

Bi-Party versus Multi-Party Approaches in Political Party Assistance by Dutch Political Party Foundations

Jos van Wersch

Twente University

Public Policy and Administration

Master Thesis

Prof. Dr. J.H. de Wilde

Dr. P van der Molen

08-03-2006

Preface (in Dutch)

Dit verslag is geschreven als afstudeerscriptie voor de studie Bestuurskunde aan de Universiteit Twente. Tijdens het schrijfproces zijn er een aantal mensen geweest, waar ik enige dank aan verschuldigd ben.

Allereerst wil ik graag mijn begeleiders vanuit de universiteit bedanken: Dr. Irna van der Molen en Prof. dr. Jaap de Wilde. Hun ondersteuning heeft ervoor gezorgd dat ik deze scriptie heb kunnen afronden. Daarnaast wil ik graag Jaap de Wilde speciaal bedanken voor alle inspiratie om iets van mijn studie te maken. Ik waardeer vooral de wijze waarop hij mij al deze jaren heeft gestimuleerd om verder te kijken dan de gebaande paden van de studie. Zodoende heb ik een vrij doctoraal programma samengesteld, waardoor ik veel meer heb kunnen studeren vanuit mijn eigen interesses. Naast begeleiding vanuit de Universiteit Twente heb ik ook tijdens mijn afstudeerstage begeleiding gekregen vanuit het Nederlandse Instituut voor Meerpartijen Democratie (IMD) in de persoon van Drs. Marieke van Doorn, 'policy officer international relations'. Dankzij IMD heb ik een voor mij nieuw onderzoeksveld kunnen aanboren, dat me ook verder heeft gebracht naast de scriptie. De constante steun van Marieke van Doorn heeft er mede voor gezorgd dat ik bleef geloven in een goed einde van deze scriptie. Verder is een goede vriend, Drs. Peter Scholten, promovendus aan de Universiteit Twente, met name in de laatste fase van mijn scriptie, bepalend geweest voor de afloop van het geheel. Daarnaast wil ik de Nederlandse politieke partij stichtingen graag bedanken voor hun uitgebreide medewerking aan dit onderzoek.

Naast deze personen, wil ik niet voorbijgaan aan de steun die ik heb mogen ontvangen van mijn vriendin Nynke Noort en mijn ouders. Zij stonden en staan altijd voor mij klaar en dat heb ik als zeer prettig en ondersteunend ervaren. Als laatste wil ik mijn vrienden, onder andere PH en RIS, bedanken voor hun interesse en stimulerende woorden gedurende mijn gehele studie.

Jos van Wersch

Den Haag, maart 2006

Executive Summary

This research paper is a Master Thesis for the study Public Policy and Administration at Twente University. It discusses two approaches in political party assistance by Dutch political party foundations: Bi-Party and Multi-Party. The main research question is: to what extent have Dutch political party foundations that use the Bi-Party Approach (BPA) or the Multi-Party Approach (MPA) contributed to democratisation? In order to structure the paper, the Logical Framework Approach (LFA) is chosen to research the approaches. The LFA provides a logical scheme for the planning and evaluation of projects by setting goals on different levels within the projects and using indicators to check the effects of the activities and the output of the activities. It is designed by the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD). The main data sources for this research are academic literature and literature from the Dutch political party foundations and the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs as primary funding agency of these organisations. Added to this are semi-structured interviews in which academics and employees of the Dutch political party foundations have been questioned. Basically, the academic literature is the theoretical information and the literature from the foundations and the interviews are the empirical information.

Since the LFA has a prominent position in this research, a short description of the LFA. The LFA is designed for planning development cooperation projects, but it can also be used to evaluate those projects. The LFA distinguishes different levels of objectives for a project: at a more abstract level, the ‘development objective’ and at a more concrete level, the ‘immediate objective’. Both objectives can be recognised by their indicators. A project thus has two objectives, abstract and more concrete and in this research the projects of Dutch political party foundations have as abstract ‘development objective’ ‘democratisation’ and as concrete ‘immediate objective’ ‘improve functioning of political parties’. Both objectives have ‘sub-objectives’ that are essential parts of the objectives. In order to achieve the objectives, activities must be undertaken, that lead to an output that should be close to the objectives. The activities are the actual projects, in this research conducted by the Dutch political party foundations. For the activities a certain input is needed, for instance funds. With each project, there are external factors that can influence the project and its output. These external factors are also part of the LFA.

Within this research paper, the first part discusses an overview of academic literature on democratisation and the various objectives in the research. This is the ‘development objective’ of all projects by Dutch political party foundations. ‘Democratisation’ is for this study regarded as ‘the process towards democracy’. ‘Democratisation’ has two ‘sub-objectives’: ‘democracy’ and ‘political parties’. The sub-objective ‘democracy’ provided the research with six indicators that make clear what is understood as a democracy in this research. The six indicators are mainly derived from the work done by Dahl (2000) for establishing what constitutes a democracy: elected officials; free, fair and frequent elections; freedom of expression; alternative sources of information; associational autonomy; and inclusive citizenship. The research then aims to establish distinct indicators for the presence of

political parties, which turn out to be: groups with a ‘focus on getting good result in elections’, who play an ‘intermediate role between citizenry and formal political system’ and that are ‘formally registered as political party’.

This part on academic literature also discusses the ‘immediate objective’, being ‘improve functioning political parties’. Since literature views political parties as essential to a democracy and the foundations under study assist political parties, the ‘immediate objective’ is ‘improve functioning political parties’. The sub-objectives for this objective are ‘democracy assistance’ and ‘political party assistance’. For the first sub-objective, the indicators are ‘assisting formal political institutions’ and ‘election support’. Authors emphasise that democracy assistance cannot be impartial and is therefore political. Supporting political parties is a logical outcome of this reasoning. For the sub-objective ‘political party assistance’ two indicators were found, namely ‘election support’ and ‘training political leadership’. The last section of this part shortly comments on the external factors for the projects. External factors can have influence on all levels of the project: development objective, immediate objective, activities and output. The number of external factors is endless, which makes it not feasible for this study to further investigate this element further, given the time span of this research.

The next step in the research is to view the 2004 annual reports of the Dutch political party foundations. Firstly, this paper explains what constitutes as a political party foundation. These types of organisations share three characteristics: they are (closely) related to one or more political parties in their home country; they are for the main part officially funded by government agencies; they give special attention to political parties in their democracy assistance activities. All Dutch political party foundations also have these characteristics. In The Netherlands there are two types of political party foundations: seven foundations that use the Bi-Party Approach (BPA) and one foundation that uses the Multi-Party Approach (MPA). To explain the different approaches: within the BPA political party foundations assist political parties on the basis of a shared ideological background All Dutch political party foundations applying the BPA, work in the same region, namely Eastern Europe and Euro-Asia. For the MPA, on the supply-side and on the demand-side multiple political parties are involved, which are all ideologically different. This approach is thus ideologically neutral. In The Netherlands, The Netherlands Institute for Multiparty Democracy (IMD) is such an organisation and within this research IMD is the primary focus for the MPA.

Firstly, the BPA foundations will be discussed, after which the MPA foundation will follow. The main topic will be to what extent foundations that use the BPA/MPA have contributed to democratisation? For the BPA foundations, the ‘development objective’ originates in the funding programme of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs that provides the Dutch political BPA foundations with subsidy, the MATRA Programme. The overall goal of the programme is ‘assisting the transition of EU accession-states or potential accession states or selected neighbouring states of the enlarged EU in the regions Central, South-Eastern, Eastern Europe, Northern Africa and the Middle East, to a pluriform, democratic constitutional country.’ This goal is understood in this research as

contributing to 'democratisation in specific regions and states'. The indicators for the 'development objective' are: the region and the specific countries; secondly the 'democratisation'. For the 'immediate objective' again is looked at the subsidy programme of the Ministry, in this case a sub programme, the MATRA Political Parties Programme. The goal of this programme is 'to enable the Dutch political parties to contribute to the training of the management officials of ('sister') parties in countries in Eastern Europe, Euro-Asia, Northern Africa and Middle East.' The indicators for the 'immediate objective' are provided by the same sub programme and are the type of activities that can be granted subsidy: political education courses; produce documentation materials on the political objectives of the 'sister' party for schools, associations, universities etcetera; training trainers to conduct the training activities; preparing, creating and dispersing documentation. The largest share of the activities of the MATRA foundations in 2004 can be categorised as 'political education courses', since most projects are evolved around two types of 'political education courses': on political issues (i.e. environmental issues) and training in political skills (mostly election support, i.e. training in campaign financing). The input for the activities is threefold: budget, people and time. The budget of the Dutch BPA foundations is modest compared to their European colleagues, therefore they try to cooperate with larger foundations. The people are in the case of the larger foundations fulltime employees and in the case of the smaller foundations part time employees from the party. The people that conduct the training are mostly volunteers. The time which is spent on projects is mostly two to three days, in order to be efficient because of the distances. The output is difficult to measure, but it would be logical if the participants of a political skills training, actually learned more about a certain topic. In sum on the BPA, it can be concluded that these foundations adhere to the indicators set by the Ministry in the MATRA Political Parties Programme. Of course there are external factors that influence the projects of Dutch BPA foundations, but since this research cannot actually review the output of the projects, this element receives less attention. The conclusion after this part is that the BPA projects adhere for the largest part to the fixed set of projects and are located in the regions as indicated by the Ministry.

The following part of the research reviews the annual report of IMD, the MPA foundation, for the year 2004. This part deals with the MPA to political party assistance and focussed on IMD as the only Dutch MPA foundation. First of all, the 'development objective' is discussed, which can be found in a subsidy programme of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Theme based Co-financing System (TMF-system). The overall goal of this programme and therewith the 'development objective' of IMD projects is 'poverty reduction'. There are seven themes on which the focus lies, that are considered indicators to this objective: 'sustainable development; HIV/Aids and reproductive health; social cultural development; political development; peace and security; environment and water; gender. IMD's projects can be categorised around the theme 'political development', which is the 'immediate objective'. The 'immediate objective' has two elements of which one has proven to be especially relevant, namely 'good governance': human rights and good governance. The element good

governance has nine possible topics or indicators that an organisation has to work on, if it wants to receive funding for their activities. Of all these topics, two are the main indicators for IMD: policy development in stimulating formal, political, democratic processes, especially an inclusive political system; and capacity building of different actors in the political, democratic process. The activities of IMD are mostly orientated on the second indicator of the 'immediate objective', capacity building of political actors (political parties in the case of IMD), either by cross-party or bilateral activities. The conclusion is that IMD activities adhere to one of the indicators for the most part. Again like is the case in the previous part, it needs to be put forward, that external factors can influence the projects of IMD.

In the final part of this research the two approaches are evaluated and compared to the findings in academic literature in order to answer the main research question to what extent have Dutch political party foundations that use the Bi-Party Approach (BPA) or the Multi-Party Approach (MPA) contributed to democratisation? For the BPA the objectives are quite similar to the objectives found in academic literature, but the indicators are somewhat different from the indicators in academic literature. This can be explained, since the indicators come from a manual on which projects are eligible for funding and which not. The indicators of the manual are far more practical and concrete than the indicators from the literature. The MATRA foundations do adhere to some indicators of the literature, but not to all. They focus especially on political skills training in preparing parties for elections. However, two important indicators for assisting political parties, according to literature are 'the intermediate role between citizenry and the formal political system' and 'assisting formal institutions'. This is not covered in most projects by Dutch political BPA foundations. The other indicator from the literature is 'assisting formal institutions'. Also this topic has not been used frequently in the MATRA projects. Therefore the answer on the question to what extent have Dutch political party foundations that use the Bi-Party Approach (BPA) contributed to democratisation? is that they have contributed to democratisation, but only for the part of the 'focus on getting a good result in elections' for parties. The other important elements, the intermediate role and assisting formal institutions, have not been a prominent topic in their projects.

For the MPA, again the comparison is made with the objectives and indicators of the second chapter. What is remarkable is the fact that the objectives do not match. The objectives and indicators, like is the case with the BPA foundations, come from the subsidy programme. The main goal is 'poverty reduction', which has several indicators, of which 'political development' is the most relevant for IMD. This indicator does not match with the indicators of the literature of the 'development objective'. Furthermore the 'immediate objective' comes from a sub element of the subsidy programme, being 'political development'. Political development has similarities with the 'development objective' of the literature, 'democratisation'. The same reasoning applies to the indicators of the 'immediate objective': 'policy development in stimulating formal, political democratic processes' and 'capacity building of political actors'. The first indicator matches quite well

with the first indicator from the literature, 'assisting formal institutions', since both indicators are related to formal, democratic processes and institutions or bodies cannot function without democratic processes. The second indicator, capacity building of political actors, seems more difficult to match to the second indicator from the literature, election support. But an important element in IMD's projects is capacity building training activities targeted towards elections, strategic planning for example. Only very few projects of IMD pay attention to the indicator 'intermediate role between citizenry and formal political system'. Concluding on the research question: to what extent has the Dutch political party foundation that use the Multi-Party Approach (MPA) contributed to democratisation? The answer is yes, but only partially, as certain important elements, like the 'intermediate role' and 'assisting the formal institutions' were not important topics in their projects.

It must be stated, that it is difficult to determine to what extent the BPA and MPA have contributed to 'democratisation', since the objectives indicators of both approaches sometimes differ from the objectives and indicators from the literature. In addition, it is difficult to evaluate eight organisations by interviews and researching their annual report. Unfortunately, due to time and financial constraints, this was not possible, but it is highly recommended to any future research on political party assistance. It is difficult to measure what the direct effect of the activities is. Too many other factors play a role in determining what the output will be.

After the conclusion, this paper proposes a new approach that unites the advantages of both approaches. The new approach could be a combination of the three elements trust, training and supporting all parties: starting in a multi-party way, gathering all parties from parliament start up a dialogue, form a national agenda. When an individual party request further assistance, first the individual donor-parties are asked if they see any possibility to work in a bi-party project in order for trust to be built up. When this ideological match is not possible, the trainers of both approaches work together to assist the individual party.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	10
1.1	Introduction	10
1.2	Methodology; Logical Framework Approach (LFA)	12
1.3	Research outline	15
1.4	Data Sources	17
2	What does Academic Literature say?	19
2.1	Introduction	19
2.2	Development Objective	20
2.2.1	Democratisation	21
2.2.2	Democracy	24
2.2.2	Political Parties	31
2.2.4	Conclusion	34
2.3	Immediate Objective	37
2.3.1	Democracy Assistance	37
2.3.2	Political Party Assistance	40
2.3.3	Conclusion	44
2.4	External Factors	45
2.5	Conclusion	46
3	Family Business	49
3.1	International overview	50
3.1.1	The Netherlands: an overview	52
3.2	Development Objective	55
3.3	Immediate Objective	56
3.4	Activities	57
3.4.1	The actual activities	59
3.5	Input and Output	64
3.6	Conclusion	65
4	Outside the Family	70
4.1	Background and organisational setup	70
4.1.1	Organisational setup	72

4.2	Development Objective	73
4.3	Immediate Objective	75
4.4	Activities	75
4.4.1	The actual activities	77
4.5	Input and Output	79
4.6	Conclusion	80
5	Conclusion	86
5.1	What did Literature say?	86
5.2	Family Business Revisited	87
5.3	Inside ‘Outside the Family’	88
5.4	Back to the main issue	89
5.5	Conclusion	91
5.6	Debate and the New Approach	93
	Literature	99
Annex I	Abbreviations	105
Annex II	Respondents	106
Annex III	Logical Framework Approach Tables	107
	Logical Framework Approach Tables	
Table 1		13
Table 2.1		36
Table 2.2		48
Table 3		67
Table 4		83
Table 5.1		107
Table 5.2		108
Table 5.3		109

1 Introduction

1.1 Introduction

Recently, organisations active in democracy assistance are more and more recognising the potential of well functioning political parties in democracies. Several government agencies place more attention on political parties by starting special programs. Next to this development some new approaches to assist political parties have emerged and with that new organisations. All these organisations realise that political parties have one important characteristic: political parties can have real influence through their seats in parliament, the role they can play in government and the shaping of democratic institutions (parliament, position of the president, the justice system). Ideally through elections, parties in parliament represent the people and decisions are taken on their behalf. When functioning properly, political parties aggregate the demands of the electorate and this role has become more recognised since the late nineties. Contradicting this development is that in many countries, political parties seem to have lost their connection to society, both in the western world as in the developing world.

In the field of democracy assistance, political parties in developing countries seem to be the next donor baby, but the answer to the question how to assist them, has not been widely agreed upon. There are several approaches, but the debate is still ongoing as to what approach is most effective in leading to democratisation. The debate concentrates on the effectiveness of two approaches; Bi-Party Approach (BPA) and Multi-Party Approach (MPA). The BPA involves political party foundations that support their sister parties, while within the MPA a non-ideological approach is chosen. Foundations that use these different approaches have been active in the same country and the question has been raised what approach is most successful in contributing to democratisation?

To explain the different approaches: within the BPA, political party foundations assist political parties on the basis of a shared ideological background. This means that in the western world, political parties have established foundations to support political parties that have the same ideology. As an example: the International Democratic Institute, the political party foundation of the Dutch social liberal democratic party D66, works closely with social liberal movements and parties in Eastern Europe & Euro-Asia. All Dutch political party foundations applying the BPA, work in the same region. The Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, more specifically the MATRA-programme, funds seven political party foundations with different ideological backgrounds to assist their like minded parties in Eastern Europe & Euro-Asia.¹ The seven Dutch political parties that are active in supporting their 'sister' parties through the BPA, also work together in the IMD. This institute works with multiple parties from various ideological backgrounds. The reason that IMD has been chosen to serve as an example for the MPA is because IMD has the most outspoken form of a multi-party organisation working in a multi-party way with diverse ideologies on both sides of the partnership. Employees from

various parties work together in country teams, whereas other MPA-foundations tend to disperse a large part of the money to the participating parties, which have their own projects with a BPA.²

IMD is one of the political multi-party foundations that have been founded recently.³ These newly established organisations challenge the way political party foundations in general have worked before. They use a different approach: the MPA, which means that on the supply-side and on the demand-side multiple political parties are involved, which are all ideologically different. Most political party foundations, nevertheless, use the BPA to support their ‘sister’ parties.⁴ Especially in The Netherlands, a unique situation has emerged. Within one country both approaches in supporting political parties are used by political party foundations. That is one more reason to research the Dutch situation in supporting political parties.

Considering the just mentioned situation, this study will deal with the following main research question: to what extent have Dutch political party foundations that use the Bi-Party Approach (BPA) or the Multi-Party Approach (MPA) contributed to democratisation? It is a research into the more technical approach of the BPA and the more abstract approach of the MPA. It might be the case that these approaches are complementary in assisting political parties. The main research question will be answered by making use of the Logical Framework Approach (LFA). The reason for using the LFA is that this method provides a logical scheme for the planning and evaluation of projects by setting goals on different levels within the projects and using indicators to check the effects of the activities and the output of the activities. In section 1.2 the LFA will be further explained.

Besides the LFA, the research presents an analysis of the literature on democratisation, democracy, political parties, democracy assistance and political party assistance. A final element in the research are the interviews held with practitioners of the BPA and the MPA. The purpose of the interviews is to provide background information on the practices and theory behind both approaches.

The BPA and MPA in political party assistance are used by foundations affiliated to political parties and are mainly funded by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs. This study has a special focus on the situation in The Netherlands for several reasons: firstly, I held an internship for nine months at the Netherlands Institute for Multi-party Democracy (IMD), which is the main focus for the MPA in this research. Secondly, I am a Dutch citizen, which makes it easier to gain information from Dutch

¹ Recent developments have made it possible for Dutch political party foundations using the BPA to also work in Morocco, Turkey and Jordan.

² For instance: within the Westminster Foundation for Democracy, a multi-party foundation in the United Kingdom, the participating parties (mainly Labour, Conservatives and Liberal Democrats) receive half of the foundations’ annual overall budget to support sister parties in the world.

³ In 1992 what can be perceived as a MPA foundation, was established in the U.K. with the Westminster Foundation for Democracy (which has close similarities with National Endowment for Democracy in the United States, founded in 1983). In 2000 IMD was founded and in 2002 the Norwegian Centre for Democracy Support. In Canada and Finland political parties are debating on the possibility to found a multi-party institute.

⁴ In most countries the BPA is chosen: Germany, Sweden, France, Spain, Portugal, Greece, Italy, Austria, United States. In a few countries the MPA is used: United Kingdom, Norway and the Netherlands.

political party foundations and the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, since many policy documents and studies are in Dutch.

Eventually the aim of the study is to contribute to the debate of the different approaches in political party assistance. There has been extensive debate about both approaches, but thus far there has been no systematic evaluation on both approaches. This research hopes to contribute to this debate through such a systematic evaluation of the contribution of the BPA and MPA to democratisation. .

1.2 Methodology; the Logical Framework Approach

As stated before, this study will evaluate the activities in political party assistance of Dutch BPA and MPA foundations by using the Logical Framework Approach (LFA). The LFA is a very useful research tool for evaluating projects, which is the core activity of the foundations under study. Next to this, the Dutch political party foundations already plan their projects and programmes in such a manner that resembles the LFA. In this section the LFA will be discussed in order to also elaborate on the methodology of the research.

The LFA is designed to structure projects in development cooperation by the Norwegian Agency for Development Co-operation (NORAD).⁵ The main incentive for developing the LFA for NORAD is the experience of practitioners in project planning that ‘planning documents are often specific and clear as to the physical and financial inputs, personnel, activities and expected physical results. But thorough assessment of the overall objectives, the target groups and the external factors, which determined success or failure is often lacking’ (NORAD; p.3). The LFA is designed for organisations that work on a project-basis, especially in the donor community and is, for instance, used by UN organisations and the German Agency for Technical Cooperation (GTZ) (NORAD; p.6).

The main items within the LFA for development cooperation projects are ‘objective oriented’, ‘target group oriented’ and ‘participatory’. ‘Objective oriented’ means that a development cooperation project is supposed to have an abstract overall goal (the ‘development objective’) and a more concrete, direct goal (the ‘immediate objective’). Following the logic of the LFA: next to the element ‘objective oriented’, ‘target group oriented’ refers to the notion that there is a certain group for which the project is designed. The definition within the LFA for ‘target group’ is the direct beneficiaries or ‘the specific group for whose benefit the project or programme is undertaken’ (NORAD; p. 107). The last element ‘participatory’ is not actually explained by either the NORAD Handbook or the literature on LFA by SIDA, but it seems to hint to the idea that LFA is designed for projects in which the target group has to participate, such as a training or workshop.

⁵ The Handbook on the LFA of the Norwegian Agency for Development Co-operation and a summary on the theory behind the LFA method of the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (2004) are the main sources of information on the LFA for this research.

The core of the LFA is a schedule that represents the elements of this approach to plan development cooperation projects:

Table 1 Logical Framework Approach⁶

	Sources Academic Literature	Sources BPA+MPA	
1. Development Objective: Democratisation	1a. Indicators	1b. Indicators BPA/MPA	1. External factors
2. Immediate Objective	2a. Indicators	2b. Indicators BPA/MPA	2. External factors
3. Activities	3a. Input	3b. Input BPA/MPA	3. External factors
4. Output	4a. Indicators	4b. Indicators BPA/MPA	4. External factors

The above presented table is based on the original table, but has been modified for the evaluation of the activities of the Dutch BPA and MPA foundations. The ‘development objective’ of this research is presented in the introduction by mentioning the main research question: ‘to what extent have Dutch political party foundations using the Bi-Party Approach (BPA) or the Multi-Party Approach (MPA) contributed to democratisation?’ The ‘development objective’ is the abstract goal of the work done by Dutch political party foundations or as defined by NORAD: ‘the main overall objective that the project is meant to contribute to in the long run, and which explains the reason why it is implemented’ (NORAD; p.105) Although eventually the goal is achieving a stable democracy in countries where the projects of Dutch political party foundations are conducted, this goal is not very likely to be entirely related to the work done by these Dutch foundations. There are many other actors that cooperate with political parties present in the countries where the Dutch foundations work. These other actors might have larger budgets and/or might be more influential in contributing to democratisation. Besides the other actors in democracy assistance, there are numerous external factors that can be far more determining for the result of a project conducted by a political foundation than the project itself. The highest achievable goal for the Dutch political party foundations is to contribute to the processes towards democracy (‘democratisation’) through their projects with political parties.

The following cell below in the table presents the ‘immediate objective’, which is the more concrete goal or as put by NORAD: ‘the effect which the project is expected to achieve if completed successfully and on time’ (NORAD; p.106), for instance ‘improve functioning political parties’. This ‘immediate objective’ might differ per approach in assisting political parties. The Bi-Party Approach might have as ‘immediate objective’ to ‘strengthen the position of the ‘sister’ party, while the Multi-Party Approach might aim to ‘strengthen the overall party system’. The LFA does presume a general agreement within development projects on the ‘development objective’ and the ‘immediate objective’. It will be clear in the course of the research if the ‘development objective’ and the ‘immediate

objective' of both approaches are alike, especially in chapter three on the Bi-Party Approach and chapter four on the Multi-Party Approach. In evaluating the projects of the BPA and MPA, the 'development objective' will be presented in the second chapter by using literature other than from political foundations. In chapter 2, the sub-objectives of the research will be discussed, which lead to indicators for evaluating BPA and MPA projects according to the literature. These indicators will be considered as the agreement on what the improved situation is. Next to this, specific literature of the Dutch political foundations will be used, such as annual reports, to establish what their 'development objective' and 'immediate objective' is.

The other cells in the first column are 'Output' and 'Activities'. 'Output' can be understood as the result of the activities or as defined by the NORAD Handbook: 'output is the results that can be guaranteed by the project as a consequence of its activities' (NORAD; p.107). For instance: six members of a political party are trained in campaigning techniques, which is the activity and the result or output should be that six people now have more knowledge on campaigning techniques than before the training. The phrase 'activities' according to NORAD refers to 'an action which is necessary to transform given inputs into planned outputs within a specified period of time' (NORAD; p. 107), which is in the example the training. The definition of 'activity' includes 'input', which needs explaining. 'Input' involves 'raw materials of a project necessary to produce the intended output.' (NORAD; p. 106). Examples of 'input' are funds, personnel, materials, services etcetera.

The second column will be filled with indicators to check the objectives, outputs and activities. Indicators 'define the performance standard to be reached in order to achieve an objective.' (NORAD; p.106). As an example: in order to classify a group as political party, one indicator might be that this group should be focussed on getting a good result in elections. The indicators and input (1a, 2a, 3a, and 4a) are determined by evaluating literature other than literature of the Dutch political foundations on this subject. What are the thoughts in literature on the sub-objective 'democratisation' and how is that reflected in this research? This will be done in the second chapter. The third column refers to the indicators and input (1b, 2b, 3b and 4b) according to the Dutch political party foundations using their literature, such as annual reports. What do these organisations view as indicators to eventually contribute to the development objective? Do their indicators differ from the indicators found in literature? This is dealt with in chapter three for the BPA and chapter four for the MPA.

The fourth column focuses on all external factors that influence the project and its environment or as put by the NORAD Handbook: 'events, conditions or decisions which are necessary for project success, but which are largely or completely beyond the control of project management' (NORAD; p.106). For example, regarding the first row in the table: the 'development objective' of this research is 'democratisation', but when a society is faced with a war, this makes democratisation less important, while there is a greater need for safety for civilians in stead of training political parties. Thus, a war would then be an external factor to the 'development objective', being 'democratisation'.

⁶ As found in The Handbook on the LFA of the Norwegian Agency for Development Co-operation, p.17

1.3 Research outline

In the introduction, the main research question has been presented as: to what extent have Dutch political party foundations that use the Bi-Party Approach (BPA) or the Multi-Party Approach (MPA) contributed to democratisation? This main research question provides the study with the ‘development objective’. The ‘development objective’ is the end-goal for the projects and programmes of the Dutch political party foundations that will be evaluated in this research. Their end-goal is: ‘to contribute to democratisation’ and therefore ‘democratisation’ is the ‘development objective’. The BPA-foundations, on the one hand, receive their main funds from the MATRA-programme of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, to be more specific, the MATRA Political Parties programme, which states as main goal: ‘supporting the transition of European Union (EU) member states (accession-states or potential accession states) or selected neighbouring states of the enlarged EU in the regions Central, South-Eastern, Eastern Europe, Northern Africa and the Middle East, to a pluriform, democratic constitutional country.’⁷ The IMD, on the other hand, has placed the following statement on their website: ‘The main objective behind IMD is to ‘support the process of democratisation in young democracies by strengthening political parties as the pillars of parliamentary democracy in order to help create a well-functioning, sustainable, pluralistic system of party politics.’⁸ These are the development objectives of the IMD and the MATRA-foundations and within this study they are perceived as ‘democratisation’.

In the second chapter the aim is to apply the logic of the LFA to the operationalisation of the key sub-objectives ‘democratisation’, ‘democracy’, ‘political parties’, ‘democracy assistance’ and ‘political party assistance’ according to (academic) literature other than from the Dutch political foundations. By dealing with these sub-objectives and the perception of scholars of them, indicators will emerge, that will be used for the evaluations of country programmes of both approaches. This will lead to the ‘immediate objective’, since the sub-objectives and the political party foundations result in indicators for the evaluation of the projects by these foundations.

Finally, chapter two will discuss the external factors to activities of political party foundations. Due to time constraints and lack of academic literature on the activities and output and the input and indicators, this element is not discussed in this research.

