of the Union. Simultaneously, the Parliament, the Council and the member states also contribute to external relations by carrying out diplomatic actions. Due to scope, this study focuses on the EU as whole, disregarding the activities member states have performed individually.

Christine Hackenesch's model to classify EU pro-democracy strategies is applied. Hackenesch divides the possible response the EU gives to support democratic reforms in three strategies: confrontation, criticism and cooperation. As developed in the literature review, the three concern the use of different actions by the EU. For each period of time, it is possible to determine which strategy was used, in accordance with Hackenesch's criteria. This classification is used in this analysis, as a clear way to differentiate and compare different countries and periods.

The contemporary history of Rwanda is divided in three periods in this study: 1994 - 2004, 2005 - 2012, and 2012 onwards. After the genocide in 1994, the country passed through a transition period that lasted for nine years, until 2003. Under the control of the RPF, the main Tutsi political party in Rwanda, the country recovered from the former dramatic situation. However, during those uncertain years the regime faced constant

opposition and instability.<sup>76</sup> From 2005 under the leadership of Paul Kagame, who was officially president after 2003 elections,<sup>77</sup> the regime stabilized, in part thanks to the application of tactics to prevent opposition<sup>78</sup> and criticism.<sup>79</sup> This stability remained until 2012, when Rwanda was accused by the UN to be involved in the RDC conflict.<sup>80</sup> The set of years between 2005 and 2012 constitutes the time frame scrutinized in this thesis.<sup>81</sup> The fact that this demarcated time was more stable than the recent previous and future years in Rwanda is taken as an assumption which is supported by scholarship, thus Rwanda is not compared to itself before or after that period. On the contrary, in order to determine if stability and development could be the main reasons why the EU employed a cooperative strategy, the situation in the country is compared to that of two African countries: Niger and Guinea.

Guinea and Niger have been chosen as relevant countries to be compared to Rwanda. As well as Rwanda, these countries were considered not to be “free” by international non-governmental organizations such as the Freedom House and, in turn, their respective governments have put in practice undemocratic practices, in a higher or lower intensity.<sup>82</sup> In the three countries, the EU has contributed to the promotion of democracy during this specific period of time. However, unlike Rwanda, Niger and Guinea received a confrontation strategy by the EU, entailing the explicit use of political and economic sanctions.<sup>83</sup> Thus, the different treatment by the EU is relevant for the decision of including these two countries as part of the analysis.

Stability and development are the two key aspects of the hypothesis of this study: the EU employed a cooperative strategy because of the levels of stability and development present in Rwanda during that period. Considering the specific context of the country, the concept of stability is related to security and order. Rwanda’s own history of conflict and the favourable comparison with other countries in the region, such as the DRC, determines

---

<sup>76</sup> Reyntjens, pg. 180.

<sup>77</sup> James Astill. “Rwandan leader wins 94% of vote”. *The Guardian*, 27 August 2003. Accessed 23 October 2016. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/aug/27/jamesastill>.

<sup>78</sup> The Democratic Republican Front (MDR), the main party in the opposition, was banned in 2003.

<sup>79</sup> Hackenesch., pg. 90.

<sup>80</sup> United Nations, Security Council. “Letter dated 12 November 2012 from the Chair of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1533 (2004) concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo addressed to the President of the Security Council “. S/2012/843. 15 November 2012. Pg. 3.

<sup>81</sup> Data is taken from 2005 until 2011 included, because 2012 constitutes the inflexion point in the change of approach by the EU. In consequence, data collected about 2012 is not representative.

<sup>82</sup> Del Biondo, pg. 242 -244.

<sup>83</sup> Del Biondo, pg. 242.

what can be understood as stability.<sup>84</sup> Thus, in this thesis, stability is measured by the number of internal conflicts and number of deaths in the country. This information is taken from the UCDP Conflict Encyclopedia, an online conflict database from Uppsala University, which is considered one of the most accurate data-sources on armed conflicts.<sup>85</sup>

In order to test development, regardless of the level of democracy, economic growth and the human development index have been looked at. The average GDP growth experienced during the years under study is used; growth is by itself an indicator of development. Also, scholars suggest that economic growth is partly caused by stability<sup>86</sup>, which makes this indicator even more relevant for this study due to the positive correlation between the two elements. This is explained by the fact that higher levels of stability trigger higher levels of government spending, foreign investment and literacy among the population.<sup>87</sup> The second indicator, the Human development index (HDI), considers three key dimensions of human development: a long and healthy life, access to knowledge and a decent standard of living. Even though these indicators show the broad picture, they provide with a standard to compare the general stability and development situation in these countries.

