Postconflict Elections:

War Termination, Democratization, and Demilitarizing Politics

Terrence Lyons

Working Paper No. 20

February 2002

Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution
George Mason University

About the Author

Terrence Lyons joined the faculty of the Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution (ICAR) in 1999 and teaches courses on conflict analysis, theories of conflict resolution, and conflict and development. He received his Ph.D. from the Johns Hopkins University School for Advanced International Studies in 1993. From 1990 until 1998 he served as coordinator of the Conflict Resolution in Africa project at the Brookings Institution and conducted research on African security, humanitarian intervention, democratization, and U.S. foreign policy. He served as a Senior Researcher and Program Leader for Conflict Resolution and Peacebuilding Program at the International Peace Research Institute, Oslo, from 1998 to 1999. He has participated in talks to mediate conflicts in Ethiopia and served as Senior Program Advisor to the Carter Center's project on postconflict elections in Liberia in 1997.

Lyons' interest in the relationships between conflict resolution and democratization developed during his experiences as an election observer. He has observed elections in Ethiopia, Eritrea, Benin, Ghana, Bangladesh, and Liberia. His book, *Voting for Peace: Postconflict Elections in Liberia* (Brookings, 1999) analyzes the role of elections as an instrument of peace implementation in that case.

Among Lyons' other publications are *African Foreign Policies: Power and Processes* (co-editor, Lynne Rienner, 2001); *Sovereignty as Responsibility: Conflict Management in Africa* (co-author, Brookings, 1996); and *Somalia: State Collapse, Multilateral Intervention, and Strategies for Political Reconstruction* (co-author, Brookings, 1995).

Foreword

Questions relating to postconflict peacebuilding and reconciliation increasingly have become central to the field of conflict analysis and resolution. We have long recognized that the outcome of a process of conflict resolution, whether on an interpersonal, organizational, national, or international level, may serve either as the basis for enduring new relationships and sustainable conflict resolution or as the basis for a new round of conflict. But the literature has tended to focus more on the challenges of reaching an accord than the often larger challenges of implementing and sustaining the agreement.

Terrence Lyons examines the question of peacebuilding in some of the most difficult cases of civil war. He focuses on the instrument of postconflict elections in cases where elections served to implement a peace agreement following a period of civil war. These elections, he argues, are embedded in two distinct but interrelated transitional processes of conflict resolution and democratization. Such elections have become the predominant mechanism to implement peace agreements following civil war, as illustrated in this paper by the cases of Angola, Cambodia, El Salvador, Mozambique, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and Liberia. Postconflict elections are shaped in part by the legacy of fear and insecurity that persists in the immediate aftermath of a protracted internal conflict.

Under such circumstances, it is difficult to advance the dual goals of war termination and democratization. The comparative analysis of the six cases suggests, however, that processes that demilitarize politics and recognize the connections between the conflict resolution and political transition offer the best opportunity to generate sustainable outcomes. In particular, the role of interim regimes is critical because well-designed and -supported transitional institutions and norms can provide a new framework for political competition that bridges the destructive patterns of the conflict and the new rules necessary for peace and democracy. In addition, processes relating to demobilization, the construction of credible electoral authorities, and the transformation of militias into political parties can advance both conflict resolution and democratization.

Lyons joined the ICAR faculty in 1999, and this is his first ICAR Working Paper. We believe that the issues analyzed in this paper are critical not only to understanding the particular patterns following civil wars but to a larger understanding of the challenges of peacebuilding and to formulating strategies to promote sustainable peace. We look forward to continuing our work on these topics.

Sara Cobb
Director
Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution
George Mason University

About the Institute

The Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution at George Mason University in Fairfax, Virginia, has as its principal mission to advance the understanding and resolution of significant and persistent conflicts among individuals, communities, identity groups, and nations.

In the fulfillment of its mission, the institute conducts a wide range of programs and outreach. Among these are its graduate programs offering the Doctor of Philosophy and Master of Science in Conflict Analysis and Resolution, clinical consultancy services offered by individual members of the faculty, and public programs and education that include the annual Vernon M. and Minnie I. Lynch Lecture Series.

The institute's major research interests include the study of conflict and its resolution, the exploration and analysis of conditions attracting parties in conflict to the negotiating table, the role of third parties in dispute resolution, and the application of conflict resolution methodologies in local, national, and international settings. The institute's Applied Practice and Theory Program develops teams of faculty, students, and allied practitioners to analyze and address topics such as conflict in schools and other community institutions, crime and violence, jurisdictional conflicts between local agencies of government, and international conflicts.

The Northern Virginia Mediation Service is affiliated with the institute and provides conflict resolution and mediation services and training to schools, courts, and local agencies and practitioners in communities across Northern Virginia and the Washington metropolitan area.

For more information, please call (703) 993-1300 or check the institute's web page at www.gmu.edu/departments/ICAR/.

Outcomes of transitional periods after peace agreements to halt civil wars are critical to sustaining peace and providing the basis for a long-term process of democratization. Understanding these transitional processes and designing policies to promote successful peace implementation are among the greatest challenges of the post–Cold War era. In a number of recent cases, including Angola (1992), Cambodia (1993), El Salvador (1994), Mozambique (1994), Bosnia-Herzegovina (1996), and Liberia (1997), elections have been designated in the peace accord as the mechanism for ending the transition.[1] Such postconflict elections are designed to advance two distinct but interrelated goals – war termination and democratization.[2]

This essay will examine the comparative lessons of these recent postconflict elections and their relationship to the twin processes of conflict resolution and democratization. The election events themselves gain importance by their connection to these deeper and longer-term processes. While the dynamics of conflict resolution and political transition are distinct, postconflict elections are embedded in both. "Demilitarizing politics" is a concept that captures elements of both components and emphasizes the importance of specific processes and policies that support the twin goals of war termination and democratization. Insights from theories and concepts developed by scholars of conflict resolution and in the literature on political transitions therefore help explain the dual nature of such elections and suggest what types of processes support the demilitarization of politics to advance the twin goals of peace and democracy. Conflict resolution concepts point to the importance of managing the inherent strategic and security dilemmas to encourage military leaders to stop the fighting and exchange their armed power for a chance at political power. The literature on political transitions helps us see how the legacies of the old order and the uncertainties inherent in competitive elections structure strategic choice. Both conflict resolution and democratization studies emphasize the role of institutions, suggesting that in postconflict transitions the role of interim government and the construction of

democratic institutions such as political parties and effective electoral commissions will be critical to both the security and political agendas.