The main resources of information will be (academic) literature, other than from the Dutch political foundations. The following research questions will be dealt with in the second chapter:

The overall research question of chapter two is: Which indicators can be drawn from the sub-objectives ‘democratisation’, ‘democracy’, ‘political parties’, ‘democracy assistance’ and ‘political party assistance’ according to academic literature?

⁷ Translation provided by the author, from Dutch into English. As seen in the ‘Manual MATRA Political Parties Programme’, 2004, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

⁸ As seen on 5th of August 2005 on the website of IMD: www.nimd.org

- What are the main indicators for the sub-objectives ‘democratisation’, ‘democracy’ and ‘political parties’ for the ‘development objective’?
- What are the main indicators for the sub-objectives ‘democracy assistance’ and ‘political party assistance’ for the ‘immediate objective’?
- What are the external factors to activities of political party foundations?

Chapter three deals with the Bi-Party Approach-foundations in political party assistance in The Netherlands. The sources of information are annual reports, external evaluation of country programmes and interviews. Firstly the background of the BPA foundations are presented. The aim of the third chapter is to establish the ‘development objective’ and ‘immediate objective’ of the BPA foundations. From these objectives, indicators will emerge, by which the activities and its output is evaluated. Later in chapter three, this will be compared to the objectives and indicators derived from the literature in chapter two.

The main question is this chapter is: to what extent do Dutch political party assistance activities of the Bi-Party Approach contribute to democratisation?

- What is the background of the BPA and what are the BPA foundations?
- What is the ‘development objective’ and its indicators for the BPA foundations?
- What is the ‘immediate objective’ and its indicators for the BPA foundations?
- Are theory and practise regarding the two evaluated country programmes mutually supportive?

The fourth chapter explores the IMD as example for the MPA. The sources of information are annual reports, external evaluation of country programmes and interviews. Firstly the background of the IMD is presented. The aim of the fourth chapter is to establish the ‘development objective’ and ‘immediate objective’ of IMD as a MPA foundation. From these objectives, indicators will emerge, by which the activities and its output is evaluated. Later in chapter four, this will be compared to the objectives and indicators derived from the literature in chapter two.

The main question of chapter four is: to what extent do the political party assistance activities of the Multi-Party Approach contribute to democratisation?

- What is the background of the IMD and the Dutch MPA?
- What is the ‘development objective’ and its indicators for the MPA foundation?
- What is the ‘immediate objective’ and its indicators for the MPA foundation?
- Are theory and practise regarding the two evaluated country programmes mutually supportive?

The final chapter presents the conclusion of the research in answering the main research question: to what extent do the political party assistance activities of the Bi-Party Approach and the Multi-Party

Approach lead to democratisation? This chapter uses the LFA to answer the main research question. The primary source of information will be the research findings in the second, third and fourth chapter. The research will also discuss the experience in using the LFA and present recommendations on this method. Finally the research presents the first draft of a new approach in political party assistance.

1.4 Data sources

An important source of data for the research is literature, academic and from the Dutch political foundations. The literature comes from various sources: books, articles and annual reports of Dutch political foundations.⁹ It is mainly used in the second chapter to define the sub-objectives. An overview of several debates on democratisation, democracy, political parties, democracy assistance and political party assistance is presented. This overview will also analyse the different characteristics of these sub-objectives in order to provide indicators for the research to evaluate the projects of the BPA and MPA foundations. The annual reports and other documents of the Dutch foundations are used to define their ‘development objective’ and ‘immediate objective’ of their projects.

The final element in the research are the interviews held with professionals from BPA-foundations and the MPA-foundation. These interviews were semi-structured: there is not a fixed set of questions asked in a specific order (questionnaire); however, with each interview the same topics have been brought up. The outcome of these semi-structured interviews will be used as qualitative data in this research.

The main goal of the interviews is to evaluate the theory and practise of both approaches to political party assistance. The interviews have a concrete and abstract component. The concrete component focuses on the organisations of the Dutch political party foundations and the projects and programmes of the foundations. The abstract component focuses on the role political parties play in a democracy, the role of political party assistance, the role of the Dutch political party foundations in this process. Especially this last element of the abstract component is examined: What are the strong points and weak points of the BPA and MPA? What are the similarities and differences in the BPA and MPA?

To summarise the interview setup:

- Concrete component: organisational structure, projects and programmes
- Abstract component: political parties and democracy, political party assistance
 - Role of Dutch political party foundations in democracy assistance – BPA and MPA: advantages and disadvantages, similarities and differences

Interviews were held with various respondents that can be categorised in groups: officials of Dutch political bi-party foundations, officials of the Dutch political multi-party foundation IMD and

⁹ In Annex 1, all Literature used for the research has been summed up.

academics with a specialisation in democracy assistance and/or political party assistance.¹⁰ In the first category, all Dutch bi-party foundations are represented. Each foundation accepted an invitation to hold an interview, which each took 1 hour to 1 1/2 hours. In addition to the Dutch foundations, the German academic Michael Dauderstädt, working for the Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (FES), the German bi-party foundation linked to the social democratic political party Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands (SPD) was interviewed. The German Stiftungen (foundations) have been an example to many governments to (re)form their approach of funding political party foundations. Germany was the first country where political parties established foundations that supported their national and international activities. The German political party foundations have many other projects besides political party assistance, while the Dutch bi-party foundations mainly support political parties. For the MPA, interviews were held with two IMD-officials: Jan Tuit, senior policy officer and Roel von Meijenfeldt, executive director. The last category, the academics, has been chosen for their publications in journals, magazines, books and conference readers. Annex 2 contains a list of all respondents per category.

¹⁰ In annex II, a list is presented with all the respondents of the interviews.

2 What does Literature say?

In this chapter the primary goal is to establish indicators for the ‘development objective’ and the ‘immediate objective’ of the research by using (academic) literature, other than from the Dutch political foundations. The research question, therefore is, which indicators can be drawn from the sub-objectives ‘democratisation’, ‘democracy’, ‘political parties’, ‘democracy assistance’ and ‘political party assistance’ according to academic literature? This chapter can best be qualified as a literature study in which literature on democracy assistance and democratisation will dominate, given the subject of this research. In the first chapter, it has become clear that the ‘development objective’ is ‘democratisation’; chapter two will establish the ‘immediate objective’. The ‘immediate objective’ will have become clear after examination of the literature on the topic. In order to get the indicators needed for the research, various sub-objectives will be discussed. There are five sub-objectives: ‘democratisation’, ‘democracy’, ‘political parties’, ‘democracy assistance’, and ‘political party assistance’. The five sub-objectives follow naturally from the literature studied for this research. This has led to the following research question: Which indicators can be drawn from the literature on the ‘development objective’ and the ‘immediate objective’ of BPA and MPA projects?

Besides the indicators for the sub-objectives and the sub-objectives and objectives themselves, this research also presents a small overview of academic literature on activities and the output, as well as the input for the activities. Finally, chapter two will discuss the external factors of the ‘development objective’ and its sub-objectives, the ‘immediate objective’ and its sub-objectives, the activities and output.

Chapter two contains five parts: introduction; ‘development objective’: sub-objectives (‘democratisation’, ‘democracy’ and ‘political parties’) and indicators; ‘immediate objective’: sub-objectives (‘democracy assistance’ and ‘political party assistance’) and indicators; activities and output; external factors; and finally the conclusion. The table on the logical framework will be completed with the ‘immediate objective’ and the indicators for both objectives.

2.1 Introduction

The first sub-objective, ‘democratisation’, is mentioned in the main research question. It refers to the ‘development objective’ of the projects of the foundations under study. Their long-term abstract objective in working with political parties is to assist the democracy in a country. Eventually their assistance should further the process of democratisation of the country and in the end lead to a sustainable democracy. Through analysing literature, indicators of the sub-objectives democratisation will be established in this part. Democratisation is closely related to the sub-objectives democracy; it can be perceived as the road towards democracy.

But what is a ‘democracy’? In discussing various viewpoints, indicators will emerge on how to establish what a democratic process is. A discussion will be presented on the different approaches of democracy: the majoritarian and the consensus approach.

One of the essential elements in a democracy are the political parties. Many scholars emphasise the role that political parties can and should play in a democracy. Therefore the third part aims to capture the indicators of the sub-objectives 'political parties'. A link is made between democracy and political parties, since these sub-objectives are closely related. For instance: political parties are in the ideal situation, one of the key components to realise 'rule by the people' by voicing the interests from the citizenry to state-level in a democracy.

Following the logic of the LFA, the 'immediate objective' is a more concrete objective than the 'development objective'. After studying literature on assisting democracies and political parties, the goal is to assist parties in order to function better. Therefore the 'immediate objective' for the work of the Dutch political foundations is 'improve functioning political parties'. In the chapters three and four, this will be specified for the BPA and MPA.

The first sub-objective of the 'immediate objective' is democracy assistance, which is a form of assistance to which many activities of donor organisations are attributed. It has become a very complex form of assistance, since it is unclear what can be understood as democracy assistance. This part will focus on the indicators of this sub-objective for the research.

The final sub-objectives, political party assistance, will be discussed in the following part. The assistance to political parties should focus on the intermediate role between citizenry and the state level, when following the reasoning in the previous paragraph. This objective is the result of analysing literature on democracy (assistance) and political parties and political party assistance.

As fourth part, the external factors to activities of political party foundations will be discussed. These factors can influence the possible relation between the different elements, such as the 'development objective' and the 'immediate objectives'. Finally, the conclusion of the second chapter, presents the table of the logical framework. The elements that can be added after this chapter are the 'immediate objective', 'activities', 'output', the indicators for the 'development objective', 'immediate objective', 'activities' and 'output' and the external factors for these elements, all according to academic literature. Due to time constraints and lack of academic literature on the activities and output and the input and indicators, this element is not discussed in this research.

2.2 Development objective

This section of the research will focus on the development objective and the sub-objectives 'democratisation', 'democracy' and 'political parties'. The part on democratisation looks into various views on democratisation within the academic literature and formulates indicators for the research. Democratisation literature is closely related to literature on the sub-objective 'democracy'. The sub-objective 'democracy' should be the destination of the trip on the road toward democratisation. Literature on democracy is very extensive and the research presents an overview of the main types of democracies that exist and what indicators can be found in (academic) literature for these types.

Within a democracy, political parties are an essential element. In an ideal democracy, according to many authors, political parties are the primary distinctive element that separates democracies from other forms of government (for example autocracy). Many scholars also emphasise the role political parties can and should play in a democracy. In a democracy, for instance, political parties are one of the key components to make it 'rule by the people' by voicing the interests from the citizenry to state-level, in the ideal situation.

2.2.1 Democratisation

There is a vast amount of literature on democratisation, which makes it necessary to place the debate for this research in the context of democracy assistance and political party assistance. This allows for a reduction of literature and views on democratisation and makes it possible to provide the research with indicators. Democratisation in this research is seen as sub-objective, which provides the research with indicators. Next to this, democratisation is viewed as the road towards democracy. The research question for this part is: What are the main indicators for the sub-objective 'democratisation'?

According to several surveys, between 1946 and 2004 many countries have gone through a process of democratisation and have become democracies. An example of such a study is the work done by Marshall and Gurr (2005), *Peace and Conflict, A Global Survey of Armed Conflicts, Self-Determination Movements, and Democracy*. The following graph shows the number of countries that can were categorised as 'democracy', 'anocracy' or 'autocracy'.

Graph 1 Global Regime per Type, 1946-2004¹¹



The phrase ‘autocracy’ refers to a situation , where ‘citizen’s participation is sharply restricted or suppressed; chief executives are selected according to clearly defined (often hereditary) rules of succession from within the established political elite; and, once in office, chief executives exercise power with few or no checks from legislative or judicial institutions. The opposite situation obviously refers to a democracy and an anocracy is a situation in which neither is the case and the situation in a country holds the middle ground between an autocracy and a democracy. According to this survey, in early 2005, there were 29 autocracies, 44 anocracies and 88 democracies (161 independent states), while in 1950, there were 28 autocracies, 27 anocracies and 23 democracies (78 independent states). This means that in 1950, the number of democracies was about one third (23) of the total number of independent states (78), while in 2005 democracies comprised more than half (88) of the total number of independent states (161). Of course it needs to be put forward, that these surveys are somewhat arbitrary. The reason for mentioning these figures is to give an idea of the growth in the number of democracies worldwide. Especially after the Berlin Wall fell in 1989 and communism diminished and the Soviet Union collapsed, the largest wave of democratisation has taken place. Many countries became independent states, in Central and Eastern Europe, but also countries that used to be part of the Soviet Union.

Most literature on democratisation mentions the conditions that favour the positive outcome of democratisation. Huntington has mentioned the ‘third wave’ of democratisation, which started in the

¹¹ Marshall, M. and Gurr, T., *Peace and Conflict, A Global Survey of Armed Conflicts, Self-Determination Movements, and Democracy*, 2005, Center for International Development and Conflict Management, University of Maryland, College Park, United States. This study does not include micro-states in its analyses; a state must have reached a total population of 500,000 to be included.

1970s and was made possible by several changes in economic, political and military international relations and national circumstances (Huntington, 1991). These changes are actually the external factors that influence democratisation and will be discussed later in the chapter. Other authors like Diamond (1996) claim that there is a trend in the opposite direction, as some democracies fall back into a grey zone between autocracy and democracy. Luckham, Goetz and Kaldor (2003) state that ‘...there is an apparent chasm between democratic aspirations and democratic practise in most established Western democracies (red. ‘democratic deficit’)...Democratisation in the developing South and post-communist East too, has largely failed to live up to its initial promise.’

These thoughts on the supposed wave of democracy come close to the work of Carothers, who claims in the article ‘The End of the Transition Paradigm’ (2002) that too much authors and practitioners believe in the transition paradigm. This paradigm has five assumptions, in short:

- 1 countries moving away from dictatorial rule, move towards democracy;
- 2 democratisation unfolds in a set sequence of stages;
- 3 elections determine the success of a democracy;
- 4 external factors (economic level, political history, ethnic make-up, sociocultural traditions) are not major factors on the outcome of the transition process;
- 5 democratic transitions of the third wave are built on coherent, functioning states (Carothers, 2002: 8).

Carothers places many ‘transition’ countries in the ‘grey zone’. This means that their democracy can go either way: it can become more democratic or less. This notion is targeted at the practitioners of democracy assistance, which makes it especially interesting for this research. Carothers emphasises that these professionals should realise that most countries in the developing world and post communist world are in the grey zone: ‘...that, what is often thought of as an uneasy, precarious middle ground between full-fledged democracy and outright dictatorship, is actually the most common political condition today of countries in the developing world and the post communist world’ (Carothers, 2002: 18). In his view, assisting democratisation should in many cases be about supporting two interrelated issues: political actors (improving variety and quality) and bridging the gulf between citizenry and formal political system (Carothers, 2002: 19).

Another author, Kumar (1998), describes what the process of democratisation should be: ‘It (red. Democratisation) also involves establishing and strengthening a constitution that enshrines civil and political rights, a free press and electronic media that contribute to information sharing and shaping of public opinion, civil-society organisations that articulate the interests and aspirations of different groups, and an independent judiciary.’ It thus should be a ‘gradual internalisation by the populace of a set of beliefs, values, and norms that promote political tolerance, compromise, and mutual accommodation’ (Kumar, 1998: 215-216). This description from Kumar is very helpful, since it highlights the main aspects of democratisation. It shows that democratisation is a process towards

democracy. All the elements mentioned are the same elements that are mentioned in the debate about the sub-objective 'democracy', as will become clear in the next section.

Although Carothers makes a very useful point in focussing in the practitioners of democracy assistance, I would like to leave this discussion of whether the wave of democratisation is happening or not. Apparently, it is unclear, what circumstances are needed in order to achieve a process towards democracy, democratisation. First of all, this process will not always be a straight line to a democracy. Of course countries face setbacks in democratic transition and therefore the word transition can be confusing, as pointed out by Carothers. It is not even certain that countries that go through a phase of democratisation will eventually be well established, stable democracies. This has to do with much more factors, than domestic democratisation, but is also dependent on many other external factors, such as the international economic situation. Secondly, scholars on democratisation, as studied for this research, do not indicate what democratisation is, other than the process towards a democracy. I have not found any set list of parameters or points that indicate democratisation. Therefore it is not feasible to provide the research with indicators for the sub-objective 'democratisation', since there does not seem to exist as a sub-objective. If the phrase democratisation is explained as the process towards a democracy, than the sub-objectives 'democracy' should be studied. What is a democracy? What are the elements of a democracy? When this becomes clear, than it is clearly what needs to be supported by practitioners of democracy assistance and political party assistance in order to contribute to democratisation.

2.2.2 Democracy

As easy as is often stated in the literature on democratisation, that achieving a form of democracy is the ultimate goal, it seldom talks about the actual meaning of democracy. What is democracy and when democratisation takes place, what kind of democracy should be the goal? The research question for this section, consequently, is: What are the main indicators for the sub-objective 'democracy'?

There are numerous books, papers, articles etcetera written on the meaning of the term 'democracy'. As has become clear from the previous section, the sub-objective 'democracy' has become very popular, especially in the last fifteen years. The popularity of this sub-objective is exemplified in the statement by Amartya Sen, that democracy is universal applicable and relevant (Sen, 1999: 16). Jaap de Wilde criticises the scaling up of democracy. The international relations debate uses the term too loosely without specifying what 'indicator' is referred to (de Wilde, 2004: 226). Authors should be more aware of their terminology. This research, therefore, aims to view democracy from a specific perspective: political parties and their role in democracies. But assuming that democracy is universally applicable, what kind of democracy should states choose? Lijphart correctly asks this question: 'who will do the governing and to whose interests should the government be responsive when the people are in disagreement and divergent preferences?' (Lijphart, 1999: 1-2)

One answer is that the majority of the people should have a determining voice in the governing. There are two possible answers, which result in two democratic government forms: the majoritarian and the consensus approach of democracy. The majoritarian or Westminster approach answers the question of Lijphart as follows: the minimal majority of the people. This means that the majority can be minimal, as long as it is a majority. As a result there is no need for compromises in politics; it is an exclusive form of government. The other approach, the consensus type of democracy is the opposite form of democracy. The answer to the question for the second approach is: a majority as large as possible. In this approach the aim is to maximise the majority, which means that compromises have to be made; it is an inclusive form of government. The two approaches lead to two different party-systems, which both have their advantages and disadvantages. The majoritarian approach has a two-party system in which a disproportional electoral system is used. Since there is no room and need for compromises, the electoral system functions with the adagium 'the winner takes all'. When a party wins the elections, this results in a single-party majority cabinet. An example of such a form of democracy is the United Kingdom, where there are two dominant parties: Labour party and the Conservative party. The third party, the Liberal Democrats are far smaller; the last elections showed the following result: seats in the House of Commons (parliament), Labour 354, Conservatives 196, Liberal Democrats 62, and other 34. The main reason, why in a Westminster form of democracy, there mostly exist only two parties, is because of the disproportional system of elections. In the United Kingdom, but also in many other majoritarian type democracies, the country is divided into districts. For each district one candidate receives a seat in parliament (House of Commons), when he or she gets the majority of the votes (or the largest minority). Consequently, it is difficult for new political parties to get many seats in parliament, since there is no room for compromises and therefore only a few political parties will be able to exist. Most of the times, the two parties mainly differ on socioeconomic issues. The consensus approach, conversely, has a multi-party system with a proportional representation. As compromises can be made, various political parties will emerge, which cooperate in order to form government. The result is broad multi-party coalitions that are formed after the elections. An example of such a democracy is Belgium, which has the consensus approach of a democracy. Belgium has a multi-party democracy with more than two parties. In parliament at the moment, are 10 political parties active that have the following division of seats: the VLD (Liberals-Flemish) 25, SP.A-Spirit (Socialists-Flemish)23, CD & V 21 (Christian Democrats-Flemish), PS 25 Socialists-Wallonian), VB 18 (right wing party-Flemish), MR 24 (Liberals-Wallonian), CDH 8 (Christian Democrats-Wallonian), Ecolo 4 (Greens-Wallonian), NVA (nationalists/conservatives-Flemish) 1, FN (right wing party-Wallonian) 1. At the moment the national government of Belgium consists of four parties: VLD, MR, SPA-Spirit and PS (liberals and socialists). The distribution of seats is made possible by the system for elections: proportional representation. The aim of this system is to divide the parliamentary seats among the parties in proportion to the votes they receive. This has as consequence that in the consensus form of democracy, a political party almost never solely has the

majority of the seats in parliament, since there is a lot to choose for the voters. Many political parties emerge, since it is well possible the gain seats in parliament, because of the electoral system of proportional representation.¹²

Of course, these typologies are an over-generalisation of the real world, but the basic assumption that the majoritarian democracy leads to a two-party system and that the consensus approach leads to a multi-party system, is agreed upon by most scholars. The terms are used frequently in numerous documents on democracy and political parties. Most democracies in the world can be categorised into two approaches: the majoritarian and the consensus approach. In Dutch democracy, the consensus approach is used. All political party foundations, as well as the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, stress in their policy documents and in interviews that they stimulate a multi-party democracy in the countries they work in. Multiple parties in a democracy mostly are synonymous for the consensus approach, although two parties can be considered 'multiple'.

Now it is clear what the most common forms of government are, it is necessary to establish the key elements of a democracy. This will allow for establishing the indicators for the sub-objective 'democracy'. What is useful for this exercise is the work done by Dahl, *On Democracy* (2000) in which he explains what the key ingredients are for an ideal democratic process: 'democracy provides opportunities for: effective participation, equality in voting, gaining enlightened understanding, exercising final control over the agenda and the inclusion of adults.' (Dahl, 2000: 38). These elements can be considered as indicators for democracy and thereby for democratisation, since they should ensure political equality. When you want to contribute to democratisation, than you should focus on these elements.

The first element is effective participation, which directly refers to the primary 'suspects' of this research: political parties. It is important that citizens can have a say about the future policy of the government. This is done by voting for candidates that can gain a seat in parliament and can form a government, which takes decisions that have to pass parliament. Mostly in this process, candidates are members of political parties that form governments and appoint government officials (i.e. ministers).

The second element, equality in voting, has just been mentioned to some extent. When citizens vote, it should be on an equal and fair basis: '...every member (red. citizen) must have an equal and effective opportunity to vote and all votes must be counted as equal.' (Dahl, 2000: 37). In ancient Greek city states, for example, only the citizens with Greek parents were allowed to vote; slaves and people with only one Greek parent were not. The policies that were formulated were decided upon by full Greek citizens, which were chosen by full Greek citizens, but which influenced the lives of all people living in the city state. This element tries to ensure that such circumstances do not exist in the ideal democratic process.

¹² There is however, a threshold of 5% of the votes in order to gain a seat in parliament. The Netherlands, also an example of the consensus approach, does not have such a threshold.

The subsequent element that is needed to achieve an ideal democratic process is ‘gaining enlightened understanding’. This element refers to the possibility for citizens to ‘learning about the relevant alternative policies and their likely consequences’ (Dahl, 2000: 37). When citizens do not have the possibility to know about other possible policy propositions, they cannot make a choice, since they only have one option. The options which are alternatives, however, should be feasible and relevant in order to be worthy alternatives.

The fourth characteristic of an ideal democratic process is ‘exercising final control over the agenda’. This element is rather difficult, since it is not quite clear what Dahl means by this element. Firstly, let me explain the argument of Dahl in his own words: ‘The members (citizens) must have the exclusive opportunity to decide how, and if they choose, what matters are to be placed on the agenda.’ (Dahl, 2000: 38) Dahl means that the democratic process is always open for debate on the topics placed on the agenda. This should be ensured by the rights that elected officials have in parliament; they can submit a topic to the agenda and parliament can vote if this topic will be submitted. Through the representation of the elected officials citizens can, in principle, place all topics on the agenda. But it is also possible, that Dahl’s words are used by advocates of a referendum. This involves a direct vote in which an entire electorate is asked to either accept or reject a particular proposal.¹³ This is a more direct way, in which citizens can influence the agenda. Opponents of a referendum, claim that citizens get the chance to vote in fair, free and frequent elections for the policy they prefer through voting for a specific candidate. Then the responsibility of citizens ends, from that point, elected officials in parliament and government officials determine what topics are submitted to the agenda. Since this is a somewhat controversial issue, the research will discard the option of a referendum.

The final element of Dahl’s description of an ideal democratic process is the inclusion of adults. Dahl states that all or most adult permanent residents should have the full rights of citizens that are implied by the first four elements. He does not specify what is meant by a permanent resident and how people who are mentally challenged should be dealt with. However, it does provide another useful element, since it ensures, that no groups are left out of the democratic process, in order to achieve that all citizens are equal.

These elements are the first indicators for the research, since all are required to have a democratic process. The ultimate goal of the projects conducted by Dutch political foundations is to contribute to the process of democratisation in a country. The research has established that democratisation is the process towards a democracy. In order to be a democracy, the procedures and processes of a country, need to be democratic. Therefore, the research has been provided with five indicators by using the elements of Dahl’s ideal democratic process:

- 1 effective participation
- 2 equality in voting
- 3 gaining enlightened understanding

¹³ The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English, 1988

- 4 exercising final control over the agenda
- 5 the inclusion of adults (Dahl, 2000: p.38)

When reading these elements of an ideal democratic process, it comes to mind, that it will be difficult to find a country in the world, that adheres to all elements perfectly and in which all citizens are truly equal. One of the explanations provided by scholars such as Luckham, Goetz and Kaldor (2003) for this is that there is a difference between institutions and people; when the institutions are democratically organised, but the people in those institutions do not adhere to the democratic procedures, then the democratic institutions are a facade. But first, it needs to be identified, what an institution is. Luckham, Goetz and Kaldor give a few examples: ‘free elections, political and civil rights protected under law...’ (Luckham, Goetz and Kaldor, 2003: 15), but they also provide a definition: ‘....institutions are a socially constructed set of arrangements routinely exercised and accepted’ (Luckham, Goetz and Kaldor, 2003: 18). However interesting this definition might be, it does not bring the research further in determining the actual meaning of the term ‘institution’. For this research, it is needed to have a limited set of institutions in order to establish if they are useful as indicators to the sub-objective ‘democracy’. More importantly, literature seems unclear about what the institutions within a democracy are. Kumar for instance, mentions three democratic institutions that can facilitate free and fair elections: political parties, mass media and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) (Kumar, 1998: 218-220). These are clearly organisations and not a set of arrangements. Dahl on the other hand, refers to a meaning of institutions that is near to that of Luckham, Goetz and Kaldor. He determines six institutions (Dahl calls them *political* institutions), that a democracy requires: elected officials, free, fair and frequent elections, freedom of expression, alternative sources of information, associational autonomy and finally inclusive citizenship (Dahl, 2000: p.85). For the sake of argument, I chose to make use of the characterisation of Dahl of an institution. The institutions mentioned by Dahl are logical since they are elements, which in some form or another have been used in the previous part on the elements of an ideal democratic process. There are some similarities between the elements and the institutions. The element of equality in voting is closely related to the institution of free, fair and frequent elections. When all elections are free and fair, citizens are equal in voting. Of course there are other aspects to the elements and institutions, which will be discussed in the next section on ‘institutions’ provided by Dahl.

As mentioned previously, Dahl provides the research with six institutions: elected officials; free, fair and frequent elections; freedom of expression; alternative sources of information; associational autonomy; inclusive citizenship (Dahl, 2000: p.85). In short, these institutions are explained, since they have some similarities with the elements of an ideal democracy, according to Dahl.

The first institution, elected officials, ensures that through officials elected by citizens, there is control over government decisions; governments therefore should be representative. This refers to the

first element, effective participation and the exercise of final control over the agenda. The second institutions is free, fair and frequent elections, which is also mentioned which ensures that there is equality in voting, which is the second element of an ideal democratic process. The next institution, freedom of expression, which means that ‘citizens have the right to express themselves without danger of severe punishment on political matters broadly defined, including criticism of officials, the government, the regime, the socioeconomic order and the prevailing ideology.’(Dahl, 2000: p.86). The fourth institution is access to alternative sources of information, which can be related to the third element, gaining enlightened understanding. Both refer to the possibility for citizens to learn from alternative, relevant policies. The institutions goes further, since it means that citizens have the right to look for alternative information sources in general in various media, like internet, television, radio, newspapers etcetera. The alternative sources of information should not be controlled by the government, which is closely related to the freedom of expression. People can have criticism on the government without the fear of being prosecuted. The subsequent institution, associational autonomy, dealt with the notion that citizens have the right to found organisations that are autonomous from the government, such as political parties. The final institution is inclusive citizenship, which means that ‘no adult permanently residing in the country and subject to its laws can be denied the rights that are available to others and are necessary to the five political institutions just listed.’(Dahl, 2000: p.86).