---

<sup>84</sup> Brown, pg. 519.

<sup>85</sup> Uppsala Conflict Data Program - UCDP Conflict Encyclopedia: [www.ucdp.uu.se](http://www.ucdp.uu.se), Uppsala University.

<sup>86</sup> Ranmali Abeyasinghe. "Democracy, Political Stability, and Developing Country Growth: Theory and Evidence" (2004). Honors Projects. Paper 17. Pg. 31.

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid*, pg. 25.

## Method

A comparative case study is used to test the hypothesis of this thesis: the levels of stability and development in Rwanda during 2005 – 2012 are the main reasons why the EU chose a cooperative strategy. One of the assumptions of this thesis is that Rwanda was more stable during the period 2005 – 2012 than the recent previous and following years. As a consequence, in order to answer the research question, Rwanda is not compared to itself, but to other countries within the same time frame: Niger and Guinea. The hypothesis of this thesis could be valid if Rwanda turns out to be more stable and with higher levels of development than Niger and Guinea.

Human rights reports annually published by non-governmental organizations, such as the Freedom House, has been used to assess the democratic situation in these three countries during the specific period of 2005-2012. The EU actions in each country have been acknowledged in EU official reports, such as the EC human rights reports.<sup>88</sup> These documents describe the activities carried out by the EU in third countries and the specific distribution of the funds. The official EU press release data base, secondary sources and scholarship on the topic have been also widely used. Following Hackenesch's classification, each strategy has been classified as cooperation, criticism or confrontation.

The democratic situation and the strategy that the EU used in every country is firstly described, followed by a comparison of the three indicators defined in the previous section. Due to scope, the standard indicators are compared without disaggregation, which permits a general comparison between countries. This is particularly relevant for the HDI, which contains several different sub indicators that provide more specific information in different areas. In this study, the HDI as a whole has been used.

## Comparative case study – Niger, Guinea and Rwanda

The EU has been intensely promoting democracy since the signature of the Cotonou Agreement in 2000. With this agreement, the efforts in the promotion of human rights and democracy were intensified, bringing a new framework under which the EU has been applying pro-democracy strategies to third countries with the apparent aim of enhancing the democratic standards worldwide.

Nevertheless, some argue that this promotion has been partly characterized by instrumental variation; critics affirm that the Union has been applying different approaches to very similar situations, depending on the circumstances. Rwanda is one of the recipient African countries in which the EU has operated democratization strategies. The African country is an authoritarian state where coercive practices and repression have been exerted to diverse sectors of the population, such as the political opposition or regime critics, whilst several incidents and undemocratic practices have been acknowledged by the international community without much reaction. Nevertheless, for the time frame under study, the EU did not confront the authoritarian regime but employed a collaborative approach instead. On the contrary, the approach taken in other countries, such as Niger and Guinea, was based on confrontation, albeit the elements involved were similar in the three scenarios. *Why did the EU choose not to confront the government of Rwanda from 2005 to 2012?*

Human and political rights had been violated by the coercive practices Paul Kagame's administration used against Rwandans. An aggressive aid strategy from a big donor such as the EU could have helped avoiding these tactics, by applying pressure with the implementation of sanctions or the shift on aid. Yet, the EU took a collaborative approach.

The hypothesis of this study claims that one of the reasons why the EU decided to use a cooperation strategy instead of a confrontation one is because of the levels of stability and development Rwanda enjoyed during those years, especially if this is compared to the situation before and right after the genocide in 1994. The relatively good economical, but mostly peaceful situation in the country could be the reason why the EU was reluctant to apply sanctions. The fact that Rwanda was stable during 2005-2012 is an assumption in this study, so the comparison with Guinea and Niger helps determining if indeed this stability could have influenced the EU in its decision at that moment.

The following section compares Rwanda to two other African countries: Niger and Guinea. An overview about both countries is presented, with the aim to provide context and understand the similarities and differences between them.

## **Guinea, Niger and Rwanda – An overview (2005-2012)**

### **Guinea**

Guinea has officially enjoyed multiparty democracy since 1991, when the system was implemented by its President Lansana Conté. However, rules were quickly adapted in his favour, so he could extend his rule.<sup>89</sup> He finally stayed in power until his death.

The strategy used to force his stay in office was criticized by the EU since its application. In 2004, Article 96 consultations were opened, which constituted the first step to apply sanctions. Effectively, the aid budget was drastically reduced by €65 millions in 2005<sup>90</sup>. Progress towards democratization was made again in 2006, and in consequence the EU reconsidered and cancelled the imposed sanctions.