Understanding the Dual Nature of Postconflict Transitions

Elections have become the principal means to legitimate the new leadership and institutions that emerge from a negotiated settlement to a civil war.[3] Such postconflict elections carry a tremendous burden. They are called upon to settle the contentious issues of internal and external legitimacy and must be organized under the difficult circumstances of societal disorder, general insecurity, fear, distrust, and institutional breakdown. The legacy of fear will last long after the initial cease-fire, as vulnerable populations assess whether security will hold. In some cases the vote is expected to do the impossible: Elections cannot settle a military conflict that negotiations or victory have failed to end.

The often brief time between cease-fire and elections is characterized by the first steps in multiple difficult transitions. It is during these interims that war-torn societies initiate the lengthy struggle to construct legitimate political institutions, demobilize soldiers and resettle displaced populations, come to terms with past human-rights abuses and institutionalize rule of law, and begin moving their economies from relief to development. Each of these transitions is a long-term and difficult process. The initial paths chosen during the peace-implementation phase are important because they establish critical precedents, norms, and institutional frameworks that structure the postconflict political order. These interim periods therefore contain particular opportunity and risk as local leaders assess the relative benefits of working to sustain peace and build democracy in societies still polarized and distorted by war and where demagogues can capitalize on people's fears.

As a result, the influence of institutional arrangement and design, incentives and

sanctions, and norms and patterns of behavior during these transitions play a particularly important role in encouraging peacebuilding and reducing the chances of backsliding into renewed conflict or authoritarian rule. The nature of the interim institutions established during the peace-implementation phase will form the context in which former combatants and future voters assess their prospects and make decisions to either organize in a manner that supports the peace process or prepare for a return to war. The processes created to manage such implementation issues as demobilization of armed forces, administration of elections, and the transformation of militias into political parties offer opportunities to encourage the demilitarization of politics.

From the conflict resolution and war termination literature, concepts relating to how security is constructed in the absence of authoritative institutions help explain important dimensions of transitions that culminate in elections. Among the most difficult challenges to the implementation of an internal peace agreement are the inevitable security dilemmas that often thwart demobilization and the transition to nonviolent political competition. A security dilemma occurs in a situation where one party's efforts to increase its own security reduces the security of the others. Theorists of civil wars have adopted the concept, as developed by Jervis to explain interstate conflict and arms races, to explain why reaching agreement is hard and successful implementation even more difficult.[4] Conditions following civil war are structurally similar to international anarchy because institutions and norms are weak or at least contested and parties therefore seek self-help solutions to their security concerns. In such contexts, information failures and the inability to make credible commitments hinder the demobilization process and make parties reluctant to give up the military option and accept electoral results when they cannot be assured of their rival's compliance.

Following a cease-fire, government and insurgent leaders alike must make difficult judgments about the likely costs and benefits of adhering to the provisions of the peace accord

under conditions of considerable uncertainty and imperfect information about the goals, character, and behavior of their opponents. Stedman has stated: "By signing a peace agreement, leaders put themselves at risk from adversaries who may take advantage of a settlement, from disgruntled followers who see peace as a betrayal of key values, and from excluded parties who seek either to alter the process or to destroy it."[5] Walter similarly has written that peace agreements in civil wars ask opponents "to do what they consider unthinkable. At a time when no legitimate government and no legal institutions exist to enforce a contract, they are asked to demobilize, disarm, and disengage their military forces and prepare for peace."[6] Lake and Rothchild have specified three different strategic dilemmas that threaten peace implementation in internal conflict: information failures, problems of credible commitment, and incentives to use force preemptively (also know as the security dilemma).[7] The challenge to creating a framework to end civil wars is less the lack of possible arrangements and more the difficulty in creating enforcement mechanisms.[8]

Every peace process creates losers along with winners, and "spoilers" often derail peace implementation. Unless powerful forces involved in the conflict have agreed to the terms of the settlement or have been either defeated or successfully marginalized, the peace process risks coming under attack from those with an interest in continuing the conflict.[9] Determining in advance whether a given actor is committed to the process or a potential spoiler is impossible. It is only in the context of the peace implementation process that intentions can be assessed – through compliance with demobilization provisions and acceptance of electoral results, for example.

Theories developed by scholars of conflict resolution therefore point to several elements of particular importance in understanding postconflict elections. Unless the strategic and security dilemmas are managed during the implementation phase, renewed conflict likely will prevent democratization. Problems of information failure in the context of mutual distrust

following a conflict and the problem of credible commitment make not only security arrangements but also electoral provisions difficult to put in place. As will be argued below, processes to promote the demilitarization of politics can help alleviate these dilemmas while at the same time promoting democratization by creating institutional frameworks to manage the transitional process. The processes by which the strategic and security dilemmas are managed and the institutions and norms thereby created will structure postconflict politics and elections. Interim institutions based on consultation, effective political parties, and credible electoral commissions will promote transparency and confidence building, thereby managing some of the security dilemmas and reassuring former combatants to accept the peace implementation process and electoral results.