To sum up the differences between elements and institutions: institutions are to guarantee the elements needed to have an ideal democracy. For example, elected representatives are needed to satisfy the democratic demand of effective participation and control over the agenda. These elected officials are chosen by citizens and can control the agenda and aggregate the demands of citizens. For the research, the institutions are needed for a democratic process. Literature implies that when you want to contribute to democratisation (the process towards a democracy), you must focus on these institutions, since they are designed to ensure that all elements of an ideal democracy are present. Therefore the institutions are more important than the elements, because they are the starting point that lead up to the elements. Following this reasoning, I have chosen to view the institutions as indicators, since supporting them, should lead to the elements needed to have an (ideal) democracy. The main indicators for the sub-objective ‘democracy’ and therewith for democratisation are as follows:

- 1 Elected officials
- 2 Free, fair and frequent elections
- 3 Freedom of expression
- 4 Alternative sources of information
- 5 Associational autonomy
- 6 Inclusive citizenship (Dahl, 2000: p. 85)

One aspect of these indicators needs to be stressed, before continuing the literature study and that is the scale of which is measured if a country can be ‘marked’ as a democracy or not. These

indicators only indicate what the basis requirements are for a democracy and not to which level it should be adhered to. It is quite obvious that according to these standards, The People's Republic of China is a democracy, but the level to which is adhered to all the six indicators is not very high. Still, to measure a democracy is very difficult and to some 'in the eye of the beholder'. Let alone, this point should be remembered when discussing democracies.

In addition to Dahl's institutions, it is useful to see what a democracy is composed of. This research deals especially with the political elements of a democracy, but literature suggests that there are also other areas. Linz and Stepan (1996) have made a useful contribution to the debate by defining the main arenas in a democracy: civil society, political society, rule of law, state apparatus and economic society. Civil society refers to 'self-organising groups, movements, and individuals, relatively autonomous from the state, that attempt to articulate values, create associations and solidarities, and advance their interests' (Linz and Stepan, 1996: 7). The political society has a few core elements: elections, electoral procedures, political parties, political leadership, inter-party alliances and legislatures. The civil society and the political society can be viewed as opposites, as well as complementary. Civil society can support governing parties, but also support and assist parties in the opposition. At least they should be interlinked according to Linz and Stepan, especially in times of democratisation: 'A robust civil society, with the capacity to generate political alternatives and to monitor government and state can help transitions get started, help resist reversals, help push transitions to their completion, help consolidate, and help deepen democracy. At all stages of the democratisation process, therefore, a lively and independent civil society is invaluable' (Linz and Stepan, 1996: 9). The three other arenas are rule of law, state apparatus and economic society. The phrase 'rule of law' implies that government authority may only be exercised in accordance with written laws, which were adopted through an established procedure. The principle is intended to be a safeguard against arbitrary rulings in individual cases. The following arena is state apparatus is needed, since 'democracy...needs the effective capacity to command, regulate and extract, which means a functioning state and bureaucracy.' (Linz and Stepan, 1996: 11). The economic society 'produces the indispensable surplus to allow the state to carry out its collective good functions and provides a material base for the pluralism and autonomy of civil and political societies' (Linz and Stepan, 1996: 14).¹⁴ These arenas have made clear that democracy is more than procedures and processes. This description creates the well needed overview of this research and its topic: assisting political parties with democratisation.

¹⁴ There is an ongoing debate on the question whether economic factors determine more the pace of the democratisation process than political factors, such as free elections.

2.2.3 Political Parties

In this section, the sub-objective ‘political parties’ is discussed, following the main indicators for the sub-objective ‘democracy’. In the following section, it will become clear why political parties are the only organisations, capable of including all institutions. This implies that by supporting political parties, democracy is supported and thereby a contribution is made to democratisation. At the end of this section, the main indicators for the sub-objective ‘political parties’ will be made up after an overview of the (academic) literature on this topic. The aim is to find unique indicators, by which is meant: those indicators in which political parties differ from other organisations. The research question is: what are the main indicators for the sub-objective ‘political parties’?

A few remarks need to be made, from the viewpoint of the sub-objective ‘political parties’. In discussing the sub-objective democracy, the research mentioned the general conception of two possible forms of democracy and party-systems: the majoritarian and the consensus system. The majoritarian party-system lives by the rule ‘half plus one’, which means that the smallest possible majority, half plus one (100, majority is $50+1=51$), gets the decisive powers. The consensus system, however, views majority as the largest possible majority. This means that in parliament political parties want to form a government with as much other parties as possible, since this enhances the chance that, for example, laws submitted by the cabinet will be approved in parliament.

In reality, however, many developing and western countries have a multi-party system in theory, but in practise it is a two-party system. This is the case in countries where one party is the strongest player in elections and therewith in parliament and government. Other parties do not have the same capabilities as does the strongest party (more members and funds), which leads to fewer activities around elections in terms of campaigning-power. The strongest party, mostly also the largest party, has more man-power and money to use during elections, let alone the political power in parliament and other political institutions. In many developing countries, like Tanzania and Mozambique, this is the case, but also in some western countries, like Sweden, there is a dominant political party.¹⁵

But despite the differences in party systems, the most important question is what the functions of political parties are? Why are they (potentially) important for a democracy according to authors? What is their added value to a democracy or are they even indispensable? Many scholars are of opinion that political parties are essential for a democracy. ‘They are the markers of democracy’ as Randall and Svåsand state (Randall and Svåsand, 2002: 10). ‘Parties are the core institutions of democratic politics’ (Lipset, 1996: 170). This provides a rather tricky combination. Parties are the core

¹⁵ Tanzania, seats in parliament per party: - CCM 244, CUF 16, CHADEMA 4, TLP 3, UDP 2, Zanzibar representatives 5; Mozambique, seats in parliament per party: Frelimo 160, Renamo 90; Sweden, seats in parliament per party: Social Democrats 144, Moderates 55, Liberal Party 48, Christian Democrats 33, Left Party

institutions and are the markers of democracy. This means that by behaving badly parties can have a strong negative influence on a democracy. Political parties are part of the problem and part of the solution. By supporting political parties, democracy is supported, that seems the general conception amongst scholars. Carothers stresses this point: 'political party development should be a top agenda item' (Carothers, 2002: 19).

Clearly political parties are seen as important institutions of democracy, but in many western countries and elsewhere, political parties are in decline. They are losing members, the activism is low, and citizens have built up a real distrust towards governments, parliament and political parties. Plattner highlights this development: 'the collapse in citizen engagement with political parties is as close to a universal generalization as one can find in political science' (Plattner, 2001: 29). Diamond and Gunther present an even more striking comparison: 'in the past quarter of the twentieth century democracy spread throughout the world, but in many western states democratic institutions are under a great deal of scepticism, especially political parties' (Diamond and Gunther, 2001: ix (introduction)). The western world, however, sees itself as the basis of democracy with a history in democratic government since the Ancient Greek and Roman era.¹⁶

Still, political parties are a vital element of democracy, simply because no other form of organisation can replace parties. For a good functioning democracy it is necessary that there are people who represent parts of the citizenry. A democracy would not function when every person which was entitled to vote, also cooperated in governing debates. Political parties bring people together with the same interests and parties should ideally aggregate their demands into government policies. Those interests can be various: locally, regionally, religiously, ethnically, socio-economically, targeted to a specific social group (for instance farmers) or as is most common in Western Europe, a political ideology, such as socialism, liberalism, conservatism etcetera.

The conviction for long has been that civil society organisations can provide this intermediate link between citizenry and government. Yanai even goes as far as stating that civil society can have the same intermediate role in expressing the interests of citizenry to government and parliament as political parties (Yanai, 1999: 6). There is surely some truth in that, but the big difference between parties and civil society groups is that parties have the ability to actually influence the policies of governments and the agenda setting. As Randall and Svåsand put it: 'although civil society organisations voice group demands, they cannot aggregate them' (Randall and Svåsand, 2002: 6) In parliament elected officials from political parties draw up laws and vote on them. This function is not available for civil society. They can have their influence, but they cannot vote in parliament or even have a minister to execute their policies. The intermediate role of political parties is mostly mentioned

30, Center Party 22, Greens 17. Source: CIA The World Factbook, seen on 27th of June 2005. In these countries the parties in power have been for a long period.

¹⁶ The history Europe has with political parties is much longer than the rest of the western world. The first signs of political parties were noted in the eighteenth century by Lord Bolingbroke *A Dissertation upon Parties*, 1733-1734 (Plattner, 2001: 32). Bolingbroke explains that political parties are a danger for the national strength of

in literature. Parties are what makes democracy responsive, when they take their responsibility to voice the interests of citizens and representing social groups.¹⁷

The position of parties in an (ideal) democracy comes rather naturally from the institutions provided by Dahl. Political parties should be associational autonomous organisations that are not under government control (institution 5). They should be able to express their views on government policies and should not fear repercussions (institution 3). In the ideal situation, all permanent residing citizens can start a political party and can participate in elections. In almost all democracies, perfect or not, political parties provide candidates that, when voted for, can become elected officials. Most of the time the primary selection for the list of candidates is conducted by the party itself. Political parties provide the voters with candidates to vote for (institution 1). Subsequently, political parties should provide citizens with alternative sources of information and alternative, relevant policies to the government policies (institution 4). In western style democracies, especially political parties from the opposition ensure the alternative information sources. This brings us to another distinct feature of political parties that can provide the research with an indicator for the sub-objective 'political parties'.

Besides the intermediate role political parties can and should play, literature seems to agree on another distinct element of parties: a political party is an organisation aimed at getting a good result at elections. 'Parties are unique in their electoral focus' (Plattner, 2001: 43). Diamond and Gunther mention seven functions of which three are related to elections: 'recruitment and nominating candidates for elective offices, mobilizing electoral support, aggregating specific interests into broader electoral and governing coalitions' (Diamond and Gunther, 2001: xiv (introduction)). This is a clear difference with other organisational forms in a society: political parties participate in elections, unlike any other form of organisation. This relates to the last institution of Dahl: free, fair and frequent elections (institution 2). Parties are, in most democracies, the only type of organisations that actually participate in elections. Of course, there are candidates that are independent, but the bulk of the candidates in most elections is a member of a political party. Political parties thus have a unique role in elections in competing for votes and therewith for seats in parliament for their future 'elected officials'.

Surely, there are other functions of political parties, such as the recruitment and formation of political leaders, integration of citizens into the nation-state and its political process, ensuring accountability of government through competition, legitimising the electoral and political process and the formation and/or sustaining governments, but these functions are not mentioned by the majority of the authors and are therefore not included as indicators for this sub-objective. Next to this, these functions seem to be more of a result of the previous indicators. When one accepts that political

England. The parties as we know them today emerged with the Wig and Tory parties under the reign of Charles II (Plattner, 2001:32).

¹⁷ An interesting question is raised by Anckar and Anckar: are there any democracies without parties and if so, how do they manage? They have come up with six small island states in the Pacific Ocean: Micronesia, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Tuvalu, Belau and Nauru. Due to cultural and historical reasons, political parties have not been necessary. See Anckar and Anckar, 2000: 225-247.

parties' sole purpose is to get a good result during elections and then aggregate the interests of the citizenry, then these functions will logically follow. After the election, the process of leadership or presidency emerges, just like the formation of a government and so on.

The last criteria or indicator for a group to qualify as political party, is the fact that this group has to be registered as political parties at a centralised organ of the government. In The Netherlands, de 'Kiesraad' or Electoral Council, is the organ of the Dutch government, that handles all registrations of Dutch political parties. There is a list of requirements to be fulfilled to be able to register as Dutch political party for the national and European parliamentary elections.¹⁸ The list contains the following amongst other regulations: it has to be an association (non-profit), the name cannot be longer than 35 characters or other 'signs', the name cannot be misleading etcetera.

What are the main indicators for the sub-objective 'political parties'? Political parties have three distinctive aspects: they play an intermediate role between citizenry and government and parliament and can actual influence and determine the political process. Next to this aspect, political parties are aimed at getting good results at elections, which makes them different from other organisations. The third aspect is a bit technical, but for a group to be qualified as 'political party', such a group needs to have an official registration as political party. Therefore the three indicators for 'political party' are:

1. Intermediate role between citizenry and formal political system
2. Focus on good results in elections
3. Formal registration as 'political party'

2.2.4 Conclusion

In this part of the research the research question has been: what are the main indicators for the sub-objectives 'democratisation', 'democracy' and 'political parties' for the 'development objective'?

The following indicators have emerged:

For the presence of 'democracy':

- 1 Elected officials
- 2 Free, fair and frequent elections
- 3 Freedom of expression
- 4 Alternative sources of information
- 5 Associational autonomy
- 6 Inclusive citizenship

For the presence of 'political parties':

¹⁸ An approved national registrations can also be used for regional and local elections.

- 7 Intermediate role between citizenry and formal political system
- 8 Focus on good results in elections
- 9 Formal registration as 'political party'

These indicators are the indicators for the development objective 'democratisation'. In the previous sections on democratisation, democracy and political parties, I have concluded that democratisation is not a sub-objective, since there are no clear definitions or descriptions of democratisation found. Most literature only mentions the conditions under which democratisation is most likely to lead to a form of democracy and under which conditions this is less likely. Moreover, democratisation is actually the process towards a democracy and therefore, I have studied literature on democracy to find out what the determining characteristics are. Two characteristics have been discussed: institutions and elements. Institutions make elements possible and as a result institutions are chosen as indicators for a democracy, since they lead to elements that are needed to ensure an (ideal) democracy. For the sub-objective 'political parties' I have searched distinctive characteristics of political parties. What makes them different from other types of organisations? The research has come up with three indicators: political parties ideally perform an intermediate role between citizenry and the formal political system. Next to this indicator, political parties are focussed on getting a good result in elections. Finally, political parties need to be registered as such by a formal registration.

The LFA Table, table 2.1, now can be filled in with the sub-objectives 'democracy' and 'political parties' and their indicators for the development objective.

Table 2.1 Logical Framework Approach, overall Table

	Sources Academic Literature	Sources BPA/MPA	
1. Development Objective: Democratisation Sub-objective: Democracy Sub-objective: Political Parties	1a. Indicators 1 Elected officials 2 Free, fair and frequent elections 3 Freedom of expression 4 Alternative sources of information 5 Associational autonomy 6 Inclusive citizenship 7 Focus on good result in elections 8 Intermediate role 9 Formal registration as 'political party'	1b. Indicators BPA/MPA	1. External factors
2. Immediate Objective	2a. Indicators	2b. Indicators BPA/MPA	2. External factors
3. Activities	3a. Input	3b. Input BPA/MPA	3. External factors
4. Output	4a. Indicators	4b. Indicators BPA/MPA	4. External factors

2.3 Immediate Objective

The goal of this section is to answer the following research question: What are the main indicators for the sub-objectives ‘democracy assistance’ and ‘political party assistance’ for the ‘immediate objective’? By using (academic) literature, other than from the Dutch political foundations, these sub-objectives will be discussed.

The ‘immediate objective’ of the research becomes clear from the sub-objectives of the development objective: ‘democracy’ and ‘political parties’. The overview of the literature on these sub-objectives showed that political parties can be key characteristics of a democracy. In an ideal democracy, they have all qualities needed to make it a democracy. Therefore, the position of political parties can determine a lot of the quality of a democracy. In many democracies, parties do not perform all their functions as they should, therefore in assisting political parties the goal should be: improve functioning of political parties. This is also the ‘intermediate objective’, since it is closely linked to the activities of Dutch political foundations. They mainly work with political parties and according to literature we can now establish that these foundations should focus on improving the functioning of political parties. This means that political parties should execute all their functions. To remind us, the functions of political parties are related to the institutions Dahl has mentioned: provide a democracy with candidates to be elected during free, fair and frequent elections. They must be able to freely express themselves and provide citizens with alternative information and relevant policies to government policies (Dahl, 2000: 85). Who wants to work with political parties must bear in mind that they are unique in the sense that they are focussed on getting a good result in elections and they should play an intermediate role between the citizens and the formal political system.

The assistance of political parties thus lies at the centre of assisting democracies, but it is not the only part of democracy assistance. Therefore, firstly, the sub-objective ‘democracy assistance’ is discussed. In many articles and books on democratisation, the support/promotion/assistance to democracy is a logical element in the discussion. Democratisation is quite often stimulated by foreign donors, both governmental and non-governmental. The final sub-objective ‘political party assistance’, will be discussed in the following part. The assistance to political parties should focus on the intermediate role between citizenry and the state level, when following the reasoning in the previous paragraph. These characteristics of political parties are unique and they ensure all needed institutions that eventually should lead to a democracy.

2.3.1 Democracy Assistance

The topic of this section is to establish the indicators for providing ‘democracy assistance’. Many democratisation processes are supported and stimulated by external donor agencies, like political party foundations. Although it is difficult to form a clear cut, widely agreed upon understanding, the research question for this part is: what are the main indicators for the sub-objective ‘democracy assistance’?

In order to understand what the indicators are, it is important to grasp the meaning of the term democracy assistance.¹⁹ The literature on this subject is extensive. But as the chapter proceeds some definitions will pass in order to come to a sufficient understanding of the term ‘democracy assistance’.

Schmitter and Brouwer are two authors who have written on democracy assistance. They provide us with a definition of democracy promotion: ‘Democracy Promotion consists of all overt and voluntary activities adopted, supported, and (directly or indirectly) implemented by (public or private) foreign actors explicitly designed to contribute to the political liberalisation of autocratic regimes and the subsequent democratisation of autocratic regimes in specific recipient countries’ (Schmitter and Bouwer, 1999: 12).²⁰ This definition has some distinctive features that need clarification. Schmitter and Bouwer state that democracy promotion is a ‘voluntary’ activity. Many international organisations, both public and private work with professionals and make very little use of volunteers, at least not on the providing-side. In this research both types of organisations, the MATRA political party foundations and the IMD work mainly with professionals.

The second element of the definition deals with the notion of ‘foreign actors’. In recent years the phrase ‘ownership’ has come up very strongly within organisations active in development cooperation and more specifically in democracy assistance. This phrase refers to the idea that programmes and projects are implemented after a clear-cut question from the intended recipient organisation (= ‘demand driven’ projects). In a manual on Dutch political party assistance by political party foundations it is even mentioned, that all projects proposals should be initiated by the receiving party.²¹ Besides the concrete question, ‘ownership’ ideally also embodies the thought of a very active recipient organisation that accounts for most of the implementation of the specific project. Donor organisations see themselves in this regard as facilitators of the process of democratisation in a partner-country. This should not do away with the fact that the recipient is financially dependant on the donor. There has been little research on this relationship and the implications for the level of ownership in the relation. Schmitter and Bouwer therefore can correctly stress the role of the foreign actors. The last element in the definition of Schmitter and Bouwer contains the emphasis they put on ‘autocratic regimes’. The term ‘autocratic’ is not further specified by Schmitter and Bouwer. This excludes all other forms of governments, democratic or not. Many of the organisations promoting democracies work in countries that could not be characterised as autocratic regimes, but as being in the ‘grey zone’ as Carothers calls it (Carothers, 2002: 9). They are in between two opposites: stable consolidated democracy and absolute autocracy. In conclusion to this definition, it has provided the debate with a very specific look at democracy assistance, namely as an active, interventionist act from foreign actors to turn an autocracy into a democracy.

¹⁹ Many terms are used as synonym for the term ‘democracy assistance’: democracy promotion, democracy support, political (development) aid, political assistance, democracy-related assistance and support for democratic development.

²⁰ This definition is presented in the paper by Schmitter and Brouwer together with a definition of democracy protection, which has much similarities with the definition of democracy assistance.

²¹ As seen in the ‘Manual MATRA Political Parties Programme’, 2004, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, pp.1

This reasoning is backed up by Gerrits (2004), when he notifies the intervention in 2003 in Iraq and places it in the debate on ‘exporting democracy’ or ‘democratic intervention’ (Gerrits, 2004: 22). There are three dimensions within this debate: international law, the role of states and governmental organisations (United Nations, Organisation of American States) and democracy promotion by non-governmental organisation, civil society. When defining democracy promotion, he emphasises the political aspect of the term: ‘democracy promotion focuses on the political process, on the variables of democratisation: empowering of democratic culture, institutions, and procedures.’ (Gerrits, 2004: 24). Democracy assistance deals more than any other form of (foreign) aid with the transfer of political values, skills and institutions. Democracy assistance has had this character for many years and according to Gerrits could even be viewed as ‘enlightened colonialism: bringing political enlightenment, the new white man’s burden’ (Gerrits, 2004: 24). This is exemplified by the stature of democracy within international law. The right for a democratic government is becoming more and more recognised by the international community and is written down into a greater extent in international treaties.²² The international treaties and charters were aimed at regulating possible interventions in the name of democracy promotion, as a recent example has shown us in Iraq (2003). Gerrits puts it correctly by stating that the label ‘democracy promotion’ on a military intervention should not be perceived as democracy promotion, he names it ‘democratic intervention’ (Gerrits, 2004: 22).

Another way of defining democracy assistance is simply summing up what kind of activities should be labelled as such. Karume took this approach for democracy assistance in the 1990s: ‘democracy assistance ...took various forms: electoral assistance (organisation and conducting elections, independent election management bodies, supervision of elections verification of elections) and technical assistance (voter registration, voter education, constitutional and legal matters, logistics and training of electoral officials, political parties and local observers/monitors)’ (Karume, 2003: 2). It becomes clear from this list of activities that the author notices that democracy assistance in the 1990s was perceived primarily as a means to assist a country during the period of elections. In the following sections it will become clear what other elements of the sub-objective democracy assistance can be distinguished. For the moment, activities that assist countries around elections will be perceived as an indicator for democracy assistance. This is logical, given the fact that the research already established as important indicators for the sub-objective ‘democracy’: free, fair and frequent elections and elected officials.

The third way to outline the term ‘democracy assistance’ is to give a description of a democracy. This kind of definition has been demonstrated in the section on the sub-objective of democracy. Diamond used this type in his 1995 rapport on ‘Promoting Democracy in the 1990s’. He refers to Dahl’s ‘polyarchy’ or ‘liberal democracy’. He sums up what democracy encompasses: ‘... a

²² Gerrits (2004) mentions the Human Rights Declarations of the United Nations in 1993, 1999 and 2000. Furthermore he lists the 1985 Charter of the Organisation of African states and the Harare Declaration of the Commonwealth in 1991 (Gerrits, 2004: 21).

civilian, constitutional, multi-party regime with regular, free, and fair elections and universal suffrage, organisational and informational pluralism; extensive civil liberties; effective power for elected officials; and functional autonomy for legislative, executive, and juridical organs of government' (Diamond, 1995: 5). The definition of democracy assistance is every activity that is beneficiary or consolidating these elements. Diamond specifies three types of instruments to 'promote, foster, or support democracy': political assistance, economic assistance and thirdly diplomacy, aid conditionality, and sanctions (Diamond, 1995: 20). The first type seems most applicable to the term 'democracy assistance'. Political assistance is assistance with a political goal: 'to develop democratic institutions, practices, and capacities' (Diamond, 1996: 20). Diamond also sums up the focus points that embody political assistance: formal political institutions, elections and civil society. These various types provide a much broader understanding than the former definition of Schmitter and Bouwer. Diamond sees democracy assistance as very wide ranging activities from developing political parties to promote stability in economies for imposing sanctions on countries. The reasoning of Diamond provides this research with the remaining indicators for the sub-objective democracy assistance. He mentions as focus points of political assistance (the most applicable interpretation of democracy assistance to this research): formal political institutions, elections and civil society. With the word 'institution', Diamond means organisation and not institution as in the sense that Dahl previously mentioned. This research focuses on the support of political parties in order to function better. Their functioning is to be improved in elections and formal political institutions, like parliament. Although the Dutch multi-party foundation IMD and other political party foundations have some projects with other groups than political parties, civil society will not be included as indicator for the sub-objective of democracy assistance. It is too far reaching for this research to decide which groups can be categorised as civil society and which not.

In sum, studying the literature has brought up two indicators for the research on the sub-objective democracy assistance:

1. assisting formal political institutions
2. election support

2.3.2 Political Party Assistance

In order to establish the indicators for the sub-objective political party assistance, it is necessary to go back to the discussion on the sub-objective democracy assistance. Many authors namely claim that democracy assistance is a political form of aid par excellence. There is a distinct element in democracy assistance that makes it a rather different working field than other forms of assistance. Democracy assistance is seen as a form of *political* aid to a country. The general feeling within literature is that this distinct feature of democracy assistance is very important to recognise. Many scholars argue that democracy assistance is all about politics. It is essential to look at the political aspect of democracy assistance in order to be successful. Schmitter and Brouwer state that

‘there is no apolitical way to democratise and, therefore, there is no apolitical strategy to promote & protect democracy’ (Schmitter and Brouwer, 1999: 1). The same reasoning is applied by Burnell: ‘...the notions of democracy that lie at the centre of much democracy assistance ...occupy a limited range. ..., they are a political construct. Ideas of social democracy and economic democracy are excluded (Burnell, 2000: 4). ‘Democracy assistance is oriented on the political process’ as Gerrits points out (Gerrits, 2004: 24). Carothers also highlights the political element in democracy assistance. Two themes are important: improving variety and quality of the main political actors, and gap the bridge the gulf between citizenry and the formal political system. In focussing on these two issues, Carothers makes a clear choice for the political aspect of democracy assistance. He even goes as far as stating that assisting political parties is essential for successfully assisting democracies (Carothers, 2002: 19).

Part of the explanation for the emphasis on the political element comes from the subject of most articles and books on this topic. Many authors write on states as donors in democracy assistance and provide official democracy assistance. The choices that are made by governments are by definition political, because most governments are democratic chosen governments that are comprised of political parties. Governments are formed by political parties and therefore determine the reasons for supporting developing countries are numerous. The non-state actors, though, face this problem less, since they mostly co-operate with other non-state actors (except for political parties). They also, however, have to make political choices. The primary actors in this research are political party foundations, which are linked to political parties and work mainly with political parties. This form of assistance is therefore by definition political since both sides are politically active.

There is not much academically written on political party assistance, let alone on different approaches or models of assistance. There are enough sources that highlight the political element in democracy assistance. It seems evident for scholars to argue that democracy assistance is by nature a political activity. This has to do with the viewpoint of many authors on democracy assistance. Most literature deals with official government led democracy support. Political parties form the government and the assistance to other governments and thus political parties is highly political. Less literature mentions the activities of non-state actors. These organizations, although mostly officially funded, face this problem less. They can operate more freely in a country and this is accentuated because their counterparts are generally non-state actors.

The resources that are available, mostly describe the kind of projects which can be labelled as political party assistance. There is little academic debate on how political party assistance projects should be like. The following papers or articles form the basis for this part of the immediate objective: Hesp, I., 2002, paper on Dutch political party foundations; Mair, S., Multi-partisan or Bi-partisan Cooperation, What is the best solution for Democracy Assistance?, 2004, paper which discusses different approaches in political party assistance; Kumar, K., International Political Party Assistance, an overview and analysis, 2004, a paper that discusses political party assistance by government agencies

and non-governmental organisations, such as political party foundations; Carothers, Th., *Political Party Aid*, 2004, paper prepared for the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA) on international political party assistance; Öhmann, M., Ahlbäck Öberg, Sh., Holmström, B., Wockelberg, H., Åberg, V. (Öhmann, M. et al.), *Political parties and democracy assistance*, 2004, evaluation paper on Swedish political party foundations for SIDA.

Of these articles, Carothers has made one of the most useful contributions. He describes the activities political party foundations undertake in assisting political parties. His typology can be categorised into four categories:

- Strengthening the party organisation
- Strengthening the party in preparation of elections
- Assisting parties in being effective in democratic institutions
- Strengthening the overall party system (Carothers, 2004: 6)

The first type of political party assistance refers to several kinds of assistance, which can be divided in four types: stimulating youth and women participation; stimulating internal democracy; funding assistance; and training party cadres in membership building and communication. The third kind of 'strengthening the party organisation' is understood as material assistance that provides small funds that are provided to the recipient party. This allows them to travel and take part in conferences and seminars, to buy a fax machine or a computer.

The second type are activities focussed on elections and the preparation of it. There are two kinds of this form of political party assistance. The assistance that is given prior to the election, such as training in candidate selection and candidate preparation and activities that help parties to participate effectively in an election. The third form of political party assistance is to educate parties how to be effective members of democratic institutions, like parliament. Training can be focussed on legislative drafting or negotiations and coalition building for example.

The final type is an approach which is amongst the Dutch political party foundations predominantly chosen by IMD; to strengthening the overall party system i.e. starting up an inter-party dialogue. This is very beneficiary to the party system and the overall democracy, especially in case of a post-conflict country. In these circumstances it is important to bring political parties together and try to develop a common goal. Carothers mentions also other kinds of 'strengthening the political party system': reforming the legal framework and party financing (Carothers, 2004: 21-23).

These types of political party assistance help to establish the indicators for this sub-objective. For the sub-objective political parties it was especially important to emphasise the intermediate role parties should play between citizenry and the formal political system. The literature on political party assistance does not mention this very frequently. Carothers points out that stimulating the intermediate role is one of the many activities that are conducted in political party assistance. He mentions 'grassroots outreach', 'communication methods' and 'political platform development'. He does not

make clear what is exactly understood by these terms. Other authors only touch the subject of the intermediate function in describing political party assistance. Kumar (2004) stresses the intermediate function of parties: ‘functions of parties are... representing the people and expressing their demands; reconciling diverse needs and aspirations that exist within society and translating them into manageable programs;finally, political parties help to educate and socialize people into political processes.’ (Kumar, 2004: ix (introduction)) Like many authors, Kumar describes the problem areas of political party assistance (ownership is lacking, technical expertise is lacking, short term in stead of long term commitment from donors, not all parties receive funding, partisanship blurs the relationship between donor and recipient, imbalance between support for civil society and political parties), but does not mention the focal areas of political party assistance. Therefore it does not become clear from the literature what kind of activities political party foundations conduct when it comes to one of the indicators of political parties, the intermediate role.