The scenario changed again in 2008 when Lansana Conté died, and a military junta took power.<sup>91</sup> To counter this move, the EU re-opened the Article 96 consultation hence sanctions were re-imposed. In addition to that, in 2009 a dramatic incident concerning the killing of 160 people by the security forces, in an opposition rally, triggered a drastic response from the EU.<sup>92</sup> The attack was condemned as a “gross violation of human rights” and measures were applied: a strict weapons embargo, more sanctions and the suspension of the fisheries agreement.<sup>93</sup>

The democratic progress improved in 2010, with presidential elections which led to the victory of Alpha Condé; the election was deemed legit by international observers.<sup>94</sup> It

---

<sup>89</sup> Del Biondo, pg. 242.

<sup>90</sup> European Commission. “Communication from the Commission to the Council: concerning the opening of consultations with the Republic of Guinea under Article 96 of the Cotonou Agreement”. *EUR-Lex*. Brussels, 26 July 2003. Pg 2 – 5.

<sup>91</sup> Peter Walker. “Army steps in after Guinea president Lansana Conté dies”. *The Guardian*, 23 December 2008. Accessed 20 December 2016. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2008/dec/23/guinea-dictator-lansana-conte-dies>.

<sup>92</sup> Ed Butler. “Guinea's military junta imports arms despite embargo”. *The Guardian*, 2 November 2009. Accessed 15 January 2017. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2009/nov/02/guinea-imports-arms-despite-embargo>

<sup>93</sup> Mohamed Saliou Camara. “International Sanctions”, *Historical Dictionary of Guinea*. (Maryland, Scarcrow Press, 2014). Pg. 178.

<sup>94</sup> The Freedom House. “Freedom in the world 2011: Guinea”. Accessed 15 January 2017. <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2011/guinea>.

was the first peaceful rotation of power in Guinea. Nevertheless some of the sanctions applied in 2009 remained in place until 2014.<sup>95</sup>

## **Niger**

Niger enjoyed relatively good standards of democracy until 2009, when the President Tandja proposed a change in the constitution to allow the extension of presidential and term limits. After the negative response from the Parliament and the Court, the President dissolved these institutions and called for a referendum on the new constitution, which passed exceeding the 90% of the votes. In 2009, Presidential elections were held, and Tandja successfully remained in power.<sup>96</sup> As a response, the same year the EU suspended part of the budgetary aid, and Article 96 consultations were opened.<sup>97</sup> However, a coup d'état in 2010 shifted the leadership to a military junta. Under the new ruling, elections were organized, following relatively free and democratic international standards. In 2011 the EU resumed aid, after the new President Issoufou was elected.<sup>98</sup>

## **Rwanda**

The democratization process in Rwanda started in 1993 with the Arusha accords. After the civil war and the genocide, the RPF ruled Rwanda acting as the transitional government until 2003, when they officially reached power following Paul Kagame's victory in the Presidential elections. However, irregularities and undemocratic practices (such as intimidation to the opposition or lack of competition) were denounced during the 2008 and 2010 elections<sup>99</sup>. In 2008, for instance, international observers noted that the government even downplayed the real result from 98% to 76% to seem more democratic.<sup>100</sup> Formal and informal practices to remain in power were applied during Kagame's mandate. Nevertheless, the EU did not react to the violations and remained cooperative with the government during that period.<sup>101</sup> Neither sanctions nor criticisms

---

<sup>95</sup> Del Biondo, pg. 423.

<sup>96</sup> C. Hartmann. "Leverage and linkage: how regionalism shapes regime dynamics in Africa" in *Democratization and competitive Authoritarianism in Africa*. Eds. Matthijs Bogaards and Sebastian Elischer. (Springer, Hamburg, 2007).Pg. 91.

<sup>97</sup> Council of the European Union. "Opening of Consultations with the Republic of Niger under Article 96 of the Cotonou Agreement". *Press release database*. Brussels, 8 December 2009.

<sup>98</sup> European Commission - International Cooperation and Development. "Guinea". Accessed 15 January, 2017. [https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/countries/niger\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/countries/niger_en).

<sup>99</sup> Parliamentary elections took place in 2008 Presidential in 2010.

<sup>100</sup> Hackenesch, pg 90.