Concepts developed in the literature on democratization and transitions from authoritarian rule help us understand a second set of dimensions that characterize postconflict transitions and elections. An economic or political transition will be strongly influenced by the institutional legacies of the existing order.[10] A number of scholars on regime transition have developed ideas relating to "path dependency" and "structured contingency" to examine how institutional legacies shape the course of a transition.[11] Thelen and Steinmo, for example, argue that "institutions shape the goals that political actors pursue and … structure power relations among them."[12] Linz and Stepan similarly base their analysis of transition paths on the characteristics of the previous regime.[13]

For a state engaged in a transition following a period of protracted civil war, one of the most important characteristics of the transition will be the distortion or collapse of peacetime political institutions and social structures. The legacy of the institutions developed during the war, including insurgent militias, black-market networks, the social formations characteristic of refugee and displaced-person populations, and an expanded and often unaccountable state security apparatus will structure the transition process. The nature of the interim regime that

manages the implementation process will create the institutional setting that bridges the structures of wartime and the structures needed to support peace and democracy.[14] As will be emphasized below, transitional arrangements that focus on joint decision-making processes, confidence building among the former combatants, and the development of new norms can promote the demilitarization of politics and increase the chances that postconflict elections will result in a sustainable transition.

In addition to the impact of institutional legacies on the transitional path, another important concept from the literature on democratization is the role of uncertainty. Przeworski defines democracy as a process of "institutionalizing uncertainty" where "no one can win once and for all."[15] Uncertainty and fear shape the strategic decisions of critical actors and hence the nature of the transition. In a postconflict transition where forces recently at war are key actors, questions relating to managing risk and uncertainty occur in a specific and difficult form.

In part as a result of uncertainty, many transitions take place through pacts or power-sharing agreements. Political pacts are a set of negotiated compromises among competing elites with the goal of institutionalizing the distribution of power and reducing uncertainty.[16] A number of transitions in Latin America, the Round Table talks in Poland, and the Convention for a Democratic South Africa process were organized around implicit or explicit political pacts, designed to provide powerful actors with sufficient guarantees so that they would accept the change.

Pacts, however, ultimately rely upon other mechanisms for enforcement and do not by themselves end uncertainty or resolve the difficulty in making credible commitments. The strategic problems in reaching the initial cease-fire identified above in the conflict resolution literature (information failures, inability to make credible commitments, spoiler problems, security dilemmas) will recur in the pact-making negotiations.[17] Pacts are more likely among elites with relatively clear and loyal constituencies, such as political parties, labor unions, or

other institutions in a corporatist setting. In the aftermath of a civil war, such political and social organizations generally are absent and the ability of militia leaders to deliver the compliance of even their own fighters is often under question. Finally, the ability to assess the political power of a military faction is difficult, and the identity of the critical constituencies to include in a pact is unclear immediately following a conflict. Even if the military balance among factions is relatively clear (as indicated by a stalemate on the battlefield), the relative political power of these factions and the extent to which they are capable of representing significant civilian constituencies in peacetime may be unknown.[18]

Finally, there is a substantial body of literature that analyzes the relationship of institutional design and electoral system choice in particular on the potential for conflict.[19] A recent study by Sisk and Reynolds argues that "electoral systems – the rules and procedures under which votes are translated into seats in parliament or the selection of executives – are a critical variable in determining whether elections can simultaneously serve the purposes of democratization and conflict management."[20] Proportional representation systems are generally regarded as more suitable in societies that are divided because they more often create broad, inclusive governments.[21] Other schemes involve various types of vote polling and federalism.[22]

As with pacts, however, electoral systems and constitutional checks on power are particularly difficult following civil war and generally fail to overcome the security dilemmas that shape such transitions. The same inability to make credible commitments that troubles the demilitarization dimensions of the transition will make agreements to limit power unpersuasive to parties who fear elimination by their rivals after the election. Institutions undoubtedly play a role in structuring the boundaries of acceptable political behavior and provide incentives for certain types of political organization. The influence of electoral systems is highly contextual,[23] however, and unlikely to alter the outcome of postconflict elections to the same extent as the processes of demilitarizing politics discussed below.

An examination of recent cases suggests that postconflict elections sometimes have succeeded in providing a mechanism for selecting new political leadership and institutions capable of preserving the peace and serving as the first step in a process of democratization, thereby promoting peacebuilding over time. This has been the result in El Salvador (1994), Mozambique (1994), and (partially and more tentatively) in Cambodia (1993). In other cases, the move toward elections precipitated renewed conflict, as in Angola (1992). In a third set of cases, including Bosnia-Herzegovina (1996) and Liberia (1997), elections served more as a mechanism of war termination with only a limited and possibly negative relationship to democratization.

This article will suggest that a concept of "demilitarizing politics" best captures the dynamics of these dual transitions. Some analysts have argued that there is an inherent trade-off between the processes of conflict resolution and democratization.[24] Others have emphasized the need to have a demonstrable commitment by the parties to carry out the peace accord or effective demobilization prior to elections.[25] But rather than focusing on preconditions for successful postconflict elections, it is more useful to focus on how the distinct but interrelated agendas of conflict resolution and democratization interact in the context of a postconflict transition culminating in an election. Success or failure to resolve the dilemmas on one side of the dual war termination–democratization agenda can influence the dilemmas on the other. Successful demobilization or disarmament, for example, will encourage confidence in the electoral process. On the other hand, failure to manage spoilers will undermine the prospects for democratization. By the same token, creating a credible electoral system will encourage former combatants to take the risks inherent in giving up their military options. Failing to transform militias into political parties will make demilitarization more difficult.