The other indicator of the previous sub-objective (political parties), focussing on a good result in elections, is very frequently mentioned. Carothers, Hesp, Kumar and Mair all point out that this is an important type of activity in political party assistance. ‘Much of the international assistance for party development has been tied to election campaigns.’ (Kumar, 2004: 9) Especially in bi-party cooperation, the assistance is logically focussed on getting a good result in elections for the recipient party. This can be achieved in training the partner-party in campaigning, election monitoring etcetera. This can help benefit the recipient party in getting a good result at the elections. Hereby one of the goals of the donor-party is achieved. Multi-party assistance also works with parties around elections, but the activities tend to focus on more abstract topics, like vote counting or poll watching. These are activities which do not have a clear link to an ideology or a certain working method. In order to achieve this goal, donor foundations give training session in campaigning techniques, such as voter mobilisation, campaign strategy, fundraising and other areas like training of party poll watchers (Carothers, 2004: 6).²³ This indicator for the sub-objective ‘political parties’ is ‘focussing on a good result in elections’ which is backed up by the literature on the sub-objective ‘political party assistance’. There is enough information on projects which are focussed on making the recipient party able to achieve a good result for the recipient party. This indicator therefore can be used in checking the projects of both approaches.

Besides this indicator, the research also mentions another indicator of political party assistance, namely training political leadership. Political parties are the primary vehicles for selecting political leaders and therefore training them on political leadership is valuable to political parties and the democracy. The reason why western political party foundations give training in political leadership is because many parties that are relatively new, especially in developing countries, have a strong leader-centric nature. This means that there is one strong leader that controls the party by for instance

²³ Kumar mentions the same topics: ‘...strategic planning for effective campaigns, candidate identification and selection, message/platform development, voter outreach, media relations, campaign funding and budgeting, voter mobilisation, opinion polls, poll watching, and vote counting.’ (Kumar, 2004: 9)

he 'chooses who is on the party's executive council, determines who will be candidates in legislative and other races, controls the party finances, makes the main decisions on campaign strategy' (Carothers, 2004: 16). Because of the position of the leader, problems may arise, especially around the internal democracy of a party. The training is mostly developed on a theme, like party financing and through the training democratic values are distributed to the participants of the training. Therefore political foundations train party members from the middle level, the management level, which will be the future leaders of the party bodies. Several authors (Erdmann, 2005: 26; Mair, 2004: 132; Kumar, 2004: 21) mention these problems. These authors stress that training political leaders is an important element in assisting political parties, since one of functions of a political party is to select political leaders and hold them accountable in parliament. There is even one political party foundation, the Spanish Fundación Pablo Iglesias that spends 100% of its budget on training political leaders (Van Wersch and De Zeuw, 2005: 46). But for most political party foundations, training political leadership is one of the many activities they conduct.

Concluding this section, the indicators that have become clear after literature research are:

- 1 election support
- 2 training political leadership

2.3.3 Conclusion

In this part of the research the research question was: what are the main indicators for the sub-objectives What are the main indicators for the sub-objectives 'democracy assistance' and 'political party assistance' for the 'immediate objective'?

For 'democracy assistance':

- 1 assisting formal political institutions
- 2 election support

For 'political party assistance':

- 3 election support
- 4 training political leadership

The 'immediate objective' is 'improving the functioning of political parties' and political party foundations conduct projects and activities that should lead to better functioning political parties in the countries they work. This brings the research to two sub-objectives: 'democracy assistance' and 'political party assistance'. For 'democracy assistance' two indicators have emerged: assisting formal institutions and election support. It is interesting to see whether these indicators have similarities with the indicators for 'the presence of democracy' as is discussed in section 2.2. The indicator of 'the presence of democracy' that come closest are 'elected officials' for the indicator 'assisting formal political institutions' and 'free, frequent and fair elections' for 'election support'. The first similarity is

that elected officials are representatives of the populations and they are mostly located in a formal political institution, like parliament. The second similarity is even clearer, namely I have not come across other similarities in researching literature on democracy assistance.

For 'political party assistance', the following indicators have been presented: 'election support' and 'training political leadership'. For the first indicator, a similarity can be found with the indicator for the presence of political parties: focus on good result in elections. Despite this quite clear similarity, the indicator 'training political leadership' cannot be matched with an indicator for the presence of political parties.

Now that the indicators for all sub-objectives have been established for this research, the LFA Table can be filled in further. This will be done after discussing the external factors to projects in development cooperation.

2.4 External Factors

Within the NORAD Handbook, external factors are defined as 'events, conditions or decisions which are necessary for project success, but which are largely or completely beyond the control of project management' (NORAD, p. 106). Within this vast group of factors that can influence projects of political party foundations, there is a difference in the extent to which they have influence on the projects. For instance: a western political party foundation has started a training for a political party in a developing country. When the political situation of the developing country is highly unstable, this can cause the training to be less successful, since it affects the participants of the training. Another external factor might be, that the participants get ill and therefore cannot participate fully concentrated at the training. These are all factors, which can influence the output of a project. Of course the lower level external factors (the last example) are far less influential than the higher level external factors. Since the list of external factors is endless it is very difficult to find scientific literature on this item. There is, however, a vast amount of literature of the conditions that favour democratisation. One of the most remarkable authors on this field is Samuel Huntington with his work 'The Third Wave, Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century' (1991). He views the transition of countries to a form of democracy since the 1970s and 1980s as a wave of democratisation that comes over the globe. The first wave occurred between 1828 and 1926; the second wave was between 1943 and 1962, which were each followed by reversals (Huntington, 1991: 15). Huntington explains that specific changes have 'paved the way for the latest wave of transitions to democracy' (Huntington, 1991: 18). Huntington established five main changes in the world: military defeat and economic failure presented authoritarian governments with problems of legitimacy to govern; raised living standards through growing economies, raised civic expectations and the will to express them; changes within religious institutions made them more willing and able to oppose authoritarian governments in stead of defending the status quo; the push to promote human rights and democracy by external factors such as non-governmental organisations and the European Community; the demonstration effect of

democratisation processes in other countries, enhanced by new international communications. These 'changes in the world' are external factors that can accelerate the democratisation in a country.

2.5 Conclusion

In this chapter, the following research question was posed: 'which indicators can be drawn from the sub-objectives 'democratisation', 'democracy', 'political parties', 'democracy assistance' and 'political party assistance' according to academic literature?' The second chapter also looks at what literature has to say about external factors. The main literature for this research has been democratisation literature, as well as literature on what constitutes a 'democracy' and a 'political party'. As a result I have presented an overview of the discussion and the outcome of this overview is that the 'development objective' has two sub-objectives: 'democracy' and 'political parties'. 'Democratisation' as a sub-objective appeared to be too closely related to the sub-objective 'democracy' and is for this study regarded as 'the process towards democracy'. The sub-objective democracy provided the research with six indicators that make clear what is understood as a democracy in this research. The six indicators are mainly derived from the work done by Dahl (2000) for establishing what constitutes a democracy: elected officials; free, fair and frequent elections; freedom of expression; alternative sources of information; associational autonomy; and inclusive citizenship. The research then aimed at establishing distinct indicators for the presence of political parties, which turned out to be: groups with a 'focus on getting good result in elections', who play an 'intermediate role between citizenry and formal political system' and that are 'formally registered as political party'. The following step was to establish what the 'immediate objective' is according to literature. Since literature views political parties as essential to a democracy and since the foundations under study assist political parties, the 'immediate objective' is 'improve functioning political parties'. The sub-objectives for this objective are 'democracy assistance' and 'political party assistance'. For the first sub-objective, the indicators are 'assisting formal political institutions' and 'election support'. Authors emphasise that democracy assistance cannot be impartial and is therefore political. Supporting political parties is a logical outcome of this reasoning. For the sub-objective 'political party assistance' two indicators were found, namely 'election support' and 'training political leadership'.

It is interesting to compare the indicators for the sub-objectives for the 'immediate objective' with the indicators for the 'development objective'. There are some similarities, like the indicators for 'democracy assistance' can be linked to the indicators for the presence of democracy. Not all indicators for the presence of democracy can be found in the literature on democracy assistance, but two can: assisting formal political institutions, which can be linked to elected officials (elected officials have to be representatives somewhere, like parliament, which is a formal political institutions). The other indicator, election support can be directly linked to the indicator 'free, fair and frequent elections'. For the other sub-objective, political party assistance, two indicators emerged, of which one can be linked to an indicator for the presence of a political party. The first indicator for

political party assistance is 'election support', which matches with the indicator for the sub-objective political parties, namely focus on good result during elections. Thus according to the studied literature, supporting political parties during elections stimulates democratisation, since election support on political parties are viewed as indispensable elements of a democracy.

As last part the external factors have been discussed. There are numerous external factors that can 'jeopardise' a positive outcome of the project a political party foundation is working on. There is a difference in the level of the external factors, it is clear that lower level external factors, like 'all participants get ill' has a much less negative effect on the outcome of the project than highly unstable political situation.

Now these elements of the LFA have been established, the LFA table can be filled in with the objectives, sub-objectives and their indicators. On the following page, the LFA table is presented and filled in for the second column, which contains the information retrieved from academic literature.

Table 2.2 Logical Framework Approach, overall table

	Sources Academic Literature	Sources BPA/MPA	
1. Development Objective: Democratisation Sub-objective: Democracy Sub-objective: Political Parties	1a. Indicators 1 Elected officials 2 Free, fair and frequent elections 3 Freedom of expression 4 Alternative sources of information 5 Associational autonomy 6 Inclusive citizenship 7 Focus on good result in elections 8 Intermediate role 9 Formal registration	1b. Indicators BPA/MPA	1. External factors
2. Immediate Objective Improve Functioning Political Parties Sub-objective: Democracy Assistance Sub-objective: Political Party Assistance	2a. Indicators 1 Assisting political institutions 2 Election support 3 Election support 4 Training political leadership	2b. Indicators BPA/MPA	2. External factors
3. Activities	3a. Input	3b. Input BPA/MPA	3. External factors
4. Output	4a. Indicators	4b. Indicators BPA/MPA	4. External factors

Chapter 3 Family Business

In this chapter, the key objective is to complete the table on the LFA by using literature of the seven Dutch political party foundations that use the BPA in their political party assistance. This means that they use the fraternal approach or assist their sister-parties; these are parties that have the same ideological background as the donor political party foundation. The research question for chapter three is: to what extent do Dutch political party assistance activities of the Bi-Party Approach contribute to democratisation? For answering this question, first I will establish the 'development objective' and 'immediate objective' and their indicators according to the funding source of the Dutch political bi-party foundations. They are funded by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and therefore I first check if the political party assistance projects adhere to the guidelines or indicators from the Ministry. Therefore I study the annual reports to find the activities, the input for the activities and the output. At the end of this chapter I will examine to what extent projects in the year 2004 projects from the Dutch BPA foundations meet with the 'development objective', 'immediate objective', activities and input and output for sustaining democratisation, which were set by the literature and discussed in the previous chapter. Due to practical reasons, especially time constraints, I look at one year, 2004.

In order to fill the LFA table, the research discusses the components of the LFA by using annual reports of the foundations, policy statements of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs and interviews with the political party foundations; the components are: 'development objective', 'immediate objective', 'activities', 'output' and 'input'. Besides the component 'input', all other components have indicators that will become clear in this chapter. Firstly the background and the Dutch political party foundations, internationally and nationally are introduced. This is followed by establishing the 'development objective' and its indicators of the bi-party foundations in The Netherlands. Thirdly, the 'immediate objective' and its indicators will be discussed, after which an overview of the activities and of the foundations is presented. The last component, the input for the activities and the output will follow logically from the activities.

In all the elements, the interviews will be used as background information. The interviews were semi-structured, which means that I have not interviewed the foundations with a standardised set of questions, but with a series of topics, focussed on the advantages and disadvantages of the BPA in political party assistance and the role of political parties in a democracy. The outcomes of the interviews will be used as qualitative data in this chapter. All seven Dutch political bi-party foundations have been interviewed.

3.1 International overview

First of all it is important to describe what the main characteristics of a political party foundation are. There are approximately 35-40 Western European organisations that can be categorised as ‘political party foundations’; they share the following characteristics:

- they are (closely) related to one or more political parties in their home country;
- they are for the main part officially funded by government agencies;
- they give special attention to political parties in their democracy assistance activities.

The first of these is the main distinctive characteristic of a political party foundation. The relationship between a political party and a party foundation may vary in strength, but generally there is a clear link. In the case of the Dutch political foundations, each of them is closely linked to its respective political party; the work of the foundations is mentioned by the political parties on their websites as one of their core activities. The International Democratic Initiative (IDI), for example, is part of the international office of the Dutch social liberal party D66, and focuses on supporting democratisation worldwide, particularly by stimulating international collaboration between parties. The above description does not imply that all political party foundations are alike. However, there are differences in the way they are organized. This concerns the manner in which the political foundation is structured; the exact role of a supervisory or executive board in daily management; the relationship between the foundation and the political party; and the implications of this relationship for the execution of assistance programmes.

The second characteristic of a political party foundation relates to its funding source. In most cases, the foundation receives its funds from a bilateral agency, such as a Ministry of Foreign Affairs or a Ministry of development cooperation. For example, the Dutch political foundations, working with the BPA are sponsored by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs by a European Affairs unit, while IMD is sponsored by the same Ministry, but then by a Development Cooperation unit. Political party foundations, however, work together in their programme countries with domestic foundations from a related ideological background. For example, the Eduardo Frei Foundation (EFF), of the Dutch Christian Democratic Party, has conducted projects in close relationship with the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung (KAS), which is linked to the Christian Democratic Party (CDU) in Germany.²⁴

The third defining characteristic of political party foundations relates to their area of expertise. It is clear that they pay special attention to political party development in their democracy assistance activities. In most cases, they are approached for support by political parties in developing countries. Since most political foundations are linked to a political party, they generally have a reasonable understanding of some of the challenges that political parties face in developing and former communist countries. Foundations know the political arena and can share their knowledge with their local partners. Other international actors active in democracy assistance do not have this specific experience and

²⁴ The German word ‘Stiftung’ means ‘foundation’.

expertise. In addition, it should be noted here that political foundations do not work exclusively with political parties. Civic associations, trade unions and other interest groups are also among their beneficiaries. In some cases, however, this is because political foundations face legal prohibitions to work directly with political parties. Under German Party Law, for instance, the German political party foundations or ‘Stiftungen’ are not allowed to directly support any political party, at least within Germany. Whether the ‘Stiftungen’ are allowed to support political parties abroad, especially through the ‘bi-party’ approach, remains unclear.

The oldest political party foundations in the form we know now, are the German ‘Stiftungen’ of which the oldest, the Friedrich Ebert Stiftung from the social democratic party SPD, was founded in 1925.²⁵ Since most ‘Stiftungen’ were established much earlier than their other European counterparts, the German model has been copied in many European countries.²⁶

In West-Europe, there are approximately 35 to 40 political party foundations and most of them use the BPA in their work.²⁷ Contrary to the German foundations, that are the largest and oldest in the western world, all other European foundations mainly assist political parties in their work (Van Wersch and De Zeeuw, 2005: 11, 13, 15). To give an idea of the scale and the position of the Dutch political foundations: the combined annual overall budget of the six German political foundations in 2004 was € 358 million, the combined annual overall budget of 21 other European foundations in 2004 was € 42 million (Van Wersch and De Zeeuw, 2005: 12). The seven Dutch political party foundations that work with political parties in using the BPA have a combined annual overall budget of almost € 2 million in 2004. In comparison, IMD had a 2004 annual overall budget of € 6,8 million (Van Wersch and De Zeeuw, 2005: 30-31). Next to the budgetary differences between the German ‘Stiftungen’ and the other European political party foundations, there is also a difference in life history, as already mentioned. The

²⁵ ‘The *German* (added) foundations were originally established to provide the German people with civic education and to assist the political parties in the fulfilment of their functions.’ (Burnell (ed.), 2000; Mair: 129). Later the German ‘Stiftungen’, six in total, focussed for the larger part on international democracy assistance of which political party assistance is only a small part

²⁵ Several telephonic interviews with German political foundations showed that, officially, they cannot work directly with political parties. The projects that are conducted, in which political parties participate, account for 20-25 percent of their annual project expenditure. There are six German political party foundations: Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (Social Democrats), Konrad Adenauer Stiftung (Christian Democrats), Hanns Seidel Stiftung (Bavarian Christian Democrats), Friedrich Naumann Stiftung (liberals), Heinrich Boell Stiftung (Greens), Rosa Luxemborg Stiftung (Socialists).

²⁶ The United States, the United Kingdom, Sweden, France, Spain, Portugal, Austria, Norway, Finland and the Netherlands have somewhat similar approaches for funding political party foundations. The situation in Sweden shares the most similarities with the Dutch MATRA-programme: the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, a government agency that reports to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, funds the political party foundations according to their seats in parliament. Swedish political foundations are mostly active in Eastern Europe & Eurasia (Van Wersch, 2004: 182).

²⁷ This figure comes from De Zeeuw and Van Wersch, 2005: 37, in which 32 European political party foundations were studied. Next to the Western European foundations, there are two major political party foundations in the United States; the National Democratic Institute (Democrats) and the International Republican Institute (Republicans); both receive their funds mainly from the National Endowment for Democracy, which is created to

average life history of the six German foundations is 38 years, while their European colleagues have an average life history of 14 years, which is similar to the Dutch foundations (Van Wersch, 2004: 172).

3.1.1 The Netherlands: an overview

Within The Netherlands there are eight political party foundations involved in political party and democracy assistance. Of the eight, seven foundations work with a BPA, while one, IMD, works with a MPA. IMD operates worldwide with all political parties within a programme country irrespective of their ideological backgrounds; IMD will be discussed in chapter four. This situation is quite unique in its present form.²⁸

The Dutch political party foundations share the same characteristics with their European colleagues:

- they are (closely) related to one or more political parties in their home country;
- they are for the main part officially funded by government agencies;
- they give special attention to political parties in their democracy assistance activities.

Following to the first element, the relationship between the seven foundations and their political parties is very close.

- 1 The Eduardo Frei Foundation (EFF) is linked to the Christian democratic party (CDA);
- 2 The Alfred Mozer Foundation (AMF-EFDS) to the social democratic party (PvdA);
- 3 The Haya van Someren Foundation (HvSF) to the liberal party (VVD);
- 4 The Foundation on Sustainable Solidarity (FSS) to the green party (GroenLinks);
- 5 The Eastern Europe Project Team (EEPT-SGP) to the Reformed Christian party (SGP);
- 6 The Development Cooperation project (DCP-CU) to the Christian party (ChristenUnie);
- 7 The International Democratic Initiative (IDI) to the social liberal party (D66).²⁹

Assisting political parties abroad is perceived as one of the key activities that Dutch political foundations undertake. Political foundations are therefore often viewed, despite their separate legal status, as part and parcel of the political party they are linked to.

The second element also applies to the Dutch foundations. They are mainly funded by the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs through the so-called ‘MATRA Programme’.³⁰ Established in

support nongovernmental organisations, active in democracy support. These three organisations were founded in 1983.

²⁸ To my knowledge, there is only one country that has a somewhat similar situation. In Norway, there is a multi-party foundation (Norwegian Centre for democracy Support (NCDS)) of all parliamentary parties, but at the moment it is mostly used by the Norwegian parties to work with a BPA through funds provided by NCDS. Besides the NCDS, the Norwegian parties also have their own projects in political party assistance

²⁹ There are two other Dutch political parties in parliament – the Socialist Party and the Party Pim Fortuyn – that are also eligible to receive funding for their international activities through political foundations. However, they have chosen not to apply for it.

1994, MATRA ('MAatschappelijke TRAnsformatie', or 'societal transformation') is a specific programme within the Dutch Foreign Affairs budget, aimed specifically at supporting the (political) transition of the countries of Central and Eastern Europe as well as Euro-Asia and recently also in Northern Africa (Morocco) and in the Middle East (Jordan). In its first period, 1994–98, the MATRA Programme focused on civil society and local government issues. In 1998, the programme was divided into two subcomponents: 'MATRA Pre-Accession' and 'MATRA Good Governance'. The 'MATRA Pre-Accession' component was renamed 'MATRA for European Cooperation' in 2004. The aim of this programme is to establish partnerships with the new EU member states as well as fostering partnerships with other EU neighbouring countries. The objective of the 'MATRA Good Governance' programme is 'to stimulate the desired transition to a pluriform, democratic, constitutional state in the selected countries of Central, South-East and Eastern Europe'.³¹ One part of this programme consists of the 'MATRA Political Parties Programme', which provides the funds for the seven Dutch political bi-party foundations. Their assistance is mainly focused on strengthening parties in young democracies through the training of mid-level political party activists. Almost all of their activities take place in Eastern Europe and Euro-Asia.³² The Dutch political party foundations are expected to work with like-minded parties in countries that receive aid from the Dutch government with as main goal: 'supporting the transition of EU member states (accession-states or potential accession states) or selected neighbouring states of the enlarged EU in the regions Central, South-Eastern, Eastern Europe, Northern Africa and the Middle East, to a pluriform, democratic constitutional country.'³³

In 2004, the total MATRA Programme budget amounted to € 43 million, of which € 15 million for 'MATRA for European Cooperation' and € 28 million for 'MATRA Good Governance'. Also in 2004, the 'MATRA Political Parties Programme' had a budget of € 1.7 million, representing the funds for the Dutch political party foundations. Each political foundation receives a minimum amount from the MATRA Political Parties Programme, and this is supplemented by a certain amount according to the number of parliamentary seats held by the political party that is affiliated to that foundation.³⁴ The 2004

³⁰ In addition, by law, Dutch political parties represented in parliament may also apply for funds from the Netherlands Ministry of the Interior for their international activities and for supporting like-minded parties abroad through training activities, without the need to set up political foundations. However, to my knowledge none of the Dutch parties represented in parliament has yet applied for these national funds.

³¹ Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *Bijlage bij Kamerbrief inzake Beleidsvoornemens MATRA-programma*, September 2004.

³² Recently it has become possible for the Dutch political foundations that are funded through the MATRA Programme to work also in Morocco and Jordan.

³³ Translation provided by the author, from Dutch into English. As seen in the 'Manual MATRA Political Parties Programme', 2004, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

³⁴ Thus the Haya van Someren Foundation (HvSF), for example, receives funding according to the number of seats held by the Dutch liberal party, the VVD, supplemented by the minimum amount. In 2005 the minimum amount is € 82,000 and the amount per seat is calculated by the difference between the total budget of the programme (in 2005 € 2 million) and the total amount of 'minimum amounts'; the rest amount is divided by the total number of seats in parliament held by the parties affiliated to the political party foundations, which is 132.³⁴ When this figure is calculated, € 10,700 is the amount per seat. In example the HvSF, affiliated to the liberal party VVD: the VVD holds 27 seats which is $27 \times € 10,700 = € 288,900$; this is supplemented with the minimum amount of 82,000: $€ 288,900 + € 82,000 = € 370,900$.

annual overall budgets were as follows: AMF € 694,000; EFF € 468,272; HvSF € 324,737; FSS € 155,000; IDI € 121,664; DCP-CU € 97,293; EEPT-SGP € 85,000; totalling to € 1,945,966.³⁵

It is important to realise how the MATRA political party foundations are funded. The foundations are very closely affiliated to a political party, represented in parliament. 'Their' political party is the main funding source for their programmes and projects. When the foundations combined were to wish more funds, they could submit a law proposal to parliament through 'their' parties. There is much chance on approval, since all foundations would like to see an increase in their annual overall budget. Secondly, they are able to do this, since they hold 132 of the 150 seats in parliament. Added to this, is the fact, that although the Ministers and Secretaries of State have a different mandate, they are member of political parties; in The Netherlands most likely from a party whose foundation receives funding from the MATRA-programme. For the MATRA Political Parties Programme, this has never happened. The following reasons are conceivable: the political parties, of which the foundations are funded by the MATRA Programme, have very different opinions on the role of the government, the role of parliament, the position of parties and how to handle taxes. Another reason might be that the public opinion could turn on the political party foundations for lifting their budget through their voting power in parliament. In Germany as pointed out by Mair (2000): 'For long time the foundations (German foundations-researcher) seemed to be immune against any efforts of the government to reduce their expenditure.' (Mair, 2000: 130). But in the 1990s corruption scandals from the mid 1980s caused the German Green party to appeal to the German constitutional court to review the system of political foundations and their funding (Mair, 2000: 130-131). This led to an own political foundation for the Green party and some regulation which formulated some conditions, like 'banning all-purpose payments to foreign parties and unions.' (Mair, 2000: 131). In The Netherlands, there has not been much controversy about the political foundations, with might be explained by the fact that they receive relatively small budget (in 2004 € 1,7 million) compared to the overall annual budget of the MATRA Programme, which was in 2004 € 43 million.

The last element of the definition of political party foundations is that these organisations give special attention to political parties in their democracy assistance activities. The Dutch foundations not only give special attention to political parties, but they are primarily focussed on political parties. Of their project expenditures they spend more than 95% on activities related to political parties (Van Wersch and De Zeeuw, 2005: 32). This can be logically explained by the mandate they have been given from the Ministry and the MATRA Political Parties Programme, which states that the funds provided, should be

³⁵ De Zeeuw and Van Wersch, 2005: 30. The average annual overall budget was € 277,995. These annual overall budgets of the Dutch MATRA foundations comprise also other funds than the subsidy from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, funds provided by the Dutch political party they are linked to, funds from their western, mostly German, counterparts and through international associations, like the political groups in the European Parliament and the associations like Liberal International and International Socialist.

spend on ‘training and development training’ of the management level of political parties.³⁶ Such projects should be requested by the party in the young democracy of a MATRA country.³⁷ It was stressed by all foundations during the interviews. For countries in the region Eastern Europe & Euro-Asia that have become member of the EU on April 1, 2004 (Poland, Hungary, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Slovenia, Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia), there is a gentleman’s agreement between the Ministry and the foundations. This agreement means that the foundations’ activities will ‘fade out’ in these countries within three years after the accession to the EU of the countries, which was May 1, 2004. This agreement has become clear during the interviews as the respondents told me about the existence of such an agreement.

3.2 Development Objective

In the previous section, the ‘development objective’ of the projects of the Dutch political party foundations has been mentioned. The ‘development objective’ is the main overall objective of a project or programme. In this case the MATRA Programme has the following goal: ‘assisting the transition of EU accession-states or potential accession states or selected neighbouring states of the enlarged EU in the regions Central, South-Eastern, Eastern Europe, Northern Africa and the Middle East, to a pluriform, democratic constitutional country.’³⁸ For the research this will be understood as the ‘development objective’ of the projects and programmes conducted by the Dutch BPA foundations in the MATRA Programme. This ‘development objective’ has some important elements or indicators that are the guidelines for any political party foundation in The Netherlands that wants to submit a project proposal. These guidelines are the indicators for the MATRA projects. The level to which is adhered to these guidelines determines whether the ‘development objective’ is attained.

The first indicator is the region in which the foundations are allowed to work in. As has been stated in the previous section on the national overview of Dutch political foundations, there is a list of countries where the foundations can work. The countries on the list fall in the regions Eastern Europe and Euro-Asia as well as Northern Africa and Middle East and are future member states of the EU or are neighbouring states of the EU. The next indicator in the ‘development objective’ is ‘the transition to a pluriform, democratic constitutional country’. This indicator has three characteristics: pluriform, democratic and constitutional. Unfortunately I have not found a document of the Ministry what is exactly meant by these terms. But these terms do hint to a form of democratisation. Although in my discussion in chapter two the notion of a pluriform democracy has not been mentioned, the terms democratic and

³⁶ Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *Bijlage bij Kamerbrief inzake Beleidsvoornemens MATRA-programma*, September 2004.

³⁷ The ‘MATRA Political Parties programme’ countries at present are Russia, Belarus, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, FYR Macedonia, Moldova, Rumania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Albania, Serbia and Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Turkey, Morocco and Jordan.

³⁸ Translation provided by the author, from Dutch into English. As seen in the ‘Manual MATRA Political Parties Programme’, 2004, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

constitutional have been discussed. This ‘development objective’ starts by pointing out that the objective for MATRA-project should be ‘assisting’ democratisation; these terms have close similarities with the terms in the ‘development objective’ for chapter 2: ‘contributing to’ democratisation. For arguments sake I suppose that the Ministry places the same meaning to these terms as I have done for the ‘development objective’ in chapter 2, which was ‘democratisation’.

Therefore the ‘development objective’ of the MATRA Programme is understood in this research as ‘contributing to democratisation in countries in the regions Eastern Europe and Euro-Asia as well as Northern Africa and Middle East that are future member states of the EU or are neighbouring states of the EU.’ Additionally, two indicators for the ‘development objective’ have been established: firstly, an indicator is that a MATRA project should be targeted at ‘countries in the region in the regions Central, South-Eastern, Eastern Europe, Northern Africa and the Middle East, which are member states or future member state of the EU or are neighbouring states of the EU’. The second indicator is that a MATRA project should be aimed to ‘assisting the transition to a pluriform, democratic constitutional country’

3.3 Immediate Objective

The Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs states that ‘Political parties play an essential role in the process of democratisation of the partner countries. Since long, the network between Dutch political parties, represented in parliament and their ‘sister’ parties have been supported. The intention is to have partnerships between like-minded parties.’³⁹ This statement comes from the Dutch Minister for European Affairs, Atzo Nicolaï in a letter to parliament on the policy intentions from the Minister on the MATRA Programme. It makes two items clear: first of all, the Minister views political parties as essential and secondly, in assisting political parties, the intention is to work with the ‘sister’ parties of Dutch political parties. Especially the last element is striking as the Minister states through this statement that supporting political parties is at best done through ‘sister’ parties. The idea of working through ‘sister’ parties mostly refers to the BPA in political party assistance. Other phrases used to indicate political party assistance through a Bi-Party Approach are the fraternal approach (Carothers, 2004: 8), party-to-party support (Burnell, 2004: 33) and single-party approach (Carothers, 2004:8). Concluding this part on the ‘immediate objective’: in this statement, Atzo Nicolaï clearly states that political parties are essential in a democracy (thus political parties need to be assisted when a transition to a democracy has to be stimulated) and the assistance of political parties is best to be done through Dutch political parties represented in parliament that assist their ‘sister’ parties (political parties with a similar ideological background).