<sup>101</sup> Ibid, pg. 91.

were adopted, and aid was even increased by 30% in 2007, and a second 30% in 2009.<sup>102</sup> In 2012, Rwanda was considered by the EU as an “example of process made in recent years in good governance, sustainable development and the fight against poverty and hunger”.<sup>103</sup>

As the overview about the three countries show, the situations during the 2005-2012 time frame differ from one another. Unlike Rwanda, Niger and Guinea received some sort of confrontational action from the EU. Formal aid suspensions were adopted in Niger in 2009, and politico-economical sanctions were repeatedly applied in Guinea. In contrast, Rwanda did not receive sanctions or criticisms from the Union, and was twice (2007 and 2009) rewarded with an increase of aid during the same period, despite the fact that similar violations of human rights and democracy were taking place in the country.

It can be concluded that Niger and Guinea received a confrontation strategy from the EU, while it remained cooperative with Rwanda for that period. The following section presents the comparison of stability and development, followed by a sum of conclusions about the results.

## **Comparative case study – Stability & Development**

The analytical part of this thesis is carried out through a comparative case study of Niger, Guinea and Rwanda. The two areas compared are stability and development. The first is measured considering the number of internal conflicts and deaths induced by the state or violent organized groups in the country. The second looks at the HDI evolution and the GDP growth during the demarcated years.

### **Stability**

The concept of stability relates to security and order in this thesis, due to Rwanda’s background in violence and internal conflict. Following this, the number of internal violent conflicts in addition to the number of deaths per year is used as indicator to determine how stable each country was for a specific year. The UCDP Conflict Encyclopedia, which has been used as the main source, defines three kinds of violence: State-based, One-sided or Non-state based violence.

---

<sup>102</sup> European Commission - International Cooperation and Development. "Rwanda". Accessed 15 January, 2017. [http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/countries/rwanda\\_en](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/countries/rwanda_en).

<sup>103</sup> Hackenesch, pg 91.



Only violence exerted by the government or other organized violent groups are considered as relevant indicators of stability, thus *Non-state based violence* is disregarded in this study.<sup>104</sup> On the one hand, *State-based violence* refers to the use of armed force by the government to any other actor in the country. On the other hand, *One-sided violence* is “the use of armed force by the government of a state or by a formally organized group against civilians, which results in at least 25 deaths in a year”.<sup>105</sup> The number of conflicts looks at the number of internal isolated violent incidents, resulting or not in deaths. These can last for one or more days, but they can be counted as a single event.

Table 2. Number of conflicts and deaths in Rwanda, Niger and Guinea (2005-2011)

Country/Year	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Total
<b>Rwanda</b>								
# Conflicts	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
# Deaths	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
<b>Niger</b>								
# Conflicts	0	0	22	13	0	0	0	35
# Deaths	0	0	98	56	0	0	0	154
<b>Guinea</b>								
# Conflicts	1	7	21	0	3	1	1	34
# Deaths	3	15	45	0	160	1	25	249

Source: *Uppsala Conflict Data Program - UCDP Conflict Encyclopedia: [www.ucdp.uu.se](http://www.ucdp.uu.se), Uppsala University.*

As observed in table 2, during the analyzed period there are relevant differences between the levels of violence in the three countries.

Guinea experienced recurring episodes of violence, causing casualties every year except for 2008. In 2009, a group of official security forces killed 160 people during an opposition rally, causing the most lethal episode in Guinea within this period<sup>106</sup>; the event triggered sanctions by the EU. In sum, 249 people died between 2005-2012 in Guinea because of State or One-sided violence, the highest rate among the three countries.

On the contrary, violence in Niger was concentrated in 2007 and 2008. After a decade of relative peace between the government and groups of ethnic Tuareg rebels, conflict broke out again in 2007. Active confrontation lasted for two years, mainly caused

<sup>104</sup> This is in order to filter out the influence of non-state groups which are not within the scope of this paper.

<sup>105</sup> Uppsala Conflict Data Program - UCDP Conflict Encyclopedia. Definitions. Uppsala University. [http://www.pcr.uu.se/research/ucdp/definitions/#One-sided\\_violence](http://www.pcr.uu.se/research/ucdp/definitions/#One-sided_violence)

<sup>106</sup> The Freedom House. Freedom in the World 2010: Guinea. Accessed 15 January 2017. <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2010/guinea>

by the unfair distribution of natural resources.<sup>107</sup> Albeit no more casualties due to internal conflict took place after 2007, these two years caused the death of 154 people, in 35 different episodes of violence.

Rwanda suffered two casualties during the period 2005-2011, resulting from a violent incident in 2009. From this comparison, it is observed that the country is by far the less violent, and in consequence assumed the more stable among the three states. This conclusion supports the hypothesis of this thesis.