Interim institutions during the implementation phase will be critical arenas in which former combatants and potential civilian leaders make assessments regarding whether the

postconflict environment will protect their interests and whether they will support the dual

processes of conflict resolution and democratization. The management of demobilization, the

creation of political parties, and the administration of the electoral process are tasks at the heart

of the transition and provide critical opportunities for interim regimes to establish the norms,

precedents, and institutions needed to start the demilitarization of politics. In some cases,

interim regimes have been built around joint decision-making bodies that foster confidence

building and a new institutional context that can structure competition toward a path of

democracy and peace. As will be detailed below, this type of transition took place in El

Salvador and Mozambique. In other cases, interim regimes have failed to promote the

demilitarization of politics, leading to either renewed conflict as in Angola or electoral

ratification of wartime institutions and leaders as in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Liberia.

To demilitarize politics entails building norms and institutions that bridge the structures

of wartime based on insecurity and fear (such as militias and extreme nationalist groups) to

structures based on security and trust that can sustain peace and democracy (such as political

parties and civil society). The powerful actors that developed and were sustained during a

protracted civil war cannot be wished away: Neither can the enabling environment for peaceful

political competition be proclaimed into existence. To the extent that politics is demilitarized,

postconflict elections are more likely to result in a new political order that can sustain peace and

democracy.

The Legacy of Fear

A key to understanding postconflict elections is to recognize that fear and the distorted

social structures and (mal)distribution of power created by the war will shape the political

context. This is the institutional context that structures the path of the transition. Unless a strong

interim regime or process to demilitarize politics is in place during the period between cease-fire and elections, powerful organizations of war are likely to dominate the campaign and win the election.

In a context where the institutions of war remain powerful, postconflict elections are dominated by concerns for peace and security. Voters often choose to use the limited power of their franchise either to appease the most powerful faction in the hope that this will prevent a return to war or to select the most nationalistic and chauvinistic candidate who pledges to protect the voter's community. Outside observers regard some of these leaders as warlords or war criminals, but to vulnerable voters they may represent powerful protectors capable of defending the voter from rival military forces. In other cases, giving former military leaders political office may be perceived as the best chance for achieving peace through appeasement. Civilian candidates and those who do not have a convincing answer to the issue of postelection security are unlikely to prevail.

In Liberia, for example, memories of seven years of brutal conflict and the consequent fear clearly shaped how many voters viewed the July 1997 election and the choices available to them. As one observer put it, the voters "were intimidated not by thugs at the polling stations but by the trauma of the last seven years of war."[26] Many Liberians believed that if Charles Taylor, the most powerful factional leader, lost the election, the country would return to war. Taylor's rivals pointed to his violent past during the campaign but could not propose credible actions to contain him if he refused to accept the results. Many Liberians made a calculated choice that they hoped would more likely promote peace and stability and used their franchise to appease the powerful former militia leader. As one Liberian said, "He [Taylor] killed my father but I'll vote for him. He started all this and he's going to fix it."[27] In the end the elections ratified and institutionalized the political topography and imbalance of power created by seven years of war. Organizations and leaders who amassed great power during the conflict converted

that influence into positions of authority under the constitution through elections.

Similar patterns of voters in postconflict elections voting for the party that offered security in a context distorted by fear are evident in other cases. Nationalist parties in Bosnia-Herzegovina campaigned on the basis of chauvinistic pledges. The Croat Democratic Party (HDZ) issued advertisements warning that the "survival of their nation" depended on the vote, while Republika Srpska television warned that a vote against the Serb Democratic Party (SDS) would constitute a vote "against the Serb people."[28] Bosnian Muslims made the same sort of appeals: "A vote for the SDA (Party of Democratic Action) is a vote for the survival of the Muslim nation" went the slogan in 1996.[29]

While the issue of peace will dominate the agenda in postconflict elections, voters do not always choose the most militant parties. In Cambodia, the royalist FUNCINPEC coalition won the election over both the ruling Cambodian People's Party (CPP), which controlled the military, and the Khmer Rouge, which retained a significant military capacity. Some analysts suggest that many voters regarded FUNCINPEC as the party best positioned to come to a settlement with the Khmer Rouge and that voters rejected the brutal behavior of the ruling CPP during the election campaign. The CPP campaign suggested that that FUNCINPEC was in league with the Khmer Rouge, and since many Cambodians believed that a deal with the Khmer Rouge was necessary for peace, they voted for FUNCINPEC.[30] The following campaign speech by the deputy leader of FUNCINPEC indicates the party's themes and how it took advantage of the desire for peace:

> Some parties [e.g., the CPP] promise that if they win they won't let the Khmer Rouge come back. But will they make war in order that the Khmer Rouge don't return? We have had fourteen years of war already, and Khmer killing Khmer…. We are sick of war which we have had since 1970. We won't take your children to go to war…. Do you want war, or peace? If FUNCINPEC wins, we will make an invitation to the Khmer Rouge…. So vote for FUNCINPEC so it can solve the problems of Cambodia.[31]

In El Salvador and Mozambique, however, relatively successful processes to demilitarize politics reduced the legacy of fear. Relatively strong interim regimes, consultative processes to

manage the challenges of implementation (particularly demobilization) and electoral administration, and support for the creation of effective political parties established a new institutional context that served to bridge the conditions of wartime to those of peace and democratization. In Mozambique, some voters engaged in tactical voting to balance the two powerful parties by selecting the ruling Frelimo candidate as president while choosing the opposition Renamo candidates for the parliament.[32] Salvadoran voters made their selection on the basis of policy preferences with less concern that the outcome would re-ignite conflict, although some voters reportedly voted against the FMLN due to their involvement in the war.[33] A postconflict election therefore is likely to bring to power the groups and leaders who arose in the context of the war unless a process to demilitarize politics develops.