The ‘immediate objective’ of the projects conducted by Dutch political party foundations is provided by the mission statement of the MATRA Political Parties Programme, which subsidised the

³⁹ Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *Bijlage bij Kamerbrief inzake Beleidsvoornemens MATRA-programma*, September 2004.

foundations in order: ‘to enable the Dutch political parties to contribute to the training of the management officials of (‘sister’) parties in countries in Eastern Europe, Euro-Asia, Northern Africa and Middle East.’⁴⁰ In order to achieve this objective, the Ministry states that the foundations should conduct ‘political schooling and development training activities with the management officials of the (‘sister’) party’. This is a clear indicator in order to achieve the ‘immediate objective’. The Ministry provides the Dutch political party foundations with even clearer guidelines, the projects should relate to:

- 1 political education courses for members and interested members, management and chosen representatives in democratic bodies of ‘sister’ parties.
- 2 the preparation and composition of documentation for schools, associations, universities and like wise organisations, which have requested information, related to the political objectives of the ‘sister’ parties.
- 3 the training or funding of training of persons, that are active in the activities as described in 1 and 2.
- 4 the preparation, creation and dispersion of documentation needed for the previously mentioned activities.⁴¹

These are clear guidelines that provide this research with indicators for the ‘immediate objective’. Therefore in sum the ‘immediate objective’ is: to enable the Dutch political parties to contribute to the training of the management officials of (‘sister’) parties in countries in Eastern Europe, Euro-Asia, Northern Africa and Middle East.’ The indicators can be summarised as ‘political schooling and development training activities with the management officials of the (‘sister’) party’, which are four-fold: ‘political education courses, documentation materials, training activities and preparing, creating and dispersing of documentation.’

3.4 Activities

In this section the activities or in this case projects from Dutch MATRA foundations will be discussed. In the literature on political party assistance, there is not much written on evaluations or on the activities of political party foundations.

In 2002 Irna Hesp, a former trainer at the Alfred Mozer Foundation from the social democratic party PvdA reviewed the MATRA-programme in the period 1994-2002.⁴² This study is very useful as starting point for the overview of the activities. Hesp begins by pointing out that in the beginning the MATRA-organisations used the ‘trial and error’ method. This was due to the fact that after the collapse of the Eastern European bloc, countries immediately started to organise elections. Therefore, the (newly founded) political parties were in need for support on the basic elements of political parties.

⁴⁰ MATRA Political Parties Programme, Manual, September 2004, p.1

⁴¹ MATRA Political Parties Programme, Manual, September 2004, p.1-2

The choices made for ideologically linked parties is mostly made through contact with international organisations of political parties with the same ideology, like Liberal International, International Socialists, Global Greens; the European fractions in the European Parliament (EP), such as European Liberal Democrats (ELDR), Party of European Socialists (PES) and European Federation of Green Parties/European Free Alliance.

Hesp mentions that the foundations have three types of projects: fact-finding missions, seminars and training. The first project type refers to the situation of starting up a programme in a country. Through these missions it is investigated if there are potential partners for the Dutch foundation to work with. With regard to the second type of activity, seminars and conferences are very frequently organised in order to discuss issues in a politically 'safe' environment. These gatherings are organised to examine policy or ideological subjects. The last category of projects is aimed at the technical political skills needed in political parties. This ranges from training in financial management, setting up membership-administration to campaigning-techniques.

After the study done by Hesp, in 2005 Jeroen de Zeeuw and I concluded a research into the activities of European political party foundations with a special focus on all Dutch foundations (thus including IMD).⁴² The figures were obtained after email surveys and telephonic interviews. In the email survey the following questions were raised: What are the main themes your organisation is working on? Can you give an estimate in terms of percentage breakdown of specific thematic focus, for example civil society 30%, political parties 50%, etcetera? Of the 32 European political foundations, 21 responded and their estimates showed the following result: on average, 71% of their work is spend on 'Political Parties', 18% is spend on 'Civil Society' and 11% on 'Other' themes. For the Dutch MATRA foundations, the average was 96% on 'Political Parties' and 4% on 'Civil Society', which are justifiable figures, since the Dutch foundations have a special mandate to work with their 'sister' parties. Since both figures for the theme 'Political Parties' (71% for 21 European foundations and 96% for 7 Dutch foundations) were very high, we wanted to know what their activities with political parties actually were. We asked the foundations: Could you please specify for your organization what exactly these political party activities are? In addition, what share (in percentages) do these activities approximately account for in your organization's political party-related programs?

The following categories were available: 1) build or strengthen basic party organisation; 2) strengthen party capacity for electoral campaigning; 3) training of party poll watchers or party election staff; 4) strengthen parliamentary role of parties; 5) strengthen overall party systems; 6) stimulate women participation; 7) other activities.

Of course these categories are arbitrary; they come from a paper written by Thomas Carothers in 2004 on political Aid (Carothers, 2004: 6). For this research I will view category 2) and 3) as one

⁴² This research paper was written in request of IMD.

⁴³ De Zeeuw, J. and Van Wersch, J., Mapping European Democracy Assistance: Tracing the Activities and Financial Flows of Political Foundations, Clingendael Institute, Conflict Research Unit, Working Paper 36, 2005

category, since they are both closely related to elections and the distinction between the two categories is too futile. This category will be labelled as ‘strengthen party capacity for elections (training of poll watchers, election staff and in campaigning)’. On this question, the seven Dutch MATRA foundations responded as follows: 1) build or strengthen basic party organisation 37%; 2) +3) strengthen party capacity for elections (training poll watchers, election staff and campaigning) 23%; 4) strengthen parliamentary role of parties 15%; 6) stimulate women participation 9%; 5) strengthen overall party system 7%; 7) other activities 9%. The most noticeable activities are ‘build or strengthen basic party organisation’ with 37% and secondly ‘strengthen party capacity for elections (training poll watchers, election staff and campaigning)’ with 23%. All the figures just presented are estimates provided by political party foundations themselves. The information is very interesting for this research in providing a more detailed background on the activities of Dutch political foundations. It will be interesting to see what the findings are, when the annual reports and policy documents are checked. The main information source will be the annual reports of the seven Dutch political party foundations as submitted for approval to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; complemented with interviews held with all foundations.

3.4.1 The actual activities

The previous studies provide this study with useful background information, but they do not compare the activities of the foundations with the ‘development objective’ of the MATRA Programme and the ‘immediate objective’ from the MATRA Political Parties Programme. In the following, the activities of the foundations are related to this issue. What are the activities categorised by the indicators from the ‘development objective’ and ‘immediate objective’? To refresh our memories: the indicators for the ‘development objective’ are ‘countries in the regions Eastern Europe and Euro-Asia as well as Northern Africa and Middle East, which are future member states of the EU or countries which are neighbours of the EU’ and the second indicator is that the projects should be aimed at ‘assisting the transition to a pluriform, democratic constitutional country.’ But more important for evaluating the projects are the indicators on the ‘immediate objective’, which are: ‘political schooling and development training activities with the management officials of the (‘sister’) party’, which are four-fold: ‘political education courses, producing documentation materials on the political objectives of the ‘sister’ party for schools, association, universities etcetera, training trainers to conduct the training activities and preparing, creating and dispersing of documentation.’ These indicators will be the guidelines to check the annual reports of the Dutch political party foundations active through the MATRA Programme.⁴⁴

When examining the annual reports of Dutch political party foundations funded by the MATRA Political Parties Programme and reviewing the interviews, I have found four outcomes that can be categorised as:

- 1 Indicators ‘immediate objective’
- 2 Regional focus
- 3 Large vs. small foundations
- 4 Trends in the work of Dutch MATRA foundations: tri-party assistance, multi-party assistance, train-the-trainers, exchange visits, youth and women.

First of all, I checked the annual reports with the indicators of especially the ‘immediate objective’ as guidelines. These indicators were the type of projects for which subsidy is granted by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs: I political education courses; II produce documentation materials on the political objectives of the ‘sister’ party for schools, associations, universities etcetera; III training trainers to conduct the training activities; IV preparing, creating and dispersing documentation.

After studying the annual reports of all seven Dutch MATRA foundations, I found that the indicators are not very concrete. Regarding the first indicators, for instance, there is no explanation of the phrase ‘political education courses’. The other types of projects are somewhat more concrete, but still there is no specification in the MATRA Political Parties Programme Manual of what the projects should include. This makes it easier for the foundations to operate, since it gives room for various interpretations.

As I understand the first type of project, ‘political education course’, this phrase refers to activities that cover a political issue, for example market-economy and how to deal with the advantages and disadvantages, but also political skills training, like training in political leadership for young party members or training in media strategy before, during and after elections. In both sorts of projects there is a clear political element. In the first sort of project, on political issues, the projects mostly deal about how a specific political ideology, i.e. ‘liberal’ views a political issue and how the western counterpart deals with it. The second sort of project that is categorised in this research as ‘political education course’ is targeted at specific skills that are trained by people that have political experience. Mostly, training sessions are given by western political party members with a clear history in the party on a certain area, for instance speech writing or campaigning strategy. This background in a political party is of extra value to the participants, since the trainer has hands-on experience. Additionally, political skills refer to skills that are specific for a political activist, mostly a member of a political party.

The projects most conducted by the Dutch MATRA foundations are the ‘political education courses’. All foundations have projects in which they discuss political issues, which range from market-economy and its consequences to environmental issues to the role of religion in politics. In many cases this sort of project is linked to the accession to the EU of the country where the ‘sister’ party is active. Examples are: what are the advantages and disadvantages for our social security system when we become a member of the EU? How do we translate EU regulation to our country? How do the EU bodies function

⁴⁴ For all foundations, annual report of 2004 is available, except for the Foundation for Sustainable Solidarity of the Green party, which only provided the annual report of 2003.

and how to apply for subsidies from the EU? It is logical that parties in Eastern Europe ask these questions, since they just entered the EU or will in the near future.

The other sorts of project, that the Dutch political bi-party foundations conduct very often in this category are the 'political skills' projects, which are mostly related to elections; these projects have mostly the character of a training and are relatively concrete. The participants are members of like minded parties and in a two or three day seminar or workshop they receive in small groups, 20-30 people, training from a western trainer, which has been active in the specific issue. Examples of such skills that 'sister' parties of the Dutch foundations request training on, are: media training, campaigning techniques, political leadership, campaign financing, training in public speaking etcetera.

The other types of projects have not been so clear from the 2004 annual reports. I have not come across many projects on 'producing documentation materials for schools and like wise organisations' or projects that 'prepared, produced and/or dispersed this material'. One type of project that has been found through scanning the annual reports, were 'train-the-trainer' projects. These are projects in which a party member from the 'sister party' is trained in being a trainer. Especially the larger foundations are beginning to see the benefits of these projects. It releases some pressure from the Dutch foundations in providing trainers, since mostly trainers are party members that volunteer to give a training. Next to this, the advantage of such a project should be that the trainee will conduct the training session in a similar way as the original western trainer did. Of course it can be modified to be better match with the national, regional or local setting and to the 'taste' of the trainee, but the basic elements, like training method and political ideology, should be the same.

Concluding this section, it has become clear that Dutch MATRA political party foundations are mostly active in projects that can be labelled as the first indicator of the 'immediate objective, being 'political education courses'. The second and fourth indicators have hardly been found in the annual reports of the foundations. The third indicator, 'training trainers to conduct the training activities', was found in some cases, especially in the annual reports of the three bigger foundations. This means that the Dutch MATRA foundations for the larger part adhere to the indicators and therewith the manual and its regulations of the MATRA Political Parties Programme from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The second outcome of my study of the annual reports relates to the regional focus of the Dutch MATRA foundations. The foundations have a clear mandate to work in specific countries. I have not come across a foundation that was working in a country that is not mentioned in the list provided by the Ministry. What was striking is that most foundations work in former communist countries in Eastern Europe and Euro-Asia and are not (yet) active in Morocco and Jordan. In Turkey almost all foundations have activities, besides the IDI and the EEPT-SGP. The other foundations have recently been given the opportunity to work in Turkey; therefore most projects are in a beginning stage. Some foundations have done fact finding mission in Turkey to see what the changes for partnership are, while others have

established cooperation with an ideologically like minded parties (DCP-CU and FSS). Also in the interviews, most foundations mentioned that do see possibilities to work in Turkey and to a lesser degree in Morocco, but none of the political MATRA foundations saw a possibility to work in Jordan or was planning a fact finding mission. The focus on Eastern Europe and Euro-Asia is exemplified in the research of De Zeeuw and Van Wersch. In this research it becomes clear that European political foundations in general, but especially the Dutch MATRA foundations focus on this region (Van Wersch and De Zeeuw, 2005: 35, 54, 55). Of their project expenditure 100% is spend in this region; in this research Turkey is viewed as a country in Euro-Asia and therefore projects in Turkey are accounted for as falling in the European region.⁴⁵

The third outcome of my search through the annual reports is that there is a difference between the three largest foundations in budget, AMF, EFF and HvSF and the four smaller foundations. The average 2004 annual overall budget of these foundations is € 495,514, while the average of the four smaller foundations is € 114,739 (Van Wersch and DeZeeuw, 2005:30). The AMF, EFF and HvSF are much more focussed on training activities, in which specific political skill are trained. In the research by Van Wersch and De Zeeuw, the figures show that these foundations combined spend more than 70% of their annual project expenditure on training activities (Van Wersch and De Zeeuw, 2005:34).⁴⁶ A good example of a political skills training is a project by the AMF in Bulgaria in 2004. AMF provided training for the Bulgarian Socialist Party (BSP) in effective election campaigning for the youth members of the party that are active in campaigns. The training, conducted by mostly Dutch trainers, took three days in which the younger members of the BSP were educated in skills and techniques for effective election campaign. More concrete, the party members were trained in using a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats) analyse for the campaign.

The smaller foundations combined only spend 45% of their project expenditure on training activities.⁴⁷ The smaller foundations have a rather specific political ideology (IDI social liberal, FSS 'green', DCP-CU 'Christian: Biblically inspired politics' and EEPT-SGP 'Christian: political reformed politics'). The larger foundations have ideologies, which can be found in almost every European country: social-democratic, liberal and Christian-democratic. For these foundations is not difficult to find counterparts in Eastern Europe and Euro-Asia, while for the smaller foundations this is. Therefore, their projects are much more focussed on conferences, congresses and seminars in which they can discuss their

⁴⁵ For 27 European political party foundations combined the project expenditure are divided as follows: Eastern Europe 25% Euro-Asia 25%, Central & South America 21%, Asia 20% and Sub-Sahara Africa 14%.

⁴⁶ The total distribution of the project expenditure by Dutch MATRA political party foundations AMF, EFF and HvSF in 2004 was as follows: 71.7% training, 13.3% Advice and Technical Assistance, 8.3% Conferences and Seminars, 6.7 Other Activities (De Zeeuw and Van Wersch, 2005:34).

⁴⁷ The total distribution of the project expenditure by Dutch MATRA political party foundations FSS, IDI, DCP-CU and EEPT-SGP in 2004 was as follows: 45% training, 25% Advice and Technical Assistance, 29% Conferences and Seminars, 1% Other Activities (De Zeeuw and Van Wersch, 2005:34). The total distribution of the project expenditure by all Dutch MATRA political party foundations in 2004 was as follows: 56% training, 22% Advice and Technical Assistance, 18% Conferences and Seminars, 4% Other Activities (De Zeeuw and Van Wersch, 2005:34).

similarities with the 'sister' party. During the interviews project managers from the smaller foundations also indicated the difficulty of finding suitable partners. In many countries their specific ideology does not play a large role in national politics. Their counterparts are mostly relatively small parties, sometimes even local parties in municipals. In the projects they conduct, they discuss the role of their kind of party in politics or what, for instance, Biblically inspired politics means in every day politics. In many cases the enlargement of the EU and its effect on the 'sister' party is discussed or how the Dutch political party handles political subjects, like social-economical issues (health care, wages, unemployment) and environmental issue (economy vs. environment) or other political subjects. Especially the small Christian inspired political party foundations and to a lesser extent the larger EFF, have activities that emphasise the role of religion in a society. In sum, their activities have less the character of training activities as do the activities of the bigger foundations.⁴⁸ An example of such an activity is a project by the EEPT-SGP in Rumania, Bucharest in 2004. The EEPT-SGP organised a three days conference together with a Dutch NGO about Christianity and society. One of the subjects was the effect of Calvinism on European countries and the EU and the effects of market economy and secularisation on a society.

The last and fourth outcomes are several trends that can be traced from the annual reports and from the interviews held with project managers of the foundations. There are five major trends: tri-party assistance, multi-party assistance, train-the-trainer projects, exchange visits and youth and women as central group in a project. The tri-party projects have been found as two types: the Dutch foundations works together with a larger foundations (mostly German) and combined they assist a 'sister' party; the other type is that the Dutch foundations finances a project with a 'sister' party, but executed by another 'sister' party, that has experience in setting up projects and giving trainings. In all this, the international links are frequently used: the European foundations work through international associations like Socialist International or through a fraction in the European parliament like the European democrats. These associations are also used for getting in contact with 'sister' parties.

The multi-party is relatively new. In 2004 there has been a project in Georgia in which the three largest foundations, AMF, EFF and HvSF participated. They facilitated and gave training to 30 youth from seven Georgian political parties in political leadership skills. The three foundations have experienced the training and the cooperation as positive and want to continue the cooperation. Interestingly enough these foundations have also their own 'individual' projects in Georgia, which makes it interesting to see to what extent the cooperation is extended.

The train-the-trainer projects are mainly conducted by the larger foundations. The aim is to establish a trainer pool from which trainers can be used for training session in the country or the region. The fourth trend is exchange visits between mostly youth from the 'sister' party and youth from the Dutch political party to which the MATRA foundation is linked to. In The Netherlands all political parties have

⁴⁸ The nuance should be made that the IDI and the FSS do have training activities, but on a much smaller scale than

youth organisations that are fairly active in establishing international contact. The last trend is the focus in projects on especially youth and to a lesser extent on gender issues. In many projects the topic is ‘how to establish power in the political parties, being a youth member or a woman?’ Also in the interviews it was emphasised by most foundations, that youth and gender issues receive special attention in their projects.

3.5 Input and Output

Following LFA-logics, activities need a certain input in order to be conducted. In this research I have studied the annual reports qualitatively by presenting an overview of the main projects Dutch MATRA political party foundations conducted in 2004. Therefore I have no hard data or figures on the number of party members of the ‘sister’ party that were trained or what the budget was for this activity or how long the party members of the ‘sister party were trained. The following answers to these questions are again an overview of the annual reports under study.

Input as different types: budgetary, people and time. The budgets of the Dutch MATRA foundations are very modest compared to their European colleagues. Therefore the Dutch foundations try to cooperate with other foundations and/or have smaller projects. The average project budget is approximately € 5000. As far as the people are concerned that are responsible for the projects, they are only partially fully-paid party staff. The management of the project is conducted by a fully-paid staff, but the trainers are many times volunteers, that have a specific political skill, which makes them experienced enough to give the training. For instance a campaign writer gives training in campaigning. The last type of the input needed for a project, is time. Most projects are executed in a two to three days, especially seminars, workshops, conferences and congresses. Since the distance between the Dutch foundation and the country of the ‘sister’ party are quite large, a two day project is the minimum to have some effect. Another aspect, related to ‘time’ is the funding period. For MATRA foundations this is one year. The MATRA foundations are somewhat dependant on the number of seats their parties have in parliament. This change significantly, as for instance the liberal democrats, D66 had 14 seats in 1998 and now have 6 seats in parliament, which has serious budgetary effects.

For the output, the LFA uses the next definition: ‘The results that can be guaranteed by the project as a consequence of its activity.’⁴⁹ For the projects of these foundations, it is rather difficult to guarantee a specific outcome. There are of course training projects in which the party members of the partner party learn specific political skills, like public speaking. The only output that one can guarantee is that they have had more knowledge of how to speak in public, but it does not guarantee that the trainees are better in public speaking. Bu since the Dutch MATRA foundations, in particular the larger foundations, have an almost ten years experience with given training, it could be expected that the trainees have actually enhanced their competence on a certain political skill, like speaking publicly. The trainings are, however, only part of what these foundations do. For all other projects it is very difficult to

the foundations from AMF, EFF and HvSF.

establish the actual learning element for the ‘sister’ party. A reasonable outcome as mentioned in the annual reports is that the ‘sister’ party has gained a better understanding of how their counterparty in The Netherlands deals with certain political issues. Obviously, this is very valuable for the development of the ‘sister’ party, but it is difficult to measure.

3.6 Conclusion

In this chapter I have discussed the Dutch MATRA political party foundations and their activities in assisting political parties in order to eventually answer the following research question by making use of the LFA: to what extent do Dutch political party assistance activities of the Bi-Party Approach contribute to democratisation? First of all, I tried to answer this question by examining the annual reports and interviews held with the MATRA foundations. I have found that the ‘development objective’ of the funding programme of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the MATRA Programme, from which the foundations receive the largest part of their budget, is ‘assisting the transition of EU accession-states or potential accession states or selected neighbouring states of the enlarged EU in the regions Central, South-Eastern, Eastern Europe, Northern Africa and the Middle East, to a pluriform, democratic constitutional country.’ This objective has two indicators, which are subtracted from the ‘development objective’. The first indicator is the regional focus and the countries to which the programme is targeted: ‘countries in the region in the regions Central, South-Eastern, Eastern Europe, Northern Africa and the Middle East, which are member states or future member state of the EU or are neighbouring states of the EU’. The second indicator is that a project submitted for funding from the MATRA Programme should be focussed at ‘assisting the transition to a pluriform, democratic constitutional country’.

The Dutch political bi-party foundations receive their main funding from a sub programme, the MATRA Political Parties Programme, which provides the research with the ‘immediate objective’ and the indicators. The main goal of this sub programme is ‘to enable the Dutch political parties to contribute to the training of the management officials of (‘sister’) parties in countries in Eastern Europe, Euro-Asia, Northern Africa and Middle East.’ The MATRA Political Parties Programme also states what kind of projects can be granted subsidy: I political education courses; II produce documentation materials on the political objectives of the ‘sister’ party for schools, associations, universities etcetera; III training trainers to conduct the training activities; IV preparing, creating and dispersing documentation.

After establishing the two objectives and their indicators, an overview of the activities was presented. The MATRA foundations focus mainly on the first type of project, political education course. I have distinguished two types of a ‘political education course’: on political issues (i.e. environmental issues) and training in political skills (mostly election support, i.e. training in campaign financing).

The input of the activities can be categorised in three elements: budget, people and time. The budget of the MATRA foundations is relatively modest; the people that give the training work mostly as

⁴⁹ NORAD; p. 107

volunteer, while the management is a fulltime or part time function, depending on the size of the foundations. The time relates to the fact that these foundations receive their budget annually and that most projects take two to three days. The output of the activities is difficult to measure, although training should provide the trainees with more knowledge than before the training. Of course there are external factors that influence the projects of Dutch BPA foundations, but since this research cannot actually review the output of the projects, this element receives less attention.

The provisional conclusion is that the Dutch MATRA political party foundations mainly conduct one type of project which is in line with the indicators of the ‘immediate objective’: their projects adhere for the largest part to the fixed set of projects and are located in the regions as indicated by the Ministry.

In the following LFA Table, table 3, all objectives, sub-objectives and their indicators for the BPA have been filled in and can be compared with the data from chapter 2 on academic literature.

Table 3 Logical Framework Approach, overall table

	Sources Academic Literature	Sources BPA	
<p>1. Development Objective: Democratisation Sub-objective: Democracy</p> <p>Sub-objective: Political Parties</p> <p>BPA: assisting the transition of countries in a specific region to becoming a pluriform, democratic constitutional country.</p>	<p>1a. Indicators</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Elected officials 2 Free, fair and frequent elections 3 Freedom of expression 4 Alternative sources of information 5 Associational autonomy 6 Inclusive citizenship 7 Focus on good result in elections 8 Intermediate role 9 Formal registration 	<p>1b. Indicators BPA</p> <p>1 specific region 2 democratisation</p>	<p>1. External factors</p>
<p>2. Immediate Objective Improve Functioning Political Parties Sub-objective: Democracy Assistance</p> <p>Sub-objective: Political Party Assistance</p> <p>BPA: Dutch political parties to contribute to the training of the management officials of ('sister') parties in a specific region</p>	<p>2a. Indicators</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Assisting political institutions 2 Election support 3 Election support 4 Training Political leadership 	<p>2b. Indicators BPA</p> <p>1 political education course 2 produce documentation materials on the political objectives of the 'sister' party 3 training trainers 4 preparing, creating and dispersing documentation.</p>	<p>2. External factors</p>
<p>3. Main activities BPA: political education courses (on political issues and political skills)</p>	<p>3a. Input</p>	<p>3b. Input budget, people and time</p>	<p>3. External factors</p>
<p>4. Output BPA</p>	<p>4a. Indicators</p>	<p>4b. Indicators BPA</p>	<p>4. External factors</p>

Now that has been established what the conclusion is after checking the annual reports and interviews, it is interesting to see what the final conclusion is. This means researching to what extent projects in the year 2004 projects from the Dutch BPA foundations met with the 'development objective', 'immediate objective', activities and input and output for sustaining democratisation, which were set by the literature and discussed in chapter two. Chapter two established with the following 'development objective' and the sub-objectives 'democratisation', 'democracy' and 'political parties'. The 'development objective' was that the activities of political party foundation should contribute to 'democratisation'. There are close similarities with the 'development objective' of the third chapter, of the MATRA Programme. The only striking difference is that the MATRA Programme is clearly focussed at certain regions. The indicators from the 'development objective' from chapter two are: Elected officials; Free, fair and frequent elections; Freedom of expression; Alternative sources of information; Associational autonomy; Inclusive citizenship; Intermediate role between citizenry and formal political system; Focus on good results in elections. These indicators come from Dahl, who designed them to ensure political equality. The first indicator, elected officials, can be found in the annual reports in projects that are aimed at the candidates for parliament of the 'sister' party. These projects should prepare the candidates for successfully becoming and being a member of parliament. In studying the activities of the Dutch MATRA foundations, I have not found projects that are aimed at indicators two and/or three (free, fair and frequent election and freedom of expression). The fourth indicator, alternative sources of information, can be found in only a few projects that relate to the second and fourth indicator of the 'immediate objective' from the MATRA Political Parties Programme: II produce documentation materials on the political objectives of the 'sister' party for schools, associations, universities etcetera; IV preparing, creating and dispersing documentation. The fifth and six indicators have not been found in the annual reports. The seventh indicator, political parties have an intermediate role between citizenry and the formal political system has not really been mentioned by the political party foundations during interviews or in their annual reports. The following indicator, parties are focussed on getting a good result in elections, is very frequently used as basis in projects. The 'sister' parties request training on political skills related to elections, like campaigning techniques. The last indicator, formal registration as political party, is not frequently found as an important topic in the projects of Dutch BPA foundations.

In sum, the 'development objectives' are quite similar, but the indicators are very different. The literature focuses much more on political equality and the distinctive characteristics of political parties, while the indicators of the MATRA Programme are more determined as pragmatic guidelines (certain region, certain goal). According to literature, the MATRA Programme thus needs to focus much more on the elements of political equality that are necessary to establish an ideal democratic process. Besides these indicators, the MATRA Programme also has to focus on political parties, which are organisation which have two distinctive characteristics that need to be supported. The conclusion

is that the MATRA foundations partially adhere to the indicators of the second chapter for the ‘development objective’.

The next phase is the comparison between the ‘immediate objectives’ of chapter two and chapter three. Chapter two showed that following the logic of academic literature, the ‘immediate objective’ of a political party assistance project should be ‘improve functioning political parties’, while in chapter three, the ‘intermediate objective’ is the main goal of the sub programme of the MATRA Programme, being the MATRA Political Parties Programme, which is: ‘to enable the Dutch political parties to contribute to the training of the management officials of (‘sister’) parties in countries in Eastern Europe, Euro-Asia, Northern Africa and Middle East.’ This last ‘immediate objective’ is bit more concrete than the ‘immediate objective’ from the literature, but the aim eventually is to help political parties, in a certain region, to function better by focussing on the management level within those parties. The ‘immediate objectives’ also have indicators, chapter two has provided the research with the following indicators: assisting formal political institutions; election support and training political leadership. The indicators for the ‘immediate objective’ after examining the manual of the MATRA Political Parties Programme are: political education courses; produce documentation materials on the political objectives of the ‘sister’ party for schools, associations, universities etcetera; training trainers to conduct the training activities; preparing, creating and dispersing documentation. These indicators are somewhat more concrete than the indicators from academic literature. There is not much similarity between the two groups of indicators, but in reality there is some similarity in the electoral focus. When studying literature, the focus on elections has become more than clear, just as the activities of the Dutch BPA foundations are. Their activities, especially the political skills training activities, were designed to help the ‘sister’ party to get a good result in elections.