## Development

Development is the other area this thesis takes into account in order to determine why the EU did not use a confrontation strategy towards Rwandan between 2005 and 2012. The HDI and the GDO growth (and its variation over years) are the two objective indicators used in this analysis that help illustrate the level of development these countries enjoyed during the time frame.

The first indicator used to analyze development is HDI. The following table shows the data per year and the variation between 2005 and 2011. Variation in this case is essential to understand and compare how the HDI has evolved.

Table 3. HDI and its variation in Rwanda, Guinea and Niger.

Country/Year	2005	2008	2010	2011	Variation
<b>Rwanda</b>	0.391	0.432	0.453	0.464	<b>+18,7%</b>
<b>Guinea</b>	0.358	0.377	0.388	0.399	<b>+11,45%</b>
<b>Niger</b>	0.289	0.309	0.326	0.333	<b>+15,2%</b>

Source: *United Nations Development Programme. Human development Data.* <http://hdr.undp.org/en/data>

Due to their low position in the HDI international ranking, Niger, Guinea and Rwanda are part of the Low Human Development countries. However, from 2000, Rwanda had a relatively higher position in relation to Niger and Guinea, which corresponded to a higher level of human development. Likewise, even though the three countries had a positive trend, Rwanda was the state with a higher variation between 2005 and 2012, with an increase of 18,7%. Among the three, Rwanda is the country with higher and better evolution of HDI for the period 2005-2012, which supports the hypothesis.

<sup>107</sup> The Freedom House. *Freedom in the World 2008.* Accessed 15 January 2017. <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2009/niger>

The GDP growth is the second indicator to test development. Growth helps understanding the level of economic development a country enjoys in a given year. The following table presents the annual growth, in addition to the average growth per country, between 2005 and 2011.

Table 4. Annual GDP growth and average for 2005 – 2011.

Country/GDP %	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Average %
<b>Rwanda</b>	6.91	9.23	7.61	11.16	6.27	7.31	7.85	<b>8.04</b>
<b>Guinea</b>	3	2.5	1.76	4.94	-0.28	1.94	3.91	<b>2.53</b>
<b>Niger</b>	4.5	5.8	3.15	9.59	-0.71	8.37	2.31	<b>4.71</b>

Source: *The World Bank data bank. GDP growth (annual %).*

Every year, except for 2010, Rwanda had the highest levels of growth, which is reflected in the total average for the period, being 8.4%: this supports the hypothesis of this thesis. The difference in growth was partly caused by the negative growth Guinea and Niger experienced in 2009. Scholars defend that stability directly affects development<sup>108</sup>; hence this negative figures in 2009 might be explained by the period of instability and violence both countries suffered during that year, as it has been presented in the previous section.

## Summary of the comparison

The previous section has compared three relevant indicators in order to analyze the situation and performance of Niger, Guinea and Rwanda. In the three cases, Rwanda is the country with better results in stability and development: it experienced the lowest levels of violence and the higher evolution of HDI and GDP growth. Hence, these results support the hypothesis.

Violence in Rwanda (deaths and isolated violent events) was particularly low in comparison to Niger and Guinea: 2 deaths against 154 and 249 respectively. Although Niger seemed to be peaceful throughout most of the period, it reached a peak of violence between 2007 and 2008. Meanwhile, Guinea suffered regular violent episodes over these years. This important difference might confirm that Rwanda was significantly much more stable than the other two African countries for the same set of years.

---

<sup>108</sup> Abeyasinghe, pg, 31.

In terms of development, the GDP growth average was also much higher in Rwanda during that period: 8.4%. This represents double the rate of Niger, and almost four times Guinea's.

Despite being part of the Low Human Development countries, Rwanda held the highest position in the HDI ranking among the three countries. This means that life expectancy, access to knowledge and general standards of living were superior to the ones in Niger and Guinea, which might be translated into a higher level of development. The variation through these years is also more significant: 18,7%, meaning that these aforementioned elements experienced a better progression in Rwanda than in the other two countries.

## Conclusion

It is acknowledged from scholarship that international organizations applying pro-democracy strategies in third countries might confront authoritarian regimes when human rights are violated, with the application of different mechanisms to criticize or confront that can force governments to stop these violations. This paper has aimed to explain why the EU used a cooperative strategy in Rwanda during the period 2005 – 2012, despite the coercive practices the government was using to maintain power.