Demilitarization of Politics

To overcome the legacies of civil war, postconflict transitions must manage both the security and the political dimensions through a process of demilitarizing politics. Such a process will be managed by the interim institutions established by the peace agreement and will engage in decision making on a wide variety of issues. In this article we will highlight two of particular salience for war termination and democratization – demobilization and the creation of democratic institutions, specifically political parties and electoral authorities. While consolidating the process of demilitarizing politics takes time, initial steps and precedents may be built into the transition in the short term and thereby channel the transition along a path toward sustainable peace and democratization.

Interim Institutions

Interim governments derive their authority from the extent to which they prepare the country for meaningful elections and turn power over to the winners.[34] In the meantime, however, the country needs to be governed. Critical and contentious policy decisions relating to the electoral framework, demilitarization, reintegration of the displaced, and reestablishment of functioning economic and legal institutions must be made and implemented. The process through which such policies are made will shape the expectations of the major actors and may inspire confidence or ignite fears.

An agreement to end a protracted internal conflict must include mechanisms to help sustain the agreement by managing disputes during the implementation process and by dismantling the structures that have perpetuated the conflict. As argued by Kalevi Holsti, peace agreements succeed or fail on their ability to "anticipate and devise means to cope with the issues of the future."[35] A peace settlement should not freeze a moment in history, particularly a moment distorted by the fears and insecurities of war.

Disputes are inevitable during the transition, as the broad (and often vague if not contradictory) principles listed in the peace agreement must be made operational in a difficult and tense atmosphere. As suggested by analysts of security dilemmas in civil war termination, a key to successful interim administration is to build institutional frameworks that bind the parties in self-restraint and mutual cooperation without increasing the risk of exploitation from a spoiler that does not comply.[36] In a number of cases, provisions for ongoing negotiations, bargaining, and collaborative problem solving during the implementation period have helped to build norms of nonviolent governance that foster confidence, legitimize decisions, and thereby reinforce the momentum for successful democratization.[37] Interim regimes therefore create new institutional contexts that can channel political action toward a path that supports peacebuilding and democratization.

The period between the signing of an agreement and an election provides the context for

testing and assessing the risks and benefits of cooperation and the intentions and commitments of each party. In many cases, parties to a conflict adopt the extreme rhetoric of total war during the conflict but shift their language and tactics (if not their goals) during the peace implementation process. During the period between the cease-fire and elections, each party will look for evidence to confirm its fears that its rival is cheating. Noncompliance, however, may be the result of fear or a poorly designed or implemented demobilization or electoral process rather than a lack of commitment to the new rules of the game.[38] Many analysts doubted that Renamo in Mozambique could make the transition from a fighting organization (some would even characterize it as a bandit or terrorist organization) into a viable political party able to play a constructive role in a multiparty democracy. At the same time, many anticipated that UNITA in Angola had a solid base of support and could function as a political party. It was only through the process of implementation that the capacity of each to contribute to peace and democratization became clear.

The transitions in El Salvador and Mozambique illustrate how interim institutions based on joint decision making encourage transitions that advance both conflict resolution and democratization. In El Salvador, the peace accords led to the creation of a National Commission for the Consolidation of Peace (COPAZ), a body with representation evenly split between the government and its allies, and the opposition including the FMLN insurgents, with observer status for the UN and Catholic Church. COPAZ debated and passed implementing legislation under the peace agreement, ranging from constitutional amendments that redefined the role of the armed forces to electoral law. Because the commission was evenly split between the government and the opposition (including the insurgents), "hammering out compromises became a political necessity – and a newly acquired skill for many politicians."[39] When problems arose over the electoral system or when an FMLN arms cache was uncovered after the deadline for disarmament, COPAZ was able to keep the parties talking and to keep the process moving

toward elections.

In Mozambique the "construction of a lasting peace … required still more negotiation and planning" following the Rome Accord.[40] Joint decision-making bodies such as the Supervisory and Monitoring Commission (CSC) and the Cease-Fire Commission (CCF) brought together the major political actors with the major donors in a consultative process chaired by the Special Representative of the UN Secretary-General. Other specialized commissions dealt with reintegration of former combatants, reform of the Mozambican defense forces, and preparations for the election.[41] These interim institutions created the context for overcoming some of the legacies of the civil war and thereby promoted the demilitarizing politics. In both El Salvador and Mozambique, the international community supported these transitional arrangements through effective United Nations operations.

In Cambodia, the Paris peace agreement established a complicated set of overlapping institutions to administer the country during the peace implementation period. The four Cambodia parties formed the Supreme National Council (SNC) that was designed to work with both an expansive United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia (UNTAC) and the incumbent bureaucracy. When the SNC could not reach an agreement by consensus, Prince Sihanouk had the authority to give advice to UNTAC and UNTAC had the authority to act. In addition, the United Nations Special Representative of the Secretary-General acted as the final arbiter regarding whether SNC decisions adhered to the Paris Agreement. Representatives of the permanent members of the UN Security Council and a number of other interested states and donors also had resources and authority. Some of the most important consultations were undertaken by Prince Sihanouk who had the charisma and traditional authority to call the Cambodian parties together and mediate disputes. This set of institutions therefore contained a number of checks and balances, incentives for collaboration, and opportunities for a wide range of opinions to be heard. Doyle describes this arrangement as an "ad hoc, semi-sovereign

artificial body." Decision making was cumbersome and slow, but regular consultations among this "circle of authority" helped manage unilateral actions that may have threatened any party.[42]