The final conclusion therefore is that the Dutch MATRA foundations for an important part focus on political skills training projects before elections, which is backed up by academic literature. One important element though, seems not be covered by the Dutch BPA foundations, which is the intermediate role parties play in a democracy. Consequently, following the logic from the literature I studied, their activities in total are only partially focussed on the correct indicators. The answer to the question to what extent do Dutch political party assistance activities of the Bi-Party Approach contribute to democratisation? can be answered with a yes. They do contribute to democratisation but only partially.

Chapter 4 Outside the Family

This chapter will deal with the MPA in political party assistance with a special focus on the Netherlands Institute for Multi-party Democracy (IMD). The central question in this research is to what extent do the political party assistance activities of the Multi-Party Approach contribute to democratisation? In order to answer this question, I will use the logic of the LFA and establish the 'development objective' and the 'immediate objective' and their indicators according to the subsidy programme of IMD and according to IMD itself. IMD is for largest part supported by a subsidy programme from the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Therefore I will analyse the annual report of IMD for the year 2004 with the guidelines or indicators from the subsidy programme. Due to practical reasons, especially time constraints, I look at one year, 2004. After I have checked the activities of IMD with the 'objectives' and their indicators, I will conclude the chapter by examining to what extent the IMD projects in the year 2004 meet with the 'development objective', 'immediate objective', activities and input and output for sustaining democratisation, which were set by the literature and discussed in the previous chapter.

In order to fill in the LFA table, the research discusses the components of the LFA by using the annual reports of this multi-party foundations, policy statements of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs and interviews with IMD staff; the components are: 'development objective', 'immediate objective', 'activities', 'output' and 'input'. Besides the component 'input', all other components have indicators that will become clear in this chapter. Firstly the background and history of IMD is introduced. This is followed by establishing the 'development objective' and its indicators of the multi-party foundation in The Netherlands. Thirdly, the 'immediate objective' and its indicators will be discussed, after which an overview of the activities and of IMD is presented. The last component, the input for the activities and the output will follow logically from the activities.

In all the elements, the interviews will be used as background information. The interviews were semi-structured, which means that I have not interviewed the foundations with a standardised set of questions, but with a series of topics, focussed on the advantages and disadvantages of the MPA in political party assistance and the role of political parties in a democracy. The outcomes of the interviews will be used as qualitative data in this chapter.

4.1. Background and organisational set-up

Before IMD was established, seven political parties in The Netherlands had experience with assisting political parties by using a MPA. The predecessor, namely, for IMD was the Foundation New South Africa (NZA), which was founded in 1994 by Dutch political parties represented in the parliament, both opposition and government. This collaboration intended to stabilise the political system in South Africa and to work closely with political parties. In 1994 South Africa abandoned 'apartheid' and Nelson Mandela became president. The experiences of NZA were positive for the

Dutch parties and provided a good basis for IMD to be founded on. The political parties had gained experience in collaborating with each other in order to support political parties and democracy as a whole in a foreign country. In the first five years, NZA received a total subsidy of € 12,320,999 of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

As a result of the positive experience, eight parliamentary parties founded the Netherlands Institute for Multi-party Democracy in 2000, which were the following eight Dutch political parties; all represented in parliament as either government or opposition parties: CDA, PvdA, VVD, D66, Green Party, SGP, RPF and GPV.⁵⁰ These parties are the same parties that are founded through the MATRA Political Parties programme. All the IMD parties use both approaches, BPA and MPA in supporting political parties; although in the case of IMD there is an independent bureau that administrates and monitors the projects, while the MATRA foundations are actually a part of the party. IMD's approach is characterized by its preference for working with all major legally registered political parties (and political groupings) in partner countries, including both governing and opposition parties. In addition, in IMD's activities there is a strong emphasis on inter-party dialogue and cooperation between political parties of differing ideological backgrounds in order to develop and improve a democratic and pluralistic party system.⁵¹ As the IMD website states: 'The main objective behind IMD is to support the process of democratisation in young democracies by strengthening political parties as the pillars of parliamentary democracy in order to help create a well-functioning, sustainable, pluralistic system of party politics.'⁵²

IMD is a political party foundation and therefore has the following distinctive characteristics:

- IMD is (closely) related to one or more political parties in their home country;
- IMD is for the main part officially funded by government agencies;
- IMD gives special attention to political parties in their democracy assistance activities.

Since IMD is founded by seven political parties that all have a high level party member which sits in the board of IMD. As put forward on the website of IMD: 'The IMD is an institute of political parties for political parties.'⁵³ The second characteristic of a political party foundation is the funding source. IMD is funded mainly by the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, but draws on a different funding source than the other Dutch political foundations. Whereas the Ministry's South-east and Eastern Europe Department (DZO) is responsible for the MATRA Programme, that funds the seven MATRA political party foundations, the Human Rights and Peacebuilding Department (DMV) is responsible for administering the Theme-based Co-financing System (TMF) that provides IMD funds. This means that for the MATRA foundations, the Minister of Foreign Affairs (Ben Bot) is responsible,

⁵⁰ Two parties (the Reformed Political Federation and the Reformed Political Alliance) merged into the ChristianUnion (CU).

⁵¹ IMD, 2004, *Support for Political Parties and Party Systems. The IMD Approach*, pp. 6–8.

⁵² IMD-website www.nimd.org, seen on 8-12-2005

but the Minister of Development Co-operation (Agnes van Ardenne) holds responsibility for the IMD.⁵⁴ The IMD's subsidy is € 30.958.000 million for the period 2003-2006, whereas the MATRA foundations receive their funding annually from the Ministry.⁵⁵ The TMF is a budget programme of the Ministry which has several themes that should all contribute to poverty reduction.⁵⁶ This system provides funds for civil society organisations that support civil society organisations in the partner-countries of the Dutch government for a four year period. Within the TMF system there are seven themes: sustainable development; HIV/Aids and reproductive health; social cultural development; political development; peace and security; environment and water; gender. The main funds from IMD come from the theme 'political development', which has two elements: human rights and good governance; IMD falls under the second element. The 'good governance' element 'thrives for optimising the legitimacy and effectiveness of government.'⁵⁷ Within the element 'good governance' of the theme 'political element' there are nine topics that IMD has to adhere to, of which two are especially relevant: policy development in stimulating formal, political, democratic processes, especially an inclusive political system; secondly, capacity building of different actors in the political, democratic process. Later in this chapter these elements will be further discussed.

The third characteristic of political party foundations is that they place special attention on political parties in their democracy assistance activities. Like the MATRA foundations, almost all projects of IMD are focussed around political parties. According to their own estimates, 90% of their project expenditure is spent on 'Political Parties' and 10% on 'Civil Society' (Van Wersch and De Zeeuw, 2005: 30). IMD also provided a specification of this 90% (assisting political parties): 55% strengthen overall party system, 40% build or strengthen party organisation and 5% training of party poll watchers of election staff.

4.1.1 Organisational set-up

IMD has an executive board that manages IMD, i.e. formulates policy, monitors the implementation of that policy, and represents IMD.⁵⁸ Furthermore there is a supervisory council which tasks are to advise the board, ratify the chairman of the board, to be the professional institution for projects. All seven parties that founded IMD have high level party members in the executive board and the supervisory council. Finally IMD has a bureau with programme officers, policy officers, field

⁵³ IMD-website www.nimd.org, seen on 8-12-2005

⁵⁴ In The Netherlands the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has two components which each have a Minister: Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Ben Bot as Minister, Atzo Nicali as Secretary of State for European Affairs) and the Ministry of Development Cooperation (Agnes van Ardenne as Minister).

⁵⁵ IMD experienced a 274% increase in budget in four years: 2002 € 2,273,549; 2003 € 5,122,843; 2004 € 6,785,613; 2005 € 8,500,000 (preliminary). The combined budget for the MATRA foundations saw an increase of 44% in the period 2002-2004. (De Zeeuw and Van Wersch, 2005: 28-29)

⁵⁶ Annex to Letter to Parliament on the Policy Framework Programme Theme-based Co-financing System for the period 2006-2010, 2005, p. 2-3

⁵⁷ Annex to Letter to Parliament on the Policy Framework Programme Theme-based Co-financing System for the period 2006-2010, 2005, p. 11-12

⁵⁸ All information on the organisational set-up comes from the following: IMD, 2003: 14.

representatives and administrative and technical assistance. The bureau manages the country programmes, provides policy information and implements policy. To clarify what the terms programme officer and policy officer mean: IMD has country programmes that are managed by country teams. Each country team executes is comprised of one or two programme officers, the policy officer for that region and sometimes a local IMD representative.⁵⁹ A programme officer is member of one of the member-parties of IMD that is provided by member-parties to manage the country programme.⁶⁰ Next to the programme officer, the policy officer is an independent employee of IMD that monitors the country programme. The policy officers are positioned according to three regions: Central & South America, Asia/Indonesia and Africa.⁶¹ For example, the country team for Kenya is comprised of lead programme officer of the VVD, a second lead programme officer of the SGP and the policy officer for Africa.

IMD cooperates in countries supported by Dutch Ministry for development cooperation. IMD worked in 2004 in the following countries: Georgia, Bolivia, Suriname, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Ghana, Mali, Malawi, Mozambique, South Africa, Tanzania, Zimbabwe, Zambia and Indonesia. The countries Georgia and Nicaragua have a special status within IMD. The programmes in these countries are funded by international governmental organisations: the Georgia programme by the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and the Nicaragua programme by United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).⁶²

Although IMD works worldwide, it focuses particularly on Sub-Saharan Africa, where 69% of its activities are carried out. Another important region for IMD, in terms of budget size, is Central and South America, where approximately 21% of its funds are allocated (Van Wersch and de Zeeuw, 2005: 28).⁶³

4.2 Development Objective

In the previous section on the background and the distinctive characteristics of a political party foundation, the ‘development objective’ has been mentioned. According to the logic of the LFA, the ‘development objective’ is the main overall goal of a project or programme. Like is the case with the MATRA foundations, the funding source of IMD determines the ‘development objective’. The TMF system has as primary objective to ‘reduce poverty’, which is the ‘development objective’ for IMD.⁶⁴

⁵⁹ There is a local representative in Guatemala and Mozambique.

⁶⁰ The larger parties (CDA, PvdA and VVD) provide fulltime programme officers, while smaller parties provide part-time programme officers.

⁶¹ Besides the policy officer per region, there is a senior policy officer, also responsible for three country programmes in 2004: Mali, Mozambique and Zimbabwe.

⁶² The Georgia and Nicaragua country programmes have a different organisational structure as the other country programmes due to their different funding resources and will not be under study in this research.

⁶³ IMD also spends 10% of its project expenditure to the region Asia (this is the country programme of Indonesia) and 0,2% on Georgia. The figure for Central & South America also includes the Nicaragua programme.

⁶⁴ Annex to Letter to Parliament on the Policy Framework Programme Theme-based Co-financing System for the period 2006-2010, 2005, p. 2-3

Since the distinction between the ‘development objective’ and the ‘immediate objective’ in the case of IMD is somewhat complex, I have provided a scheme.

- Development Objective: poverty reduction
 - Indicators: ‘sustainable development; HIV/Aids and reproductive health; social cultural development; political development; peace and security; environment and water; gender.

 - Immediate Objective: political development
 - Indicators: two indicators, two relevant: human rights and good governance
 - Good governance has nine topics, of which two relevant: policy development in stimulating formal, political, democratic processes, especially an inclusive political system; and capacity building of different actors in the political, democratic process.

The above presented scheme shows a layered logic, similar to the logic from the LFA, which is used in chapter three for the BPA. There is an overall subsidy programme with several elements, which each have their own elements. In LFA words: The subsidy programme has a ‘development objective’ with several indicators (seven); one of the seven indicators, political development, is the ‘immediate objective’ which has two indicators: human rights and good governance. The indicator good governance is relevant for IMD projects and this indicator has nine topics of which two relevant. The following section aims to further clarify the layered structure and the two objectives and their indicators.

- Development Objective: poverty reduction
 - Indicators: ‘sustainable development; HIV/Aids and reproductive health; social cultural development; political development; peace and security; environment and water; gender.

In order to achieve poverty reduction, organisations that want to receive subsidy from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, need to be focussed on one of the following themes: ‘sustainable development; HIV/Aids and reproductive health; social cultural development; political development; peace and security; environment and water; gender.’ These are the indicators that all should contribute to the ‘development objective’, being ‘poverty reduction.’ Unfortunately the Ministry does not explain what the actual outcomes should be of the ‘poverty reduction’, nor does the Ministry state what they understand as ‘poverty’. Therefore it is not clear what poverty actually means and what the end result should be. Concluding this section, the ‘development objective’ is ‘poverty reduction’, which has seven indicators: ‘sustainable development; HIV/Aids and reproductive health; social cultural development; political development; peace and security; environment and water; gender.’ Of these indicators, political development is most relevant for IMD, since IMD works with political parties.

4.2 Immediate Objective

Following the logic of the LFA, the ‘immediate objective’ is the more concrete objective of a project. In the case of IMD and the subsidy system of the Ministry, the TMF, the more concrete objective of a project should be ‘political development’. In other words: the Ministry also pays attention on the way in which the themes need to be supported, which provides the research with the ‘immediate objective’ for a project focussed on poverty reduction:

- Immediate Objective: political development
 - Indicators: two indicators, two relevant: human rights and good governance
 - Good governance has nine topics, of which two relevant: policy development in stimulating formal, political, democratic processes, especially an inclusive political system; and capacity building of different actors in the political, democratic process.

IMD focuses on the theme ‘political development’ and this theme has two components: human rights and good governance. Since IMD is not directly active in projects related to human right issues, and IMD works with political parties, governing and opposition, the element ‘good governance’ is most relevant. The Ministry states in order to achieve ‘good governance’, one of the following nine topics need to be the focus of a project proposal: policy development in stimulating formal, political, democratic processes, especially an inclusive political system; secondly, capacity building of different actors in the political, democratic process; monitoring the political, democratic process; development of policy to prevent and/or fight against corruption; capacity building of the actors involved in preventing and/or fighting corruption; capacity building to improve the legal status of citizens (i.e. access to juridical system); proportional representation and commitment of all groups in a society in local governance; capacity building of local organisations, associations etcetera; and finally the reinforcement of accountability and transparency of local governance. Of all these topics, IMD focuses on the first two topics: policy development in stimulating formal, political, democratic processes, especially an inclusive political system; secondly, capacity building of different actors in the political, democratic process.

4.4 Activities

Now that I have established what the ‘development objective’ and the ‘immediate objective’ including their indicators of the IMD projects are, the next step is to present an overview of the activities of IMD. In interviews and policy documents, IMD makes it clear that their projects are

generally grouped around one of three types: cross-party; bilateral; and the relationship between political parties and civil society.⁶⁵

‘Cross-party’ projects are mostly aimed at establishing dialogue between multiple parties (mostly all parties in parliament), through the organization of seminars and conferences and the development of codes of conduct. At present, this type of programming is a central element of IMD projects, concentrating mainly on the political party system of the recipient country. An example of a ‘cross-party’ project is the work done in Guatemala, where IMD helped facilitate the signing of a Shared National Agenda by 21 Guatemalan political parties in October 2003.

The second type deals concerns the party system in a particular country. ‘Bilateral projects’ are conducted by the country team and a local political party that has a specific need and has requested support from IMD. The content of this type of IMD work is mostly technically oriented; for example, to assist a political party that wants to organize internal elections for its leader. In addition to the technical component of projects, political parties are encouraged to carry out strategic planning. This approach is more content-oriented and is intended to help the parties develop a clear vision of their own role in the political party system. In both cases the party writes a project proposal and submits it to the IMD country team for approval.

The last type looks specifically at the relationship between political parties and civil society. In many developing countries there is much intolerance between these two groups. Political parties, especially in the developing world, have often had a bad image owing to the fact that they were responsible for single-party, often authoritarian-style government leadership. In such cases, parties were not the transparent bodies, representing broad interests, that the electorate wanted them to be, but mere voting mechanisms for a political or military elite which, once in power, would personally benefit from the country’s wealth. In many countries, popular disenchantment with political parties has led to the emergence of numerous civil society organizations. These organizations are also much more popular with donors than political parties are, thereby adding to the tension between the two groups of actors. By organizing events where both groups can discuss national topics, IMD is trying to bring these actors together and support the democratic progress of all groups.

Besides the three types, IMD has stated in a publication that ‘the IMD process evolves through 5 steps: preparation; introduction and identification; dialogue process; implementation programme; monitoring and evaluation programme’.⁶⁶ IMD does not actually specify what these stages mean in practise, but perhaps this will be clearer after examining the annual reports. Furthermore, for IMD, local ownership is the key and therefore a demand-driven approach is chosen. Secondly, the co-operation should lead to capacity development.⁶⁷

⁶⁵ This differentiation of projects has become clear from interviews and policy documents (IMD, 2003: 6-7)

⁶⁶ IMD, 2003: 8

⁶⁷ IMD, 2003: 7

Like the MATRA foundations, the IMD works together with other international organisations and political foundations, mostly the United States political party foundations National Democratic Institute (NDI) and to a lesser degree the International Republican Institute (IRI). Besides NDI and IRI, IMD works with international governmental organisations like Organisation of American States (OAS) and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

4.4.1 The actual activities

In researching the 2004 annual report of IMD, I have found outcomes on the following issues:

- 1 Indicators from immediate objective: twofold
- 2 Code of conducts
- 3 Intermediate organisation

First of all, the ‘immediate objective’ is political development and for IMD especially important is the second element of this objective: good governance. The explanation of the term good governance, according to the Ministry is: ‘optimising the legitimacy and effectiveness of the government.’⁶⁸ As has become clear from the second chapter and from the literature, optimising good governance is certainly an element of democracy assistance. But there are more elements to a democracy, like civil society, rule of law, state apparatus and economic society (Linz and Stephan, 1996: 12). But since IMD is focussed on the political aspect of democracy assistance and the fact that political parties are essential within a democracy, I consider ‘good governance’ as ‘democratisation’, analogue to the ‘development objective’ of the second chapter.

There are two indicators that IMD projects have to adhere to according to the ‘immediate objective’ as formulated in the previous section: policy development in stimulating formal, political, democratic processes, especially an inclusive political system; and capacity building of different actors in the political, democratic process. As is already put forward, it is difficult to understand what the Ministry actually means with these two indicators or guidelines. The indicators are rather vague and are not explained, therefore it is needed to explain what I understand in using these indicators.

The first indicator refers to development of policy and stimulating an inclusive political system. The first element in this indicator refers to the formal, political democratic processes, like voting in parliament, submitting a proposal for a new law to parliament etcetera. The second element is the development of policy that should stimulate these possibilities in the political system, like push governments to have more opportunities for parliamentarians to submit law proposals. The last element in this indicator is stimulating the ‘inclusiveness of the political system’. Inclusiveness relates to situation in which all stake holders can participate. In this case it could mean that within a

⁶⁸ Annex to Letter to Parliament on the Policy Framework Programme Theme-based Co-financing System for the period 2006-2010, 2005, p. 11-12

democracy assistance project, all elements are present, like actors from the civil society, rule of law, state apparatus, economic society and the political society.

The second indicator relates to capacity building of the political actors in the political, democratic process. The first notable element in this is 'capacity building'. This phrase is used frequently without specifying what the Ministry understands by it. When examining policy documents, annual reports and literature, I found that capacity building refers to specific skills. Mostly in trainings sessions, political parties learn a specific skill, like speaking in public or how to setup a financial administration. The range of political skills is rather wide and most political skills, as discussed in chapter three can be categorised by this term. Examples of the projects orientated to capacity building of IMD are media training, political leadership, financial administration, strategic planning for elections etcetera.

After establishing of the meaning of the terms in the indicators, the following step in this research is to discuss the outcomes of my study of the 2004 activities of IMD. In examining the annual report, it was notable that according to the two indicators, IMD follows mainly the second indicator 'capacity building of political actors.'

In many country programmes IMD facilitates projects that involve a cross-party activity, in which a political skill is trained. For instance, in many countries IMD organises these meetings to train the parties in strategic planning. Mostly this is aimed at upcoming elections, but the training should also be focussed on the period after the elections. Strategic planning deals with the position the party wants to have within a number of years or on what issues does the party want to focus on in the future or what achievements must be reached within a few years and over a longer period of time. At the moment all parties receive a training in strategic planning; their primary goal is the upcoming elections and having a good result in those elections. In example, in Zambia, IMD organised a workshop on strategic planning, in which all multiple parties participated. Representatives of the parties were trained in SWOT-analysis and translating this into a strategic plan.⁶⁹

Another type of project aimed at capacity building is the bilateral project, in which a specific party asks training in a specific skill. Many times training is given on the strategic planning of a party, the long term objectives as explained. The bilateral projects are then executed on the side of IMD by two political parties and the policy officer. This differs from the situation at the MATRA foundations, in which there is one party on each side of the assistance. An example of such an activity is the projects of IMD in Mozambique. Many projects (20 in total) were designed around one party and focussed mostly on the elections, for instance training election observers, registration procedures, forming coalition for elections etcetera.

When checking the annual report of IMD, I did not come across many projects focussed on the policy development and/or on the political system and its inclusiveness. Although IMD tries to work

⁶⁹ IMD, Annual Report, 2004: p. 51

with all legally registered parties, in practise most parties are also presented in parliament. In interviews, it became clear that it is easier for IMD to work with parliamentary parties, since they have been given a mandate from the voters contrary to the non-parliamentarian parties. Considering that most parliamentary parties are included, the IMD programme is inclusive, but only for the political parties and not for the entire democracy. More actors should be needed, like economic actors and actors active in rule of law. There some projects which could be labelled as policy development, since they relate to the formal political democratic process. In Guatemala for instance, a project was started which was related to the regulations in parliament and congress, and the comparison was made between The Netherlands and Guatemala.

Concluding the research into the activities, following the indicators from the 'immediate objective, I found that IMD focuses mostly on capacity building, either by cross-party or bilateral activities. This refers to the second indicator, 'capacity building of political actors.' The first indicator was not frequently found in the projects of IMD.

Besides the findings in reviewing the annual report according to the indicators of the 'immediate objective', there were some other notable elements. First of all, many country programmes of IMD involve all participating parties to draft, discuss and sign a 'code of conduct'. A 'code of conduct' roughly spoken, is a document in which all parties (mostly parliamentary) declare that they will adhere to all democratic norms and values, for instance avoid violence conflicts during elections, as was the central topic in the Code of Conduct that was signed by 24 political parties in the Indonesia programme.

The third notable aspect of IMD's work is the fact that in many countries it is forbidden by law to support political parties. For this purpose, IMD looks for a partner in the country. If this is not possible, then an organisation is created by political parties eligible for support and IMD. The activities and funds are conducted and transferred in co-operation with this newly established organisation. An example of such an organisation is the Centre for Multi-party Democracy (CMD) in Kenya, which is founded by the participating political parties.

4.5 Input and Output

Following LFA-logics, activities need a certain input in order to be conducted. In this research I have studied the annual report qualitatively by presenting an overview of the main projects IMD conducted in 2004. Therefore I have no hard data or figures on the number of party members that were trained or what the budget was for this activity or how long the party members were trained. The following answers to these questions are again an overview of the annual reports under study.

Input as different faces: budgetary, people and time. The budgets of IMD are relatively large compared to the MATRA foundations, but small compared to other political party foundations, let alone international governmental organisations as United Nations Development Programme (overall

annual budget approximately \$ 4 billion) and the European Union with the European Initiative for Democracy and Human Rights (overall annual budget of approximately € 125 million) (Van Wersch and De Zeeuw, 2005: 1-2). The other political foundations that IMD works with are NDI and to a lesser degree IRI, which each have annual budget that are far larger than IMD's overall annual budget. NDI had in 2004 as overall annual budget € 45.7 million and IRI had € 29.3 million. The difference between all these organisations and IMD is that the mandate of IMD is to focus on political parties and the political party system. According to interviews with academics and IMD staff, this makes IMD a relatively large player, since it concentrates on political parties, while other organisations have a different, wider mandate.

As far as the people are concerned that are responsible for the projects, there is a difference between the three largest parties in IMD and the four smaller parties. The larger parties (PvdA, CDA, VVD) provide the IMD bureau with fulltime staff, while the smaller parties (GreenLeft, D66, ChristenUnion, SGP) provide part-time staff members. The country teams always have a as 'lead agent' a party member of the three largest parties; the team is complemented with one 'second lead agent' provided by one of the other parties. Furthermore, a country team also has an independent policy officer and sometimes a local representative of IMD. On the last type of 'input', time, it is important to indicate that IMD designs relatively long-term country programmes. This is possible due to their funding period of four years, this guarantees to a degree some form of continuity. The input 'time' can also be viewed as the time of the activities. Most projects of IMD range from 1 to three days, which is the standard number of days. Even more as for the MATRA foundations, are the distances that large, that two to three days is eventually the absolute minimum to be able to effectively conduct a project.

On the output, the LFA states that this is 'the results that can be guaranteed by the project as a consequence of its activity'⁷⁰ This is a rather difficult to answer, since many projects of IMD concern dialogue conferences and workshops between different political parties. Starting up this dialogue, formulating codes of conduct is the key point of the work of IMD. These are typically projects that have clear results; results may come in a few months or years or there are other circumstances (external factors) that influence the results. The more practical training projects, like training in setting up a financial administration of a party, can be measured more easily. The result then is that the participants have more knowledge on how to set up such an administration. For all other projects it is very difficult to establish the actual learning element. Obviously, it is very valuable for the development of the parties to draft and sign a code of conduct and even adhere to it, but the direct causal relation is difficult to measure.

⁷⁰ NORAD; p. 107

4.6 Conclusion

In this final section of chapter four the primary question is to what extent do the political party assistance activities of the Multi-Party Approach contribute to democratisation? In order to answer this question I have examined policy documents from the main funding source, the TMF system of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, but also the 2004 annual report of IMD and the interviews with IMD staff members. The guidelines for all this research, was the LFA in setting up and evaluating projects. Following the logic of the LFA, I found the 'development objective' for IMD projects to be 'poverty reduction', which is the main goal of the TMF system, a subsidy programme from which IMD receives most of their funds. The 'development objective' has seven themes or indicators of which 'political development' is the most relevant: 'sustainable development; HIV/Aids and reproductive health; social cultural development; political development; peace and security; environment and water; gender. IMD's project can be categorised around the theme 'political development', which is the 'immediate objective'. The 'immediate objective' has two elements of which one has proven to be especially relevant, namely 'good governance': human rights and good governance. The element good governance has nine possible topics or indicators, an organisation has to work on, when wants to receive funding for their activities. Of all these topics, two are the main indicators for IMD: policy development in stimulating formal, political, democratic processes, especially an inclusive political system; and capacity building of different actors in the political, democratic process. The following scheme clarifies the objectives and their indicators:

- Development Objective: poverty reduction
 - Indicators: 'sustainable development; HIV/Aids and reproductive health; social cultural development; political development; peace and security; environment and water; gender.
 - Immediate Objective: political development
 - Indicators: two indicators, two relevant: human rights and good governance
 - Good governance has nine topics, of which two relevant: policy development in stimulating formal, political, democratic processes, especially an inclusive political system; and capacity building of different actors in the political, democratic process.

After establishing the indicators, the following step in this research is to discuss the outcomes of my study of the 2004 activities of IMD. In examining the annual report, it was notable that according to the two indicators, IMD follows mainly the second indicator 'capacity building of political actors.' I found that IMD focuses mostly on capacity building, either by cross-party or bilateral activities. This refers to the second indicator, 'capacity building of political actors.' The first indicator was not frequently found in the projects of IMD. The provisional conclusion therefore is that

Imp's activities do adhere for the largest part to the guidelines or indicators stated by the subsidy programme of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. On the next page, the LFA Table, table 4, is filled in with the outcomes of the research in the 2004 annual report of IMD.

Table 4 Logical Framework Approach, overall table

	Sources Academic Literature	Sources MPA	
1. Development Objective: Democratisation Sub-objective: Democracy Sub-objective: Political Parties MPA: poverty reduction	1a. Indicators 1 Elected officials 2 Free, fair and frequent elections 3 Freedom of expression 4 Alternative sources of information 5 Associational autonomy 6 Inclusive citizenship 7 Focus on good result in elections 8 Intermediate role 9 Formal registration	1b. Indicators MPA 1 Sustainable development 2 HIV/Aids and reproductive health 3 Social cultural development 4 <u>Political development</u> 5 Peace and security 6 Environment and water 7 Gender	1. External factors
2. Immediate Objective Improve Functioning Political Parties Sub-objective: Democracy Assistance Sub-objective: Political Party Assistance MPA: political development	2a. Indicators 1 Assisting political institutions 2 Election support 3 Election support 4 Training political leadership	2b. Indicators MPA 1 Human rights 2 <u>Good governance</u> 1 Policy development 2 Capacity building political actors 3 Monitoring the political, democratic process; development of policy to prevent and/or fight against corruption 5 Capacity building of the actors involved in preventing and/or fighting corruption 6 Capacity building to improve the legal status of citizens 7 Proportional representation and commitment of all groups in a society in local governance 8 Capacity building of local organisations, associations 9 Reinforcement of accountability and transparency of local governance	2. External factors
3. Main activities MPA: capacity building of political parties (cross-party and bi-lateral)	3a. Input	3b. Input MPA: budget, people and time	3. External factors
4. Output MPA	4a. Indicators	4b. Indicators MPA	4. External factors

Now that has been established what the conclusion is after checking the annual report and interviews, it is interesting to see what the final conclusion is. This means researching to what extent projects in the year 2004 projects from IMD met with the 'development objective', 'immediate objective', activities and input and output for sustaining democratisation, which were set by the literature and discussed in chapter two. To refresh the memory: chapter two established with the following 'development objective' and the sub-objectives 'democratisation', 'democracy' and 'political parties'. The 'development objective' was that the activities of political party foundation should contribute to 'democratisation'. The 'development objective' of chapter two, 'democratisation' differs from the 'development objective' from chapter four, 'poverty reduction'. An indicator of the 'development objective' of chapter four, however, 'political development' is quite similar to the notion of 'democratisation' (development objective chapter two).