The hypothesis presented in this thesis states that the EU applied a collaborative pro-democracy strategy in Rwanda partly due to its positive levels of stability and development. In the previous sections, the hypothesis has been proven: Rwanda has been compared to two other African countries, Niger and Guinea, which share a similar situation but which received a confrontation strategy from the EU instead.

The completed analysis has concluded that Rwanda was not only more stable and developed in comparison to its own past and future years, but also to other similar countries; Rwanda enjoyed relevantly higher levels of stability and development during the understudied period than Niger and Guinea. Rwanda presented the best results in all the three indicators considered in this study: levels of violence, GDP growth and variation of the HDI. Violence was almost inexistent during this set of years, and growth was positive and sustainable. These results support the hypothesis of this thesis: stability and development were main reasons why the EU decided not to confront the government and take a cooperative approach instead.

This study proposes the abovementioned explanation as a potential answer for the research questions of this thesis. However, due to the inherent limitations of research and the limited word count, other factors may also contribute to the answer.

The fact that the government of Rwanda was predominantly adopting low-intensity forms of coercion instead of high-intensity ones could support the hypothesis too. This is because in these cases the EU can be more flexible in deciding which strategy to use, due to the lower pressure it might receive from other actors, such as its member states or civil society.<sup>109</sup> This eases the overlook of human rights violations, particularly if other priorities or interests are involved. However, due to scope, the classification of high or low intensity coercion has not been in the comparison: it has been acknowledged from secondary

---

<sup>109</sup> Hackenesch, pg. 89.

sources that coercion practices from the government were used in the three countries, without looking at the intensity of the techniques. Further research could consider this element to reach more accurate conclusions.

This study has focused its research on three indicators, while disregarding other elements that could similarly be relevant. For instance, the *genocide credit*, which can be basically described as an informal sympathy from Western countries towards Rwanda due to the lack of reaction during the genocide, is an interesting element that could also explain EU decisions. However, the difficulty of quantifying this as an objective indicator has been the cause of its exclusion from this paper. In addition, the fact that Rwanda generally has an exceptional control over aid compared to other nations<sup>110</sup> and considerable independence from donors<sup>111</sup> could also be relevant to explain donors' actions in this country. Likewise, this has not been included in this paper due to scope.

Other approaches could be applied in further research. Some of the indicators used in this thesis, such as the HDI or the GDP growth, can be disaggregated, which would allow a more in depth analysis and more precise conclusions. Moreover, a more extensive comparison between other African nations having suffered from similar dramatic episodes could also shed light on the reasons or motivations donors might have when dealing with this specific kind of recipient countries.

Early in 2012, the EU publicly stated that Rwanda was an “example of progress [...] in good governance, sustainable development and the fight against poverty and hunger”.<sup>112</sup> Later the same year, the EU “partially froze its financial support to the east African nation, dealing what may had been the heaviest blow yet to president Paul Kagame”.<sup>113</sup> The conclusions reached in this thesis might be a starting point on the explanation of why this did not happen before.

---

<sup>110</sup> Hayman, pg. 591.

<sup>111</sup> Hackenesch, pg. 90.

<sup>112</sup> Ibid, pg 91.

<sup>113</sup> David Smith. “EU partially freezes aid to Rwanda”. *The Guardian*, 27 September 2012. Accessed 15 January 2017. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2012/sep/27/eu-partially-freezes-aid-to-rwanda>

## Bibliography

Abeyasinghe, Ranmali, "Democracy, Political Stability, and Developing Country Growth: Theory and Evidence". *Honors Projects*. Paper 17, 2004.

Astill, James. "Rwandan leader wins 94% of vote". *The Guardian*, 27 August 2003. Accessed, 23 October 2016. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/aug/27/jamesastill>.

Balfour, Rosa. "European Union". Supporting Democracy Abroad: An Assessment of Leading Powers. *The Freedom House*, 2012. Pg. 1-6.

Baylies, Carolyn. "Political Conditionality and democratisation". *Review of African Political Economy*. Roape Publications Ltd. Vol. 65, 1995. Pg. 321-337.

BBC News. "Kagame elected Rwandan president", 17 April 2000. Accessed 23 October 2016. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/africa/716861.stm>.

BBC News. "Rwandan journalist Charles Ingabire killed in Uganda", 2 December 2011. Accessed 26 October 2016. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-16012659>.

Biondo, Karen. "Norms or Interests? Explaining Instrumental Variation in EU Democracy Promotion in Africa". *Journal of Common Market Studies*. Volume 53. Number 2, 2015. Pg. 237–254.

Brown, Stephen. "Foreign Aid and Democracy Promotion: Lessons from Africa". *The European Journal of Development Research*. Vol.17, No.2, June 2005. Pg. 179–198.