Angola, Liberia, and Bosnia-Herzegovina, in contrast, demonstrate how weak and ineffective transitional institutions failed to build the confidence or norms to establish a new path toward democracy. Under the 1991 Bicesse Accords in Angola, pro forma meetings among the parties within the Joint Political-Military Commission (CCPM) did not act to change behavior and may have created a false sense of confidence in the parties' commitment to the agreement.[43] In December 1991, nine months before the elections, President Dos Santos stated that the CCPM was not capable "of resolving the problems the country is facing today within the framework of pacification and national democratization."[44] Demobilization failed, the military structures remained in place at the time of the elections, and war resumed immediately after the vote. Under the Yamoussoukro, Cotonou, and Abuja agreements in Liberia, interim administration was parceled out to each of the factions with only a weak and generally stalemated Council of State assigned the impossible job of coordination. The dysfunctional interim government and failed demobilization process created a context in which most voters feared a return to war unless the most powerful military faction won. Under the Dayton Accords in Bosnia-Herzegovina, a Joint Interim Commission that included the prime ministers of Bosnia-Herzegovina, the Bosnian-Croatian Federation, and the Serbian Republika Srpska met regularly, with the UN High Representative as the chair. The commission discussed a broad range of issues, but each entity responded to an autonomous and contradictory set of political dynamics based in the institutions of the three entities, making cooperation difficult. Each party continued to pursue unilateral advantage, thereby preventing effective forms of joint decision making and forcing the United Nations to act unilaterally on a number of contentious decisions.

Interim institutions responsible for administration during the period between a cease-fire agreement and elections to implement a peace accord have the opportunity to begin the process

of demilitarizing politics. To the extent that such transitional regimes operate on the basis of joint decision making and collaborative problem solving, and create norms that protect the interests of key constituencies, they can build confidence in the peace process. Effective interim regimes will be better positioned to promote demilitarization of politics, particularly with regard to demobilization, the development of democratic institutions, and the initial steps in creating a liberal political order.

Demobilization as a Process of Demilitarizing Politics

The first priority of a civil war peace settlement is to stop the fighting, manage security during the transitional period, and thereby provide the preconditions for democratization. Unless the difficult security dilemmas inherent in ending civil wars and the threats to the peace process posed by potential spoilers opposed to the agreement can be managed in the short run, the implementation process will fail. As Margaret Antsee, the UN special envoy to Angola, states "Any lasting solution of a long-standing civil war depends of a satisfactory resolution of the military element."[45]

The manner by which security is managed in the interim period, however, can have important implications for the prospects of longer-term peacebuilding. The institutions, norms, and precedents established to implement the security provisions of a peace accord can shape how governance will operate following implementation and the postconflict elections. A process of demobilization that builds institutions and norms that can help sustain democratic governance after the transition can both contribute to reducing the threat of insecurity and increase the prospect for democratization.

Demobilization, "the formal disbanding of military formations and, at the individual level, the process of releasing combatants from a mobilized state," decreases the opportunity for

disgruntled leaders and groups to abandon the peace process and return to war.[46] As military

leaders lose their capacity to deploy soldiers, they are encouraged to protect their interests and

pursue their objectives through a political process. The dismantling of Renamo as an effective

military force helped reinforce those encouraging it to accept the electoral results in

Mozambique. In El Salvador, the insurgent FMLN transformed itself from a militia into a

political party during the implementation phase. In both cases the United Nations and

international donors played important roles in encouraging and monitoring demobilization.

In contrast, the failed and uneven demobilization in Angola provided Jonas Savimbi and

UNITA with military options when they were dissatisfied with electoral results. Many analysts

conclude that UNITA was in a stronger military position at the time of the elections than it had

been at the time of the cease-fire.[47] Few observers in Liberia believed that Taylor effectively

had demobilized his militia prior to elections but, because he won the vote, his commitment to

the democratic process remained untested.[48] In Bosnia-Herzegovina, the peace agreement

permitted both Entities to retain significant armed forces, and security focused on the large

NATO-led implementation force, not on the reduction of local military capacity.

A number of analysts have justifiably criticized the international community for failing to

provide adequate leadership or resources to support the demobilization process in Angola,

Cambodia, and Liberia.[49] Better financial support and leadership in operations in El Salvador

and Mozambique encouraged more effective demobilization. These criticisms are undoubtedly

accurate. In the context of demilitarization of politics, however, what is more important than

international funding is the process by which demobilization takes place, the extent to which it

builds new institutions and norms, and its relationship to broader peacebuilding processes.

For the political process, the extent to which cooperative and transparent processes to

manage security questions are developed is more important than the absolute quantities of arms

decommissioned or reduction of force levels.[50] The absolute level of arms, for example, is less

important than the extent of the commitment to the political process and the sense of security the

peace process develops. Aldo Ajello, the Special Representative in charge of the UN operation

in Mozambique, realistically appraised the options:

> I know very well that they will give us old and obsolete material, and they will have here and there something hidden. I don't care. What I do is create the political situation in which the use of those guns is not the question. So that they stay where they are.[51]

The rationale for demobilization and disarmament is the exchange of military capacity

for political benefits.[52] The demobilization and disarmament process may serve as the context

for important confidence building among the parties and the development of new institutions and

procedures of decision making that can encourage democratization and reinforce the peace

process in important ways. There is a subtle interplay between the dynamics of a postconflict

political transition and the manner in which the disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration

provisions associated with that process are implemented.[53] On the one hand, demobilization and

related activities reduce the means by which civil wars are prosecuted and thereby reduce the

chances that war will be re-ignited. At the same time and perhaps more important,

demobilization helps create an environment for confidence and security building and for the

development of institutions and norms for nonviolent political competition.[54]

Building Democratic Institutions: Political Parties and Electoral Commissions

The transitional period between cease-fire and elections provides opportunities for the

institutions of war such as military organizations to begin their transformation into political

structures that can support democratization and long-term peacebuilding. It is extremely

difficult for militias to play the role of competing political parties in a democratic system if they

remain organized and led as they were during the period of armed conflict.[55] A successful

demilitarization of politics will include processes to encourage the transformation of militias and

single party organizations into political parties that can operate in a competitive, multiparty system. Given the security dilemmas and the distrust characteristic of a postconflict context, suspicions over the electoral system and fears that rival parties will use fraud to win make credible electoral administration critical. In many cases, a new electoral commission, often balanced with representatives from multiple parties, is necessary to build confidence in the process. In addition, transitional periods sometimes provide the opportunity for important first steps in the creation of a liberal political order through the creation of independent courts, civil society, and free media. Each of these transformations from the institutional legacies of war to structures that support democratization is again a long-term process, but the initial steps in developing such institutions may take place in the period of peace implementation and can reinforce efforts to build security.