The indicators from the 'development objective' from chapter two are: Elected officials; Free, fair and frequent elections; Freedom of expression; Alternative sources of information; Associational autonomy; Inclusive citizenship; Intermediate role between citizenry and formal political system; Focus on good results in elections; and Formal registration as political party. The first indicator, elected officials, can be found in projects that are aimed at the candidates for parliament. These projects should prepare the candidates for successfully becoming and being a member of parliament. In studying the activities of IMD I also found activities aimed at the second indicator, free, fair and frequent elections. These are the project, previously mentioned, that focus on drafting and signing by all participating parties of a code of conduct on how to deal with each other in democratic processes, such as elections. I have not found projects that are aimed at indicator three, freedom of expression. The fourth indicator, alternative sources of information, can be found in only a few projects that IMD facilitates in which political parties can present themselves to the public; an example are public debates held in Mali. The fifth and six indicators have not been found in the annual reports. The seventh indicator, political parties have an intermediate role between citizenry and the formal political system has not much been mentioned by IMD during interviews or in their annual report. There a few projects in which parties are trained in communicating and contacting their party members, but this indicators focuses mainly on the relation between citizens in general and the formal political system. The indicator, parties are focussed on getting a good result in elections, is very frequently used as basis in projects. The parties request training on political skills related to elections, like strategic planning. The last indicator was not very frequently found in the IMD projects of 2004.

In sum, the 'development objectives' are quite different, as are the indicators. The literature focuses much more on political equality and the distinctive characteristics of political parties, while the indicators of the IMD funding source are more targeted to all indicators that help to reduce poverty. According to literature, IMD should focus more on the remaining elements of political equality (indicators) that are necessary to establish an ideal democratic process. Besides these indicators, IMD also has to focus more on one of the distinctive characteristics of political parties: the intermediate role

between citizenry and the formal political system. IMD does adhere to most indicators from the ‘development objective’ of chapter two.

The next phase is the comparison between the ‘immediate objectives’ of chapter two and chapter four. Chapter two showed that following the logic of academic literature, the ‘immediate objective’ of a political party assistance project should be ‘improve functioning political parties’, while in chapter four, the ‘intermediate objective’ is the main goal of the sub programme of the TMF subsidy, ‘political development’ and its indicator ‘good governance, which is: ‘thriving for optimising the legitimacy and effectiveness of government.’ As has been clear for the discussion on this objective, is that for this research this ‘immediate objective’ is viewed as ‘democratisation’. Therefore, ‘democratisation’ as ‘development objective’ does match with the ‘immediate objective’, ‘political development’ and ‘good governance’ as indicator.

The ‘immediate objectives’ also has indicators, chapter two has provided the research with the following indicators: assisting formal political institutions; election support; and training political leadership. The indicators for the ‘immediate objective’ of the IMD are twofold are: policy development in stimulating formal, political, democratic processes, especially an inclusive political system; and capacity building of different actors in the political, democratic process. There is a clear match between the first indicator of chapter two and the first indicator of chapter four. Both indicators hint to formal democratic processes, in institutions or just in processes. Formal democratic institutions cannot be without formal democratic processes; otherwise it is a case of an empty shell. The other indicator seems more difficult to match, although one of the capacity building activities might be election support, as has been the case in IMD projects. IMD adheres to especially the second indicator of chapter two by conducting project related to elections. Again, as was the case with the comparison of ‘development objectives’, the projects of IMD partially adheres to the indicators from the literature.

According to the LFA, activities need certain input and have a certain output. The input can be viewed as budget (IMD has relatively large budget, since it focuses primarily on political parties), people (several parties work together in the IMD country teams) and time (IMD works with long-term programmes and their activities take two/three days). The output is very difficult to measure, since the effect of other factors is not clear as to the direct effect of the activities.

The final conclusion then is that for the development objective and its indicators, IMD adheres to most indicators of chapter two and for the immediate objective, it adheres to part of the indicators of the second chapter.

5 Conclusion

In this chapter the research will be concluded by answering the main research question: to what extent have Dutch political party foundations that use the Bi-Party Approach (BPA) or the Multi-Party Approach (MPA) contributed to democratisation? The question will be answered by making use of the Logical Framework Approach (LFA). What have been the development objectives, immediate objectives, activities and output of BPA and MPA programs, and how do they compare to academic literature on democratisation? A qualitative answer will be formulated to the contribution of BPA and MPA programs to democratisation, and both approaches will be compared. In addition, I will reflect more broadly in this chapter on the role of BPA and MPA in democratisation and discuss the qualitative arguments used in the debate about BPA and MPA.

I have adapted the LFA to this research by adding an extra column, as becomes clear from the following table:

Table 1 Logical Framework Approach⁷¹

	Sources Academic Literature	Sources BPA+MPA	
1. Development Objective: <i>Democratisation</i>	1a. Indicators	1b. Indicators	1. External factors
2. Immediate Objective	2a. Indicators	2b. Indicators	2. External factors
3. Activities	3a. Input	3b. Input	3. External factors
4. Output	4a. Indicators	4b. Indicators	4. External factors

The extra column is the second column from the right side. The indicators 1b, 2b, 4b and input 3b have all been filled in by researching annual reports of 2004 from BPA foundations and IMD. The second column and the last column have been filled by using academic literature, while the first column is for both the literature and the BPA/MPA. Next to this addition, I have turned around ‘Activities’ and ‘Output’, in order to suit this research better.

5.1 What did Literature say?

In chapter two, the first, second and fourth column have been completed by answering the research question ‘which indicators can be drawn from the sub-objectives ‘democratisation’, ‘democracy’, ‘political parties’, ‘democracy assistance’ and ‘political party assistance’ according to academic literature?’ The second chapter also looks at what literature has to say about external factors. The main literature for this research has been democratisation literature, as well as literature on what constitutes a

⁷¹ As found in The Handbook on the LFA of the Norwegian Agency for Development Co-operation, p.17

‘democracy’ and a ‘political party’. As a result I have presented an overview of the discussion and the outcome of this overview is that the ‘development objective’ has two sub-objectives: ‘democracy’ and ‘political parties’. ‘Democratisation’ as a sub-objective appeared to be too closely related to the sub-objective ‘democracy’ and is for this study regarded as ‘the process towards democracy’. The sub-objective democracy provided the research with six indicators that make clear what is understood as a democracy in this research. The six indicators are mainly derived from the work done by Dahl (2000) for establishing what constitutes a democracy: elected officials; free, fair and frequent elections; freedom of expression; alternative sources of information; associational autonomy; and inclusive citizenship. The research then aimed at establishing distinct indicators for the presence of political parties, which turned out to be: groups with a ‘focus on getting good result in elections’, who play an ‘intermediate role between citizenry and formal political system’ and that are ‘formally registered as political party’. The following step was to establish what the ‘immediate objective’ is according to literature. Since literature views political parties as essential to a democracy (Schmitter and Brouwer, 1999: 1; Burnell, 2000: 4; Gerrits, 2004: 24) and the foundations under study assist political parties, the ‘immediate objective’ is ‘improve functioning political parties’. The sub-objectives for this objective are ‘democracy assistance’ and ‘political party assistance’. For the first sub-objective, the indicators are ‘assisting formal political institutions’ and ‘election support’. Authors emphasise that democracy assistance cannot be impartial and is therefore political. Supporting political parties is a logical outcome of this reasoning. For the sub-objective ‘political party assistance’ two indicators were found, namely ‘election support’ and ‘training political leadership’. Finally the external factors have been discussed. Within the vast group of external factors that can influence projects of political party foundations, there is a difference in the extent to which they have influence on the projects.

5.2 Family Business Revisited

In the third chapter, the primary question was ‘to what extent do Dutch political party assistance activities of the Bi-Party Approach contribute to democratisation?’ In this context, I have focussed on 2004. The LFA Table is filled in by discussing the outcomes of a research of the annual reports of Dutch BPA foundations. First of all, the ‘development objective’ has been formulated. It originates in the funding programme of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs that provides the Dutch political BPA foundations with subsidy, the MATRA Programme. The overall goal of the programme is ‘assisting the transition of EU accession-states or potential accession states or selected neighbouring states of the enlarged EU in the regions Central, South-Eastern, Eastern Europe, Northern Africa and the Middle East, to a pluriform, democratic constitutional country.’⁷² This goal is understood in this research as contributing to ‘democratisation in specific regions and states’. The indicators for the ‘development objective’ are: the region and the specific countries; secondly the ‘democratisation’. For the ‘immediate

objective' again is looked at the subsidy programme of the Ministry, in this case a sub programme, the MATRA Political Parties Programme. The goal of this programme is 'to enable the Dutch political parties to contribute to the training of the management officials of ('sister') parties in countries in Eastern Europe, Euro-Asia, Northern Africa and Middle East.'⁷³ The indicators for the 'immediate objective' are provided by the same sub programme and are the type of activities that can be granted subsidy: political education courses; produce documentation materials on the political objectives of the 'sister' party for schools, associations, universities etcetera; training trainers to conduct the training activities; preparing, creating and dispersing documentation. The largest share of the activities of the MATRA foundations in 2004 can be categorised as 'political education courses', since most projects are evolved around two types of 'political education courses': on political issues (i.e. environmental issues) and training in political skills (mostly election support, i.e. training in campaign financing). The input for the activities is threefold: budget, people and time. The budget of the Dutch BPA foundations is modest compared to their European colleagues, therefore they try to co-operate with larger foundations. The people are in the case of the larger foundations fulltime employees and in the case of the smaller foundations part time employees from the party. The people that conduct the training are mostly volunteers. The time which is spent on projects is mostly two to three days, in order to be efficient because of the distances. The output is difficult to measure, but it would be logical if the participants of a political skills training, actually learned more about a certain topic. In sum on the BPA, it can be concluded that these foundations adhere to the indicators set by the Ministry in the MATRA Political Parties Programme.

5.3 Inside 'Outside the Family'

The fourth chapter had as research question to what extent do Dutch political party assistance activities of the Multi-Party Approach contribute to democratisation? This chapter dealt with the MPA to political party assistance and focussed on IMD as the only Dutch MPA foundation. Due to time constraints I have focussed on 2004. By using the LFA, I first of all discussed the 'development objective', which can be found in a subsidy programme of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Theme based Co-financing System (TMF-system). The overall goal of this programme and therewith the 'development objective' of IMD projects is 'poverty reduction'. There are seven themes on which the focus lies, that are considered indicators to this objective: 'sustainable development; HIV/Aids and reproductive health; social cultural development; political development; peace and security; environment and water; gender. IMD's projects can be categorised around the theme 'political development', which is the 'immediate objective'. The 'immediate objective' has two elements of which one has proven to be especially relevant, namely 'good governance': human rights and good governance. The element good governance has nine possible topics or indicators that an organisation has to work on if it wants to receive

⁷² Translation provided by the author, from Dutch into English. As seen in the 'Manual MATRA Political Parties Programme', 2004, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

⁷³ MATRA Political Parties Programme, Manual, September 2004, p.1

funding for their activities. Of all these topics, two are the main indicators for IMD: policy development in stimulating formal, political, democratic processes, especially an inclusive political system; and capacity building of different actors in the political, democratic process. The activities of IMD are mostly orientated on the second indicator of the 'immediate objective', capacity building of political actors (political parties in the case of IMD), either by cross-party or bilateral activities. The conclusion is that IMD activities adhere to one of the indicators for the most part.

5.4 Back to the Main Research Question

The most interesting aspect of this research is to compare and evaluate the two approaches to political party assistance. This is in other words, discussing the answer to the main research question: to what extent have Dutch political party foundations that use the Bi-Party Approach (BPA) or the Multi-Party Approach (MPA) contributed to democratisation?

Therefore it is needed to review the objectives and indicators of the two approaches in light of the objectives and indicators of the second chapter. The second chapter provides the guidelines of how according to literature democracy and political parties should be assisted. For the BPA the objectives are quite similar, but the indicators are somewhat different. This can be explained, since the indicators come from a manual on which projects are eligible for funding and which not. The indicators of the manual are far more practical and concrete than the indicators from the literature. The MATRA foundations do adhere to some indicators of the literature, but not to all. They focus especially on political skills training in preparing parties for elections. However, two important indicators for assisting political parties, according to literature are 'the intermediate role between citizenry and the formal political system' and 'assisting formal institutions'. This is not covered in most projects by Dutch political BPA foundations. The other indicator from the literature is 'assisting formal institutions'. Also this topic has not been used frequently in the MATRA projects.

Therefore the answer on the question to what extent have Dutch political party foundations that use the Bi-Party Approach (BPA) contributed to democratisation? is that they have contributed to democratisation, but only for the part of the 'focus on getting a good result in elections' for parties. This is the first major conclusion of this research, Dutch BPA foundations have contributed partially to democratisation in the countries they have assisted political parties. The other important elements, the intermediate role and assisting formal institutions, have not been a prominent topic in their projects.

For the MPA, the same question is raised 'to what extent do Dutch political party assistance activities of the Multi-Party Approach contribute to democratisation?' Again the comparison is made with the objectives and indicators of the second chapter. What is remarkable is the fact that the objectives do not match. The second chapter, the literature has as development objective 'democratisation', while the development objective of IMD projects is 'poverty reduction'. This can be largely explained by the subsidy basis of IMD, the Dutch MPA foundation. This basis is the TMF, which has as primary goal 'poverty reduction', which is the main focus of Dutch development cooperation. This program is thus far

greater than the MATRA Programme, not only in budget size but also in scope. The objectives and indicators, like is the case with the BPA foundations, come from the subsidy programme. The main goal is 'poverty reduction', which has several indicators, of which 'political development' is the most relevant for IMD. This indicator does not match with the indicators of the literature for the 'development objective'. Furthermore the 'immediate objective' comes from a sub element of the subsidy programme, being 'political development'. Political development has similarities with the 'development objective' of the literature, 'democratisation'. The same reasoning applies to the indicators of the 'immediate objective': 'policy development in stimulating formal, political democratic processes' and 'capacity building of political actors'. The first indicator matches quite well with the first indicator from the literature, 'assisting formal institutions', since both indicators are related to formal, democratic processes and institutions cannot function without democratic processes. The second indicator, capacity building of political actors, seems more difficult to match to the second indicator from the literature, election support. But an important element in IMD's projects is capacity building training activities targeted towards elections, strategic planning for example. Only very few projects of IMD pay attention to the indicator 'intermediate role between citizenry and formal political system'. Sometimes partially by dealing with local party members, but this are not much projects. The projects IMD conducts adhere to most indicators of the 'development objective' from the literature and for the indicators of 'immediate objective' of the second chapter, the projects adhere partially (only election support).

Concluding on the research question for the MPA: to what extent has the Dutch political party foundation that use the Multi-Party Approach (MPA) contributed to democratisation? The answer is yes, but only partially. This is the second major conclusion of the research. Within the projects of IMD, certain important elements, like the 'intermediate role' and 'assisting the formal institutions' have not been recognised as very important topics. In studying IMD as the Dutch MPA foundation in assisting political parties, I have not studied other MPA foundations like the NCDS or WFD, which could have influenced the research. In further research, it is interesting to compare these foundations in their methods of assisting political parties.

It must be stated, that it is difficult to determine to what extent the BPA and MPA have contributed to 'democratisation', since the objectives and indicators of both approaches sometimes differ from the objectives and indicators from the literature. In addition, it is difficult to evaluate eight organisations by interviews and researching their annual report. A more thorough research would involve much more: being present at various projects, interviewing the recipient political party members, interview staff members from the (Dutch) Ministry of Foreign Affairs etcetera. Unfortunately, due to time and financial constraints, this was not possible, but it is highly recommended to any future research on political party assistance.

Input and output of both approaches is somewhat the same. On input, there are some nuances between the approaches: IMD has a larger budget than the MATRA foundations combined. Therefore IMD can conduct bigger projects. IMD is funded for four years, while the Dutch BPA foundations receive their

budget annually and they are dependant on the number of seats 'their' party holds in parliament. On people, MATRA political foundations work more with volunteers, while within IMD mostly fulltime staff is available. On time, there is not much difference, except for the funding period. The time spent on a training activity is equal for both approaches: two or three days. On the output, the results are also the same. It is difficult to measure what the direct effect of the activities is. Too many other factors play a role in determining what the output will be. These external factors might play a larger role than the activities of the Dutch political foundations.

In Annex 3, three LFA tables are presented. The first table presents the outcomes of the literature study on the objectives, sub-objectives and their indicators, as well as this data for the BPA; in the second table the same is done for the MPA. The final table, table 3, presents the combined overall table of BPA and MPA combined with the sources of literature (external factors are excluded due to practical reasons).

5.5 Conclusion

Comparing the two answers, it becomes clear that both approaches view election support to political parties as an important element in their projects. Neither of them adheres fully to the indicators provided by the literature. The explanation for these differences might come from the similarities and differences between the background, organisational setup and the actual activities. BPA is more focussed on political skills training before elections, while the MPA is more oriented to long term strategic planning with political parties and setting up codes of conduct. Both of course work mainly with political parties, but in a different manner: BPA through party-to-party assistance, while the MPA uses cross-party projects. The funding source and the amount of funding are striking differences. The MATRA-foundations are funded by the DZO-department with a combined overall annual budget in 2004 of € 1.9 million, which focuses on the region South-East Europe, while IMD is funded by the DMV-department, which focuses on human rights and peace building and IMD spent in 2004 € 6.8 million (Van Wersch and De Zeeuw, 2005: 29). When all projects by the eight Dutch political foundations, funded by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, are combined, IMD holds 78% of the overall annual combined 2004 budget (Van Wersch and De Zeeuw, 2005: 29). In most western countries, political party activities by political party foundations are conducted by one type of organisation, mostly multi-party.

IMD receives a four years funding and MATRA annually. Another difference in funding source creates the situation, that the budget programme of the Dutch BPA foundations is focussed on democratic transition in Eastern Europe, Euro-Asia, Northern Africa and Middle East, while the subsidy programme of IMD is focussed on poverty reduction and has a clear focus on Sub-Sahara Africa, like has IMD.

A noteworthy similarity is the fact that the parties of all MATRA foundations are founding parties of IMD. Political parties in The Netherlands have besides other activities, at least two international foundations they participate in: their own foundation and IMD. Both types of foundations have a clear focus on political parties (96% for the MATRA foundations, 90% for IMD (Van Wersch and De Zeeuw, 2005: 30), but when working with political parties, the foundations themselves estimate as following:

IMD focuses mostly on strengthening the overall party system (55%), whereas the Dutch BPA foundations focus more on strengthening or building the basic party organisation (37%) (Van Wersch and De Zeeuw, 2005: 31). When it comes to the regional focus of all projects conducted by the eight Dutch political party foundations, the region Sub-Sahara Africa receives the most project expenditures (55%), while Eastern Europe & Euro-Asia gets second place with 20%.

Despite all the differences, it would be beneficiary to all Dutch political foundations to discuss their projects with each other, to exchange lessons learned or discuss their approach in supporting political parties. There is one land, Georgia, in which both approaches are active and it would be interestingly to see what the discussion would bring to the table on lessons learned and/or on how to work together. The projects of both approaches may differ on certain elements, but at least they are complementary. Therefore cooperation between the two approaches could be the best solution to how to assist political parties. At present, I view the debate on what approach is best, as a debate that is mostly held internally in the foundations and therefore the MATRA foundations and IMD should have more interaction. They have a common interest in a prominent place for political party activities within democracy assistance.

Concluding this research, the LFA method has proven to be rather useful. It has structured the research and provided the needed elements, like the objectives and their indicators, to draw conclusions. There are however some practical problems of the LFA, especially in the domain of operationalisation. It is difficult to quantify or measure input and/or output of the activities. This has to do with the field of democracy assistance. Most scholars emphasise that starting up projects that are designed to assist a democratic transition, can take years to have effect, let alone all the external factors involved. These external factors can be far more influential to the outcome of the project, than the project itself. For democracy assistance projects, the LFA therefore is less suitable, since it presupposes that all phrases can be clarified or quantified. In my research, it was too complex to identify the exact input and especially output of political party assistance projects. Within the LFA, it then becomes difficult to draw conclusions. Of course this has to do with the fact, that the LFA is designed for planning projects, but it also should be able to evaluate projects with the pre-set objectives and their indicators. Other difficulties arise when other elements need to be submitted to the LFA, such as time. Time as an element cannot be used in the LFA Table, but it is in this research quite relevant. Projects that are aimed at political parties should be long-term as has been states by numerous scholars and organisations. However, the factor time cannot be submitted to the table and/or the LFA logic. Another point of criticism is that the LFA does not take into account that democracy assistance is also to do with democratic culture, democratic norms and values. This is important in assisting democracy and also in assisting political parties. In many projects, the topic is what constitutes a democracy, besides the technicalities. The LFA has no method of incorporating this into the table, which makes it a less suitable technique for this type of research.

Apart from the criticism it should be noted, that the Dutch political party foundations are only a small part of the overall annual budget of the Dutch Development Co-operation; in total in 2004, it was € 4.3 billion.⁷⁴ But still, the Dutch political party foundations have their added value in assisting political parties, being political foundations. This gives an advantage in supporting parties, in comparison to another donor with no political background. In the following section I will propose an alternative approach to political party assistance.

5.6 Debate and a new approach

In this section, I will structure the ongoing debate on the best approach to political party assistance and present an alternative approach, which combines the advantages of both approaches.

It is mainly an overview of the qualitative arguments, used in the debate on what approach to use to political party assistance. I have followed this debate through attending conferences and seminars, as well as reading conference reports and articles that discuss this debate. In the overview, my personal view on the approaches is presented, as well as an alternative approach.

Both approaches have their strong and their weak points. The BPA has as main strong point the trust that is built between the donor- party and the recipient party. During the interviews, all MATRA-foundations emphasised the need for a good relationship, based on the same ideology. The ideology gives both sides the feeling that they belong to the same family, which is mostly the case when both sides are member of the same international group of political parties, like the International Socialist. This is also supported by several authors, such as Mair (2004): ‘To be effective, those who lend the assistance must be perceived by the recipient of the support as somebody who shares his/her principal norms and objectives’ (Mair, 2004: 133). Furthermore, in bi-party partnership, there is a good possibility to develop the party’s ideology. The precondition for such an in-dept debate is absolute trust. The MPA foundations, however, claim to have the same level of trust between their organisation and the political parties they support.

The main advantage of working with multiple parties in a country is the fact that it enables all parties (represented in parliament) to participate in training activities. Parties are no longer bound by a political family, which they cannot be, since mostly they do not have a clear ideology or do not feel the need to become member. This allows all parties to work on the political party system and the political system as a whole. This more abstract approach creates good opportunities for a young democracy to start the road to a more consolidated democracy in a fundamental way. This is also mentioned in research, foremost by Carothers: ‘The multiparty model facilitates efforts by the aid provider to think about the overall problems of parties in the country as a whole. ...In this way, the multiparty method can help lead

⁷⁴ Through telephonic interview with public relations office Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs on 14-12-2005.

to the development of new types of efforts to strengthen the overall party system in a country rather than just the individual parties.’ (Carothers, 2004: 11)

Besides the differences in the approach in working with political parties in both approaches, there are some more technical differences. The MATRA-foundations are funded by the DZO-department, which focuses on the region South-East Europe, of the Ministry while IMD is funded by the DMV-department, which focuses on human rights and peace building. This difference can be explained from the past. MATRA originated in 1994, a few years after the cold war had ended and is mainly aimed at (Eastern) European and Euro-Asian countries in order to prepare them for the possible accession to the EU. However in more recent years the MATRA political party programme shifted East and South to countries that are not likely to join the EU in the near future. It is even made possible by the Ministry for foundations to work in Morocco, Jordan and Turkey. Turkey is likely to access the EU, but Morocco and Jordan are not very likely to join the EU. Nevertheless, many Dutch foundations have already indicated that they do not see direct opportunities to work together with political parties in Jordan and Morocco on an ideological basis.

The IMD was initialised in 2001 and has a different mandate: ‘to encourage the process of democratisation in young democracies.’⁷⁵ Therefore this institute works in various regions and countries: Sub-Sahara Africa, Central and South America, Georgia and Indonesia. There has been also within IMD a change of scenery since they started to work in Georgia. Before this country programme started MATRA and IMD were divided over the world: MATRA in (Eastern) European and Euro-Asian countries and IMD in the Southern regions: Africa, Central and South America and Asia. When IMD started a fact finding mission in Georgia, several MATRA-foundations were already active in this country. This has stimulated the debate on the different working methods in political party assistance.

The Bi-Party Approach of assisting political parties supposes an ideological match between the western and the receiving party. The Dutch political foundations of the individual parties all cooperate in this manner. They search for counterparts that have a similar ideological background. When checking applications, the Alfred Mozer Foundation of the social democratic party PvdA for instance looks for a connection with their possible partner. The partner has to have at least the intention to become member of the International Socialist. In the most favourable situation: the possible partner is a member of the Socialist International in a country that will access the EU. The outcome of this process of checking the ideology of a partner is rather difficult. In discussions, some academics stress the difficulty for bi-party foundations to find suitable partners with special regard to the ideology that should match. Carothers in this regard, states: ‘In many parts of the developing world.....parties do not divide along ideological lines that correspond to the main European ideological groupings, or even along a left-right axis at all.’ (Carothers, 2004: 10). This is less the case in European countries, since these countries have some similar histories with western European states. In (western) Europe, most political parties were founded during or

⁷⁵ IMD-website: www.nimd.org

shortly after the Industrial Revolution. This led to political parties for the 'haves' and the 'have nots', which were formed alongside social-economical lines. Besides these two trends (liberals and socialists), the Christian parties were the third major group in Europe. Before Central and Eastern European countries were dominated by communist parties, they did experience political parties that can be characterised alongside the tri-party division of liberal, social and Christian-democratic. In other regions of the world, nevertheless, there is no history with political parties along ideological lines, like Socialism or Liberalism. Parties in Africa, Asia and Central and South America do not have the same social-economical divisions in their country, but are much more oriented towards a single person or an ethnicity or a certain area within the country. This has less to do with any (western) ideologies, therefore the match between a bi-party foundation and a political party in such region on an ideological basis will be difficult.

Besides academics, there are, however, also bi-party foundations that mention the problem of finding suitable partners, also in European countries. They bring up several examples of parties that were rather opportunistic in their choice for ideology. In many countries in this region, opportunistic, one-issue parties try to seek support from western donors. It sometimes seems like they look for the most profitable partner and then chose their ideology. This is very bluntly put, but in some instances foundations do encounter such behaviour. This is even the case in European countries, in which western political foundations are active, supporting political parties. In the interviews, some Dutch foundations have pointed out that political parties tend to merge and fall apart very easily in this region. This was also mentioned in the study by Irna Hesp, in which it was mentioned that political stability is one of the major problems in post communist countries.

BPA-organisations claim that the trust they experience in their relationship with their partners, is absent in MPA assistance. This fact is very difficult to check. This research was designed mainly to compare both approaches and see where the differences and similarities lay. Some MATRA-foundations, nevertheless, have mentioned during the interviews, the disadvantage of a very close relation with the partner organisation. After several years of cooperation, the trust-factor can have its limitations. The relation can become too friendly and both sides of the partnership can get blind for each others 'faults'. This issue is mentioned by Peter Burnell in conference paper: 'Another danger is that close party-to-party relations can undermine objectivity: the parties providing the support may get too close to allow them to properly assess the effectiveness of their assistance.' (Burnell, 2004: 14). This sometimes has the effect that political foundations only work on a short term base with a political party. This effect is somewhat contradictory to the notion that democracy assistance and political party assistance is a long-term process. It is not expected to have a direct noticeable effect. The relation should be long lasting, but with a reminder for both sides to constantly evaluate the projects in the most possible objective way.

The advantage of the multi-party approach is that it is not biased in its choice of partners. IMD works together with all parties represented in parliament. Carothers points out this feature of multi-party foundations: 'With regard to the multiparty method, its main advantage is its inclusiveness. The inclusiveness allows party aid providers to avoid partisanship, which can be a major benefit in the country

as a whole.’ (Carothers, 2004: 11). There are bi-party foundations that work in a multi-party way. The National Democratic Institute of the Democrats in the United States is known for their multi-party work in developing countries. Bi-party foundations, working in a multi-party way, can be perceived as a biased form of assistance. Parties that are not fully in line with the ideology of the donor-party might get the impression that not every party is getting the same support. This reasoning is used by multi-party foundations to advocate their approach in political party assistance. Nevertheless, in working with all parties, certain parties can get reserved in the contact with the donor-organisation. Burnell stress this point: ‘But when party-to-party work is combined with a multiparty – and hence less obviously partisan – involvement, care must be taken to ensue that equal opportunities are offered to all parties (Burnell, 2004: 15).