Brown, Stephen. "“Well, what can you expect?”: donor officials' apologetics for hybrid regimes in Africa". *Democratization*. Roudledge, Ottawa, 2011. Vol. 18 : 2. Pg 512–534.

Butler, Ed. "Guinea's military junta imports arms despite embargo". *The Guardian*, 2 November 2009. Accessed 15 January 2017. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2009/nov/02/guinea-imports-arms-despite-embargo>.

Carbone, M. "Between EU Actorness And Aid Effectiveness: The Logics Of EU Aid To Sub-Saharan Africa". *International Relations* 27 (3), 2003. Pg. 341-355.

Clark, Phil. "After genocide: democracy in Rwanda, 20 years on". *Juncture*, vol. 20, 2014. Pg. 308 - 311.

Council of the European Union. "EU Annual Report on Human Rights 2006". Brussels, 29 January 2007.

Council of the European Union. "EU Annual Report on Human Rights 2007". Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 2007.

Council of the European Union. "EU Annual Report on Human Rights 2008". Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 2008.

Council of the European Union. "EU Annual Report on Human Rights and Democracy in the World in 2005". Adopted on 03 October 2005. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 2005.

Council of the European Union. "Opening of Consultations with the Republic of Niger under Article 96 of the Cotonou Agreement". *Press release database*. Brussels, 8 December 2009.

Crawford, Gordon. "The EU and Democracy Promotion in Africa" in *EU Development Policy in a Changing World*, ed. Andrew Mold. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University press, 2007.

Delegation of the European Union to the Republic of Rwanda, EEAS. "Political and economic relation". Accessed 30 April 2016. [http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/rwanda/eu\\_rwanda/political\\_economic\\_relations/index\\_en.htm](http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/rwanda/eu_rwanda/political_economic_relations/index_en.htm)

European Commission. "Communication from the Commission to the Council: concerning the opening of consultations with the Republic of Guinea under Article 96 of the Cotonou Agreement". *EUR-Lex*. Brussels, 26 July 2003.

European Commission. "Commissioner Piebalgs' first visit to Rwanda". *Press release database*. Brussels, 29 September 2010. [http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release\\_IP-10-1206\\_en.htm?locale=en](http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-10-1206_en.htm?locale=en)

European Commission. "Human Rights and Democracy in the World report 2009". Brussels, May 2010.



European Commission - International Cooperation and Development. "Guinea". Accessed 15 January, 2017. [https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/countries/niger\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/countries/niger_en).

European Commission - International Cooperation and Development. "Human rights and governance". Accessed 22 July, 2016. [https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sectors/human-rights-and-governance\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sectors/human-rights-and-governance_en).

European Commission - International Cooperation and Development. "Mission Statement". Accessed 22 January, 2016. [http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/mission-statement\\_en](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/mission-statement_en)

European Commission - International Cooperation and Development. "Rwanda". Accessed 30 April, 2016. [http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/countries/rwanda\\_en](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/countries/rwanda_en).

European Union External Action. "Human rights and democracy". Accessed 15 July, 2016. [http://www.eeas.europa.eu/human\\_rights/index\\_en.htm](http://www.eeas.europa.eu/human_rights/index_en.htm).

European External Action Service. "Human Rights and Democracy in the World report on EU action in 2010". Brussels, September 2011.

European External Action Service. "Human Rights and Democracy in the World report on EU action in 2011". Brussels, June 2012.

French, Howard. "The case against Rwanda's president Paul Kagame". *Newsweek*, 14 January 2010. Accessed 23 October 2016. <http://europe.newsweek.com/case-against-rwandas-president-paul-kagame-63167?rm=eu>.

Garrison, Ann. "Kagame arrests Rwandan presidential candidate Bernard Ntaganda". *Digital Journal*, 24 June 2010. Accessed 26 October 2016. <http://www.digitaljournal.com/article/293800>.

Hackenesch, Christine. "It's Domestic Politics, Stupid! EU Democracy Promotion Strategies Meet African Dominant Party Regimes". *World Development*. Vol. 75, 2015. Pg. 85–96.

Hartmann, C. "Leverage and linkage: how regionalism shapes regime dynamics in Africa" in *Democratization and competitive Authoritarianism in Africa*. Eds. Matthijs Bogaards and Sebastian Elischer. Springer, Hamburg, 2007.