Political parties. In the more successful cases of transition, the process to demilitarize politics encouraged military organizations to transform themselves into political parties able to operate effectively in a multiparty context. In El Salvador, for example, the insurgent FMLN successfully converted itself to a legal political party capable of winning significant votes.[56] As the election neared, the FMLN focused its resources on building a national network of cadres and building alliances with other parties on the left. In the end, the FMLN supported Rubén Zamora of the Democratic Convergence party for president and concentrated on Assembly and mayoral elections.[57]

The United Nations called this "transformation . . . the very core of the Peace Accords."[58] At the same time as the FMLN was moving away from its origins as an insurgent movement, the incumbent ARENA party shifted its base of support. Initially founded by individuals closely associated with death squads and the repression of the left, it evolved into an effective political party that represented a broad range of landowners, bankers, merchants, and industrialists. Leadership of ARENA shifted from Roberto D'Aubuisson, who had ties to right-

wing death squads, to the more moderate, probusiness Alfredo Cristiani.[59] Postconflict elections in El Salvador therefore provided the opportunity for two key organizations involved in the civil war to make the transformation to political organizations able to compete effectively in elections.

The international community recognized that building Renamo up into a viable partner in the peace process in Mozambique was a condition for successful implementation.[60] UN Special Representative Ajello stated that "it was necessary to help Renamo to achieve a minimum level that could allow the functioning of the whole mechanism" of the peace agreement.[61] Renamo insisted that there could be "no democracy without money,"[62] and Ajello agreed: "Democracy has a cost and we must pay that cost."[63] After initial concerns from donors reluctant to fund a party with a particularly brutal reputation, a $19-million fund was established to help Renamo transform itself into a political party. In addition to financial inducements, the international community worked to "socialize RENAMO into the rules of democratic competition, and to make its legitimacy contingent on fulfilling its commitment to peace."[64]

In Cambodia, the Royalist FUNCINPEC developed during the transition into a relatively effective political party with a grassroots base, while the incumbent Cambodian People's Party (CPP) continued to behave as it had when it was the sole legal party. The Khmer Rouge continued to operate as a guerrilla movement throughout the electoral period.[65] In Angola, neither the MPLA nor UNITA ever made the transformation from a military organization to a competitive political party. In Liberia, the skill and ease by which the National Patriotic Front for Liberia transformed itself from an insurgent military organization into the populist National Patriotic Party suggests that some skills and structures developed during the armed struggle can be used as the base for an effective political organization.[66]

The creation of political parties able to represent key constituencies and compete effectively in an electoral process is an important component of any democratic transition. In a

postconflict transition, the viability of political parties plays an additional role with relation to war termination. To the extent that powerful leaders and their followers perceive that they have the option to operate as a political party rather than as a militia or military government, the chances of a successful transition are increased. Demilitarizing politics through the transformation of militias into political parties therefore promotes both war termination and democratization.

Electoral commissions. Commissions to organize and manage postconflict elections combine functions relating to both conflict resolution and democratization. The primary purpose of any electoral administrative body is to deliver credible ("free and fair") election services to the candidates and voters.[67] Issues relating to impartiality and independence, efficiency, professionalism, and transparency are particularly important in the context of suspicion and mistrust that characterize postconflict elections. Furthermore, the precedents established in a postconflict election – as in any "breakthrough" or "founding" election in a process of democratization – are likely to shape popular perceptions for years to come. Yet another challenge to postconflict electoral authorities are the memories of earlier electoral fraud, as in El Salvador and Liberia. In cases where a stolen election was a cause of the conflict, the character of the postconflict election will be closely watched.

There is no single best model for electoral commissions, and international practice is diverse.[68] In a number of postconflict cases, an international organization has played an important role in electoral administration as a means to increase public confidence in the process. The United Nations played a major role in Cambodia and Mozambique, a smaller but critical role in El Salvador, and a lesser role in Angola. The Organization of Security and Cooperation in Europe supervised elections in Bosnia-Herzegovina, and the Economic Community of West African States had oversight along with the UN in Liberia. All of these postconflict elections had international observers, from both international organizations and

nongovernmental organizations.[69]

Mozambique provides an example that demonstrates that the manner by which disputes relating to electoral administration are managed can provide the context for building new institutions and norms that promote the demilitarization of politics. The Rome Peace accords left many issues relating to the elections vague and subject to decisions made by the parties through the Commission for Supervision and Control. A series of controversies between Renamo and Frelimo, over the composition of the National Elections Commission (CNE) in particular, contributed to the postponement of the election.