When all parties are supported at the same time, one party will notice that its competition in the elections (other political parties) is learning the same. Therefore such an argumentation could create an opportunity for a party to change partners and search for a bi-party foundation. This would ensure a more exclusive relation, since there are fewer parties involved in comparison to multi-party assistance.⁷⁶ For the opponents to the MPA, it is strange that within IMD, ideologically total different parties (SGP+VVD) work together with one counter-party in the receiving country. This way, no trust can be built, since it is not exclusively one-party-to-one-party support on an ideological basis, according to these critics.

One other frequently heart criticism of the Bi-Party Approach is that it copies the strength, size and position of political parties in the donor country to the strength, size and position of political parties in the partner-country. This is the result when all bi-party foundations are active in the same country, supporting different parties. A foundation with the more money than others can support their partner with a bigger budget, while smaller foundation can provide smaller budgets. Consequently the biggest party in the donor party can become the biggest party in the recipient country.⁷⁷ This is also the ideal situation for many advocates of the BPA; they claim that when all political party foundations are working in a country, all ideologies (present in the donor country) are supported in the partner country. But mostly, this cannot be done, since it is not possible to make an ideological link, since not all ideologies are present in the partner-country. Let alone the fact that, when a political foundation has a small budget, it is not possible to be present in many countries. Opponents of the Multi-Party Approach, however, claim that working in a multi-party way freezes the political situation in a partner-country. In some instances multi-party foundations use the number of seats in parliament to determine how much funds are used for a party. More seats means more budget, which leads to a freeze of the political party situation, while most multi-party programs are aimed at levelling out the power of one big party in a country. In various countries, one party has for long, the majority of the votes and therefore also the majority the seats.

⁷⁶ Bi-Party Approach work is referred to as one-to-one assistance, but in practise their can be several partners in the democracy that is supported. There are numerous examples known of western foundations working with multiple partners with the same ideological background.

A general critique on political party assistance by political party foundations is a historic difference between parties in young democracies and parties in western countries, namely the membership base of a party. The previously mentioned parties, which originated hundred years ago, were parties with a large support base from members, volunteers and support groups from civil society. This situation is completely different in young democracies. Political parties are far more oriented on one person, a region, a religion or ethnicity. This critique is targeted to all political parties, supporting parties in young democracies. Their background and ideology is different from the parties they support generally. However, since political foundations, have much experience in the political arena, they are the most qualified for the job. Politics is quite different from any other area and therefore specialised organisation can best perform this task.

To sum up this debate, it becomes clear that both approaches have their strong points. Therefore any new approach should focus on those advantages. Bi-party foundations are experts in giving training, they have demonstrated this over the years and multi-party foundations have even made use of their trainers. Next to the training capacities of bi-party foundations, they manage to establish a trust relationship with the partner, based on ideology. It seems logical that shared ideology leads to a closer relationship. The multi-party approach has the big advantage in their approach in assisting political parties to be inclusive. They work with all parties represented in parliament, creating a dialogue that aims to assist the democracy, rather than assist one party. The future approach could be a combination of the three elements trust, training and supporting all parties: starting in a multi-party way, gathering all parties from parliament start up a dialogue, form a national agenda. When an individual party request further assistance, first the individual donor-parties are asked if they see any possibility to work in a bi-party project in order for trust to be built up. When this ideological match is not possible, the trainers of both approaches work together to assist the individual party. The main advantage of this approach is that incorporates the advantages of both approaches and view the approaches as complementary to each other. The more abstract level of assistance by the MPA and the more technical assistance by the BPA. During interviews, the new approach has received positive feedback of the Dutch foundations.

It has to be mentioned that the political arena where both sides of the assistance operate is only part of a democracy. Linz and Stepan (1996) distinguished five arenas of a democracy: civil society, political society, rule of law, state apparatus and economic society. This makes clear that supporting political parties is only one of the arenas of a democracy. In assisting democracies, far more arenas need to be dealt with in order to develop and be able to consolidate a stable democracy. Political party assistance is a small part of the entire cake of arenas to work on, but it is elementary for the succeeding of a full-grown democracy. Political parties are an essential part of democracy and therefore deserve special attention from specialised organisations.

⁷⁷ Of course, the size of a party's budget is not the only factor that determines successful election results.

As a closing statement, it will be interesting to see how the MATRA Political Parties Programme (MATRA PPP) will develop, since it seems that it is shifting from east to south. Besides this development, the MATRA PPP will end at some time, since it was originally linked to accession-states to the EU or neighbouring states of the EU. With submitting Jordan (and other countries) to the list of countries where the foundations can work, this last bridge has been crossed. At the same time, IMD is expanding its horizon and started to work in Georgia, where both approaches have met and now are beginning to inform each other about each others activities. Therefore the proposed new approach could bring both approaches together and benefit from the advantages.

Literature

- Akkerman, T. (editor), *De Kwestbare Democratie, Sleutelteksten uit de Politieke Theorie*, 2001, Aksant, Amsterdam.
- Anckar, D. and Anckar, C., Democracies without parties, *Comparative Political Studies*, Vol. 33, No. 2, 2000, pp. 225-247
- Anderson, L. (editor), *Transitions to Democracy*, 1999, Columbia University Press, New York Chicester
- Barkan, J. and Ng'ethe, N., *Kenya Tries Again*, Chapter 13, pp. 184-200 in Diamond, L. and Plattner, M. (editors), 1999
- Bastian, S. and Luckham, R. (editors), *Can Democracy Be Designed?, The Politics of Institutional Choice in Conflict-torn Societies*, 2003, Zed Books, London.
- Baylis, J. and Smith, S. (editors), *The Globalization of World Politics*, 2002, Oxford University Press, Oxford
- Bossuyt, J., and Laporte, G., Partnership in the 1990's: How to make it work better?, Policy Management Brief No. 3, 1994, ECDPM, Maastricht
- Brown, C., Human Rights, Chapter 28, pp. 599-614 in Baylis, J. and Smith, S. (editors), 2002
- Burgess, A., Universal Democracy, Diminished Expectation, *Democratisation*, Vol. 8, No. 3, 2001, pp. 51-74
- Burnell, P. (editor), *Foreign Aid in a Changing World*, 1997, Open University Press, Buckingham
- Burnell, P. (editor), *Democracy Assistance, International Co-operation for Democratization*, 2000, Frank Cass, London
- Burnell, Building Better Democracies, Westminster Foundation for Democracy, 2004, paper for the Conference 'Achieving Sustainable Political Change in Emerging Democracies: the political party Challenge', 15-17 March 2004, London
- Carothers, T., Democracy Assistance: The Question of Strategy, *Democratization*, Vol. 4, No. 3, 1997, pp. 109-132
- Carothers, T., *Aiding Democracy Abroad, The Learning Curve*, 1999, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington
- Carothers, T., The End of the Transition Paradigm, *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 13, No. 1, 2002, pp. 5-21.
- Carothers, T., A Reply to my Critics, *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 13, No. 1, 2002, pp. 33-38
- Carothers, T., Political Party Aid, Issues for reflection and Discussion, 2004, Paper prepared for Swedish International Development Agency.
- Chandhoke, N., The 'Civil' and the 'Political' in Civil Society, *Democratization*, Vol. 8, No. 2, 2001, pp. 1-24
- Crawford, G., *Foreign Aid and Political Reform, a Comparative Analysis of Democracy Assistance and Political Conditionality*, 2001, St. Martin's Press, New York

Crawford, G., *Evaluating Democracy Assistance: the inadequacy of numbers and the promise of participation*, paper for the conference on 'Combining in Development Research', University of Swansea, 1-2 July 2002

Crawford, G., *Foreign Aid and Political Reform, a Comparative Analysis of Democracy Assistance and Political Conditionality*, 2001, St. Martin's Press, New York

Crawford, G., Promoting Democracy From Without – Learning From Within (Part I), *Democratization*, Vol. 10, No. 1, 2003, pp. 77-98

Crawford, G., Promoting Democracy From Without – Learning From Within (Part II), *Democratization*, Vol. 10, No. 2, 2003, pp. 1-20

Dahl, R., *On Democracy*, 2000, Yale University Press, New Haven

Diamond, L., *Promoting Democracy in the 1990s: Actors and Instruments, Issues and Imperatives*, a report to the Carnegie Commission on preventing deadly conflict, Carnegie Corporation, New York, 1995. Found through a internet search on October 19th, 2004: <http://wwics.si.edu/subsites/ccpdc/pubs/di/di.htm>, the Woodrow Wilson International Center for scholars, Washinton: The mission of the Center is to commemorate the ideals and concerns of Woodrow Wilson by: providing a link between the world of ideas and the world of policy; and fostering research, study, discussion, and collaboration among a full spectrum of individuals concerned with policy and scholarship in national and world affairs

Diamond, L., Is the Third Wave over?, *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 7, No. 3, 1996, pp. 20-37

Diamond, L. and Plattner, M. (editors), *Democratisation in Afrika*, 1999, John Hopkins University Press and the National Endowment for Democracy, Baltimore

Diamond, L. and Gunther, R. (editors), *Political Parties and Democracy*, 2001, John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore

Diamond, L., Elections Without Democracy, Thinking About Hybrid Regimes, *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 13, No. 2, 2002, pp. 21-35

Diamond, L. and Plattner, M. (editors), *The Global Divergence of Democracies*, 2001, John Hopkins University Press and the National Endowment for Democracy, Baltimore

Ethier, D., Is Democracy Promotion Effective? Comparing Conditionality and Incentives, *Democratization*, Vol. 10, No. 1, 2003, pp. 99-120

Erdmann, G., Party Research: Western European Bias and the 'African Labyrinth', *Democratization*, Vol. 11, No.3, 2004, pp.66-87

Erdmann, G., Hesitant Bedfellows: The German Stiftungen and Party Aid in Africa. Attempt of an Assessment, Workshop 'Globalising Party-based Democracy', Warwick University 7-8 July 2005, pp. 1-32

Foweraker, J., and Krznaric, R., How to Construct a Database of Liberal Democratic Performance, *Democratization*, Vol. 8, No. 3, 2001, pp. 1-25

Gerrits, A., De Nieuwe White man's burden? Over zin en onzin van internationale democratiebevordering, *Vrede en Veiligheid*, Vol. 33, No. 1, 2004, pp. 22-34

Gyimah-Boadi, E., Ghana's *Elections: Challenges Ahead*, Chapter 12, pp. 170-183 in Diamond, L. and Plattner, M. (editors), 1999

Gunther, R. and Diamond, L., Species of Political Parties, *Party Politics*, Vol. 9, No. 2, 2003, pp. 167-199

Halperin, M., Siegle, J. and Weinstein, M., *The Democratic Advantage, How Democracies Promote Prosperity and Peace*, 2005, Routledge, New York

Hameso, S., Issues and Dilemmas of Multi-party Democracy in Africa, *West African Review*, Vol. 3, No. 2, 2002, pp. 10-22

Hesp, I., 2002, paper on MATRA Political Party Foundations, written on request of IMD

Hauck, V., Building the Capacities of political Parties in Southern Africa: Reviewing the Strategy of the Netherlands, ECDPM Discussion Paper 15, 2000, ECDPM, Maastricht

Huntington, S., *The Third Wave, Democratization in the Twentieth Century*, 1991, University of Oklahoma Press, London

Karume, S., *Summary paper on Democracy Assistance*, 2003. Found through a internet search on October 16th, 2004: <http://www.eisa.org.za/PDF/SADC%20INSIGHT%201.pdf>, the EISA is a not for profit section 21 company, established in 1996, based in Johannesburg, South Africa. Its mission is to strengthen electoral processes, good governance, human rights and democratic values through research, capacity building, advocacy and other targeted interventions. The organisation services governments, electoral commissions, political parties, civil society organisations and other institutions operating in the democracy and governance fields throughout Africa

Kumar, K. (editor), *Postconflict Elections, Democratisation & International Assistance*, 1998, Lynne Rienner Publishers, London

Kumar, K., *After the Elections: Consequences for Democratisation*, Chapter 12, pp.215-228 in Kumar, K (editor), 1998

Kumar, K. and Ottaway, M., *General Conclusions and Priorities for Policy Research*, Chapter 13, pp. 229-238 in Kumar, K (editor), 1998

Kumar, K., International Political Party Assistance: An Overview and Aanalysis, CRU Working Paper 33, The Hague, Clingendael Institute, 2004

Lijphart, A., *Patterns of Democracy, Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries*, 1999, Yale University Press, New Haven

Linz, J. and Stepan, A., *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation*, 1996, John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.

Lipow, A., *Political Parties & Democracy, Explorations in History and Theory*, 1996, Pluto Press, London

Lipset, S.M., What are parties for?, *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 7, No. 1, 1996, pp. 169-175

Luckham, R., Goetz, A.M. and Kaldor, M., Democratic Institution and Democratic Politics, Chapter 1, pp.14-59 in Bastian, S. and Luckham, R. (editors), 2003.

Lyons, T., *Ghana's Elections: A Major Step Forward*, Chapter 11, pp. 157-169 in Diamond, L. and Plattner, M. (editors), 1999

Mainwaring, S., Rethinking Party Systems in the Third Wave of Democratisations: the Importance of Party System Institutionalisation, Working Paper No. 260, Helen Kellogg Institute for International Studies, University of Notre Dame

Mair, S., The Role of the German 'Stiftungen' in the Process of Democratisation, ECDPM working paper, No. 32, 1997, pp. 1-8

Mair, S., Chapter 5: Germany's Stiftungen and Democracy Assistance: Comparative Advantages, New Challenges, pp. 128-149 in Burnell, P. (editor), 2000

Mair, S., Multi-partisan or Bi-partisan Co-operation, What is the best solution for Democracy Assistance?, 2004, Conference Reader for the conference 'Enhancing the European Profile in Democracy Assistance', 4-6 July 2004, The Hague, pp. 131-135: www.democracyagenda.org

Van der Meulen, H., *Partijvorming in Centraal-Europa*, Research Essay, Den Haag, Institute Clingendael, November 2001.

Norwegian Agency for Development Co-operation, The Logical Framework Approach, Handbook for objectives-oriented Project Planning

Örtengren, K., Swedish Agency for International Development Cooperation, The Logical Framework Approach, 2004

Ottaway, M. and Chung, T., Toward a New Paradigm, *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 10, No. 4, 1999, pp. 99-112

Parekh, B., 'Rethinking Humanitarian Intervention' in J.N. Pieterse (ed.), *World Orders in the Making*, 1998, Basingstoke, Macmillan, pp. 141 in Burnell, P. (editor), 2000

Pevehouse, J., Democracy from the Outside-In? International Organizations and Democratization, *International Organization*, Vol. 56, No. 3, 2002, pp. 515-549

Plattner, M.F., The Trouble with Parties, *The Public Interest*, Spring 2001

Pomper, G.M., Concepts of Political Parties, *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, Vol. 4, No. 2, 1992, pp. 143-159

Quigley, K., *For Democracy's Sake, Foundations and Democracy Assistance in Central Europe*, 1997, Woodrow Wilson Center Press, Washington

Randall, V. and Svåsand, L., Introduction: the Contribution of Parties to Democracy and Democratic Consolidation, *Democratization*, Vol. 9, No. 3, 2002, pp. 1-10

Rustor, D., Transitions to Democracy: Towards a Dynamic Model, Chapter 2, pp.14-41 in Anderson, L. (editor), 1999

Schmitter, P. and Brouwer, I., *Conceptualizing, Researching and Evaluating Democracy Promotion and Protection*, 1999, European University Institute, Florence

Schraeder, P. (editor), *Exporting Democracy, Rhetoric vs. Reality*, 2002, Lynne Rienner Publishers, London

Santiso, C., International Co-operation for Democracy and Good Governance: Moving Toward a Second Generation? *European Journal of Development Research*, Vol. 13, No. 1, 2001, pp. 154-180

Sartori, G., *The Theory of Democracy Revisited*, 1987, Catham House Publishers, Chatam.

Scott, J., Transnationalizing Democracy Promotion: The Role of Western Political Foundations and Think-tanks, *Democratization*, Vol. 6, No. 3, 1999, pp. 146-170

Sen, A., Democracy as Universal Value, 1999, *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 10, No. 3, pp. 3-17

Spanger, H.-J. and Wolff, J., Why Promote Democratisation? Reflections on the Instrumental Value of Democracy, background research paper for the conference *Enhancing the European Profile in Democracy Assistance*, held in The Hague on 4-6 July 2004: www.democracyagenda.org

Stokes, S.C., Political Parties and Democracy, *Annual Review Political Science*, No. 2, 1999, pp. 243-267

Verkoren, W., De Invoer van Democratie, *Vrede en Veiligheid*, Vol. 32, No. 4, 2003, pp. 433-454

Van Wersch, J., Europe in Democracy Assistance: Facts and Figures, 2004, Conference Reader for the conference 'Enhancing the European Profile in Democracy Assistance', 4-6 July 2004, The Hague, pp. 165-185: www.democracyagenda.org

Weale, A., *Democracy, Issues in Political Theory*, 1999, MacMillan Press Ltd, London

White, H. and Dijkstra, A., *Programme Aid and Development, Beyond Conditionality*, 2003, Routledge, London

Wiarda, H., *Cracks in the Consensus: Debating the Democracy Agenda in US Foreign Policy*, 1997, Westport, CT, Praeger, Ch. 1 in Burnell (editor), 2000

De Wilde, J., Flagging Democracy, *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law*, Vol. 17, 2004, pp. 211-227

De Zeeuw, J., How to make Democracy Assistance More Effective, Recommendations for Doing it Differently, Conference Reader for the conference 'Enhancing the European Profile in Democracy Assistance', 4-6 July 2004, The Hague, pp. 121-129: www.democracyagenda.org

Van Wersch, J. and De Zeeuw, J., Mapping European Democracy Assistance: Tracing the Activities and Financial Flows of Political Foundations, Clingendael Institute, Conflict Research Unit, Working Paper 36, 2005

Yanai, N., Why do Political Parties survive?, *Party Politics*, Vol. 5 No. 1, 1999, pp. 5-17

Yilmaz, H., *External-Internal Linkages in Democratization: Developing an Open Approach of Democratic Change*, *Democratization*, Vol. 9, No. 2, 2002, pp. 67-84

Literature from the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Dutch political party foundations

Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs

- Programme Societal Transition (MATRA), Manual for Subsidy MATRA Projects Programme, 2002
- MATRA, what en how, 2004
- Manual MATRA Political Parties Programme, 2004
- Annex to Letter to Parliament on Policy Intensions MATRA Programme, September 2004

- Letter to Parliament ‘Aan Elkaar Verplicht’, focus on countries and sectors in bilateral development cooperation, good governance in partner-countries, 2004
- Annex to Letter to Parliament on the Policy Framework Programme Theme-based Co-financing System for the period 2006-2010, 2005
- Manual for Subsidy Theme-based Co-financing System for the period 2006-2010, 2005

Dutch political party foundations

Annual reports:

- Alfred Mozer Foundation, PvdA: 2003, 2004
- Eduardo Frei Foundation, CDA: 2002, 2003, 2004
- International Democratic Initiative, D66: 2003, 2004
- Haya van Someren Foundations, VVD: 2003, 2004
- Foundation for Sustainable Solidarity, GreenLeft: 2003
- Eastern Europe Project Team, SGP: 2003, 2004
- Development Cooperation Project, ChristenUnion: 2003, 2004
- IMD: 2002, 2003, 2004

Other documents:

- Alfred Mozer Foundation, The Art of Effective Training, a Handbook for Trainers, 2001
- IMD, Without democracy nobody fares well, Summary of the IMD multi-annual programme 2003-2006, 2003
- IMD, Support for Political Parties and Party Systems, The IMD Approach, 2004
- IMD, A Framework for Democratic Party-Building, 2004
- IMD, Report on the Evaluation of the IMD Programme in Bolivia 2000-2003, 2004
- IMD, Report on the Evaluation of the IMD Programme in Ghana 2000-2003, 2004

Annex 1 Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Explanation
AMF	Alfred Mozer Foundation (PvdA)
BPA	Bi-Party Approach (in political party assistance)
DFID	United Kingdom Department for International Development
EFF	Eduardo Frei Foundation (CDA)
EU	European Union
FES	Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (Germany SPD)
IDI	International Democratic Initiative (D66)
IMD	Netherlands Institute for Multi-party Democracy
KAS	Konrad Adenauer Stiftung (Germany CDU)
LFA	Logical Framework Approach
MPA	Multi-Party Approach (in political party assistance)
NCDS	Norwegian Centre for Democracy Support
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
OSCE	Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe
SIDA	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
Stiftung	German political party foundation
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UN	United Nations
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
Political Parties	
CDA	Dutch Christian Democratic Party (Christen Democratisch Appel)
CU	Dutch Christian Political Party (ChristenUnie)
D66	Dutch Social Liberal Party (Democraten '66)
GreenLeft Party	Dutch Green Party (GroenLinks)
PvdA	Dutch Social Democratic Party (Partij van de Arbeid)
SGP	Dutch Reformed Political Party (Staatkundig Gereformeerde Partij)
SPD	German Social Democratic Party (Socialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands)
VVD	Dutch Liberal Party (Volkspartij voor Vrijheid en Democratie)

Annex 2 Respondents

I Officials from the BPA

	<u>Name</u>	<u>Organisation</u>
1	<u>Arjen Berkvens</u>	Alfred Mozer Foundation (PvdA)
2	<u>Wietze Smid</u>	Eduardo Frei Foundation (CDA)
3	<u>Rudi Biemond</u>	Eastern Europe Project Team (SGP)
4	<u>Karin Veltman</u>	Haya van Someren Foundations (VVD)
	<u>Caroline van Thessen</u>	Haya van Someren Foundation (VVD)
5	<u>Emilie van de Vijver</u>	International Democratic Initiative (D66)
6	<u>Jan Paul Manni</u>	ChristenUnion Development Cooperation Project (CU)
7	<u>Anne de Boer</u>	Foundation for Sustainable Development (GreenLeft Party)

II Officials from the MPA

9	<u>Roel von Meijenfeldt</u>	Netherlands Institute for Multi-party Democracy
10	<u>Jan Tuit</u>	Netherlands Institute for Multi-party Democracy

III Academics

- 11 Michael Dauderstädt, has written many articles on democracy assistance and the German Stiftungen and is currently head of the International Policy Unit of the FES. The history of the German Stiftungen, especially the FES, their long-term experience in working with political parties in various environments and the specific insights of Mr. Dauderstädt, led to the choice to approach Michael Dauderstädt for an interview, which took place at the FES-office in Bonn, Germany.
- 12 Jeroen de Zeeuw, is an author on issues related to post-conflict rehabilitation and democratisation issues and is currently the coordinator of the research project 'Democratic Transition in Post-Conflict Societies' at the Conflict Research Unit of the Netherlands Institute of International Relations, 'Clingendael'.
- 13 Jean Bossuyt, is Programme Coordinator for 'Actors and Strategic Development' at the European Centre for Development Policy management and has written on the political dimension of the EU-ACP cooperation on issues of democratisation and governance.
- 14 Dr. Stefan Mair, is Deputy Director of the German Institute for International and Security Affairs and specialises in democratisation, democracy assistance and international election monitoring as well as German interests in Africa. He has written a chapter in the book *Foreign Aid in a Changing World* edited by Peter Burnell (1997, Open University Press, Buckingham) on the German Stiftungen and has written a background paper on the issue 'multi-partisan vs. bi-partisan cooperation' for the conference 'Enhancing the European profile in Democracy Assistance', held on 4-6 July in The Hague.
- 15 Dr. Gero Erdmann, is a member of the academic staff of the German Institute for African Affairs and has written on political parties, political systems and political culture in Sub-Sahara Africa amongst other themes related to the political aspects of this region.

Annex 3 Logical Framework Approach Table

Table 5.1 Logical Framework Approach, overall table BPA

	Sources Academic Literature	Sources BPA	
<p>1. Development Objective: Democratisation Sub-objective: Democracy</p> <p>Sub-objective: Political Parties</p> <p>BPA: assisting the transition of countries in a specific region to becoming a pluriform, democratic constitutional country.</p>	<p>1a. Indicators</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Elected officials 2 Free, fair and frequent elections 3 Freedom of expression 4 Alternative sources of information 5 Associational autonomy 6 Inclusive citizenship 7 Focus on good result in elections 8 Intermediate role 9 Formal registration 	<p>1b. Indicators BPA</p> <p>1 specific region 2 democratisation</p>	<p>1. External factors</p>
<p>2. Immediate Objective Improve Functioning Political Parties Sub-objective: Democracy Assistance</p> <p>Sub-objective: Political Party Assistance BPA: Dutch political parties to contribute to the training of the management officials of ('sister') parties in a specific region</p>	<p>2a. Indicators</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Assisting political institutions 2 Election support 3 Election support 4 Training political leadership 	<p>2b. Indicators BPA</p> <p>1 political education course 2 produce documentation materials on the political objectives of the 'sister' party 3 training trainers 4 preparing, creating and dispersing documentation.</p>	<p>2. External factors</p>
<p>3. Main activities BPA: political education courses (on political issues and political skills)</p>	<p>3a. Input</p>	<p>3b. Input BPA: budget, people and time</p>	<p>3. External factors</p>
<p>4. Output BPA</p>	<p>4a. Indicators</p>	<p>4b. Indicators BPA</p>	<p>4. External factors</p>

Table 5.2 Logical Framework Approach, overall table MPA

	Sources Academic Literature	Sources MPA	
1. Development Objective: Democratisation Sub-objective: Democracy Sub-objective: Political Parties MPA: poverty reduction	1a. Indicators 1 Elected officials 2 Free, fair and frequent elections 3 Freedom of expression 4 Alternative sources of information 5 Associational autonomy 6 Inclusive citizenship 7 Focus on good result in elections 8 Intermediate role 9 Formal registration	1b. Indicators MPA 1 Sustainable development 2 HIV/Aids and reproductive health 3 Social cultural development 4 <u>Political development</u> 5 Peace and security 6 Environment and water 7 Gender	1. External factors
2. Immediate Objective Improve Functioning Political Parties Sub-objective: Democracy Assistance Sub-objective: Political Party Assistance MPA: political development	2a. Indicators 1 Assisting political institutions 2 Election support 3 Election support 4 Training political leadership	2b. Indicators MPA 1 Human rights 2 <u>Good governance</u> 1 Policy development 2 Capacity building political actors 3 Monitoring the political, democratic process; development of policy to prevent and/or fight against corruption 5 Capacity building of the actors involved in preventing and/or fighting corruption 6 Capacity building to improve the legal status of citizens 7 Proportional representation and commitment of all groups in a society in local governance 8 Capacity building of local organisations, associations 9 Reinforcement of accountability and transparency of local governance	2. External factors
3. Main activities MPA: capacity building of political parties (cross-party and bi-lateral)	3a. Input	3b. Input MPA: budget, people and time	3. External factors
4. Output MPA	4a. Indicators	4b. Indicators MPA	4. External factors

Table 5.3, overall table, BPA and MPA combined (external factors not included)

	Sources Academic Literature	Sources BPA	Sources MPA
<p>1. Development Objective: Democratisation Sub-objective: Democracy Sub-objective: Political Parties</p> <p>BPA: assisting the transition of countries in a specific region to becoming a pluriform, democratic constitutional country. MPA: poverty reduction</p>	<p>1a. Indicators</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Elected officials 2 Free, fair and frequent elections 3 Freedom of expression 4 Alternative sources of information 5 Associational autonomy 6 Inclusive citizenship 7 Focus on good result in elections 8 Intermediate role 9 Formal registration 	<p>1b. Indicators BPA</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 specific region 2 democratisation 	<p>1c. Indicators MPA</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Sustainable development 2 HIV/Aids and reproductive health 3 Social cultural development 4 <u>Political development</u> 5 Peace and security 6 Environment and water 7 Gender
<p>2. Immediate Objective Improve Functioning Political Parties Sub-objective: Democracy Assistance Sub-objective: Political Party Assistance BPA: Dutch political parties to contribute to the training of the management officials of ('sister') parties in a specific region MPA: political development</p>	<p>2a. Indicators</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Assisting political institutions 2 Election support 3 Election support 4 Training political leadership 	<p>2b Indicators BPA</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 political education course 2 produce documentation materials on the political objectives of the 'sister' party 3 training trainers 4 preparing, creating and dispersing documentation. 	<p>2c. Indicators MPA</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Human rights 2 <u>Good governance</u> 1 Policy development 2 Capacity building political actors 3 Monitoring the political, democratic process; development of policy to prevent and/or fight against corruption 5 Capacity building of the actors involved in preventing and/or fighting corruption 6 Capacity building to improve the legal status of citizens 7 Proportional representation and commitment of all groups in a society in local governance 8 Capacity building of local organisations, associations 9 Reinforcement of accountability and transparency of local governance
<p>3. Main activities BPA and MPA BPA: political education courses MPA: capacity building of political parties</p>	<p>3a. Input</p>	<p>3b. Input BPA: budget, people and time</p>	<p>3c. Input MPA: budget, people and time</p>
<p>4. Output BPA/MPA</p>	<p>4a. Indicators</p>	<p>4b. Indicators BPA</p>	<p>4c. Indicators MPA</p>