- Hayman, Rachel. "From Rome to Accra via Kigali: Aid effectiveness in Rwanda". *Development policy review*. Vol. 27:5. 2009. Pg. 581-599.
- Hayman, Rachel. "Going in the "Right" Direction? Promotion of Democracy in Rwanda since 1990". *Taiwan Journal of Democracy*, Volume 5, No.1, 2009. Pg. 51-75.
- Hurt, Stephen R. Understanding EU Development Policy: history, global context and self-interest? *Third World Quarterly*, 31:1, 2010. Pg. 159-168.
- Kurki, Milja. "Political Economy Perspective" in *The substance of EU democracy promotion: Concepts and Cases*, ed. Anna Wetzels and Jan Orbie. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.
- Ogunsanya, Kemi. "Women and elections in African politics". *Conflict Trends* 2006/2, ACCORD. April 1, 2006. Pg. 14–18.
- Olsen, Gorm Rye. "Changing European concerns: security and complex political emergencies instead of development" in *EU development cooperation: From model to symbol*, ed. Karin Arts and Anna K. Dickson. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004. Pg. 80–100.
- Reyntjens, Filip. "Rwanda, ten years on: From genocide to dictatorship". *African studies*. Royal African Society. Published 1 April 2004. Pg. 177–210.
- Rice, Xan. "Rwandan opposition leader found dead". *The guardian*, 14 July 2010. Accessed 26 October 2016. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2010/jul/14/rwanda-opposition-politician-found-dead>.
- Saliou Camara, Mohamed. "International Sanctions", *Historical Dictionary of Guinea*. Maryland, Scarcrow Press, 2014.
- Smith, David. "EU partially freezes aid to Rwanda". *The Guardian*, 27 September 2012. Accessed 15 January 2017. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2012/sep/27/eu-partially-freezes-aid-to-rwanda>.
- Stanfield, John. "Rwanda: Rough Macro- Sociology of Knowledge Notes on a Symbolic Emergence of a Post– Cold War African Nation". *American Behavioral Scientist*. SAGE Publications, 2012.
- Sarah Sunn Bush. "Introduction and argument" in *The taming of democracy assistance: why democracy promotion does not confront dictators*. Cambridge University Press. 2015

The Freedom House. "Freedom in the World 2005 : Rwanda". Accessed 18 September.  
<https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2005/rwanda>.

The Freedom House. "Freedom in the World 2006 : Rwanda". Accessed 18 June, 2016.  
<https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2006/rwanda>.

The Freedom House. "Freedom in the World 2007 : Rwanda". Accessed 18 June, 2016.  
<https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2007/rwanda>.

The Freedom House. Freedom in the World 2008: Niger. Accessed 15 January 2017.  
<https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2009/niger>

The Freedom House. "Freedom in the World 2008 : Rwanda". Accessed 18 June, 2016.  
<https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2008/rwanda>.

The Freedom House. "Freedom in the World 2009 : Rwanda". Accessed 18 September.  
<https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2009/rwanda>.

The Freedom House. "Freedom in the World 2010 : Guinea". Accessed 15 January 2017.  
<https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2010/guinea>.

The Freedom House. "Freedom in the World 2010 : Rwanda". Accessed 18 September.  
<https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2010/rwanda>.

The Freedom House. "Freedom in the world 2011: Guinea". Accessed 15 January 2017.  
<https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2011/guinea>.

The Freedom House. "Freedom in the World 2011 : Rwanda". Accessed 18 September.  
<https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2011/rwanda>.

The World Bank. World Bank national accounts data, and OECD National Accounts data files. Data Bank. GDP growth (annual %).

United Nations, Security Council. *Letter dated 12 November 2012 from the Chair of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1533 (2004) concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo addressed to the President of the Security Council*. S/2012/843. 15 November 2012.

Uppsala University. Uppsala Conflict Data Program - UCDP Conflict Encyclopedia:  
[www.ucdp.uu.se](http://www.ucdp.uu.se).

Walker, Peter. "Army steps in after Guinea president Lansana Conté dies", *The Guardian*, 23 December 2008. Accessed 20 December 2016. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2008/dec/23/guinea-dictator-lansana-conte-dies>

Wetzel, Anne and Orbie, Jan. "Introduction". *The substance of EU democracy promotion*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire : Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

Youngs, Richard. "A new approach in the Great Lakes? Europe's evolving conflict-resolution strategies". *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 22:3, 2004. Pg. 305-323.

Zuercher, Christoph. "An Introduction To The Project" in *External Democracy Promotion in Post-Conflict Zones: Evidence from Case Studies: Rwanda*. Rachel Hayman. *Freie Universität Berlin*. 2010.