After a series of discussions and with the active involvement of the UN Special Representative, the parties reached an agreement on the composition of the CNE. Frelimo received 10 seats, Renamo 7, and other political parties 3. The partisan balance made efficient decision making difficult but increased the confidence of each party in the process. Over time and under the leadership of the Brazão Mazula, its independent chair, the CNE developed a reputation for nonpartisan decision making.[70] Unlike the Cease-Fire Commission and other commissions that included international actors along with representatives of the parties, the CNE was an independent and wholly Mozambican organization. The presence of UN technical advisers working within the Technical Secretariat, however, provided the parties with additional confidence in the process.[71]

El Salvador demonstrates that a consultative interim administration and other components that demilitarize politics can counterbalance the distrust created by a weak electoral administration. The peace agreement in El Salvador created a new electoral commission, the Supreme Electoral Tribunal (TSE), composed of representatives from five political parties, including the leftist Democratic Convergence (CD), but partisanship, "institutionalized distrust," and incompetence created gridlock, a crisis over voter registration, and chaos on election day.[72] A multiparty Board of Vigilance that had oversight over the tribunal alleviated some of the

suspicion toward the TSE.[73] Despite these concerns, the presence of COPAZ and greater success in the dimensions of demobilization and creation of political parties resulted in a successful process of demilitarization of politics.

Building a liberal political order. In a number of postconflict transitions, progress toward building an environment capable of supporting democracy has been initiated during the interim period and the organizing of elections. In El Salvador and Cambodia, local human-rights organizations developed during the transition. One analyst of Cambodia describes the development of civil society during the transition as the "one clear success story" of the transition in Cambodia and represents the "single best hope and insurance for eventual democracy."[74] In Liberia and Cambodia, the international community supported independent radio stations during the transition, providing models for a free press. Elections often provide an opportunity for civic organizations to mobilize around voter education or as election observers. The opportunities for preliminary steps toward a more liberal political system and the international support of some aspects of such a process have helped set precedents and plant seeds of what – if security holds – may evolve into an institutional context of liberalism necessary to sustain democracy over the longer term.

While insufficient by itself to manage the security challenges of peace implementation, the development of a strong civil society can help create the context that will reduce fears. The existence of a relatively strong civil society in El Salvador, for example, helped strengthen moderates looking to end the conflict and helped reduce fears that the victory of one party in the postconflict elections would result in the elimination of its rivals. The lack of a strong civil society in Angola and Liberia and the ethnic segmentation of civic organizations in Bosnia-Herzegovina reinforced fears that the political order promised in the peace agreement provided too little protection.[75]

The development of strong political parties, professional electoral administration, and a

liberal political order clearly are long-term processes. Decisions on these matters, however, will need to be made during the interim period in order to hold multiparty elections to implement the peace agreement. Patterns and precedents from the interim period will shape the path of the transition and the subsequent government. Preliminary steps to encourage organizations to shift their focus from fighting a war to competing in an election can help demilitarize politics and thereby reinforce both war termination and, over time, democratization.

Conclusions

A comparative examination of recent cases where elections have been used to implement peace agreements following civil war suggests that in some cases a process of demilitarizing politics is possible and that such a process offers opportunities to achieve both war termination and democratization. In El Salvador, Mozambique, and to a more limited extent Cambodia, processes that began during the transitional period encouraged the demilitarization of politics. Early precedents and new institutions to structure politics developed out of the processes of demobilization, the transformation of militias into political parties and the creation of credible electoral commissions to overcome the pervasive distrust among the former combatants, and the initial steps toward creating the structures of a liberal political order. In other cases, however, including Liberia and Bosnia-Herzegovina, the transitional period contributed little to the demilitarization of politics process. In these cases, structures based in the incentives of war continued to dominate throughout the peace implementation period and controlled the government following elections. In Angola, in a context where the institutions of war remained powerful and strategies to manage spoilers were absent, elections led to a new round of war.

Postconflict elections are embedded in the distinct but linked processes of war termination and democratization. On the one hand, issues relating to managing security

dilemmas and spoilers are critical to implementation. At the same time, overcoming fear and the

institutional legacies of the conflict is important for long-term democratization. Processes to

demilitarize politics during the transitional period can establish the conditions for postconflict

elections to promote both peace and democracy. Interim regimes based on joint problem

solving, demobilization that emphasizes confidence building and the construction of new norms

of decision making, the transformation of military organizations into political parties, and the

construction of effective electoral commissions help create an institutional context that supports

both war termination and democratization.

Notes

---

[1] Krishna Kumar, ed., *Postconflict Elections, Democratization, and International Assistance* (Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner, 1998).

[2] There are often other goals from the perspective of the international community that are beyond the scope of this article. Elections may mark the end point for an international peacekeeping mission, be an opportunity for a patron to disengage from a client, or serve as the mechanism to create a valid counterpart for international financial institutions to begin postconflict reconstruction efforts.

[3] Timothy D. Sisk, "Elections and Conflict Management in Africa: Conclusions and Recommendations," in Timothy D. Sisk and Andrew Reynolds, eds., *Elections and Conflict Management in Africa* (Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1998), 146.

[4] Robert Jervis, "Cooperation under the Security Dilemma," *World Politics* 30 (January 1978): 167-213; Barry R. Posen, "The Security Dilemma and Ethnic Conflict," in Michael E. Brown, ed., *Ethnic Conflict and International Security* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1993), 103-24; Stephen John Stedman, "Negotiation and Mediation in Internal Conflict," in Michael E. Brown, ed., *The International Dimensions of Internal Conflicts* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1996); Barbara F. Walter, "The Critical Barrier to Civil War Settlement," *International Organization* 51:3 (summer 1997): 335-64; Jack Snyder and Robert Jervis, "Civil War and the Security Dilemma," in Barbara F. Walter and Jack Snyder, eds., *Civil Wars, Insecurity, and Intervention* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999); David A. Lake and Donald Rothchild, "Containing Fear: The Origins and Management of Ethnic Conflict," *International Security* 21:2 (fall 1996): 41-75.

[5] Stephen John Stedman, "Spoiler Problems in Peace Processes," *International Security* 22:5 (fall 1997): 5.

[6] Walter, "Critical Barrier to Civil War Settlement," 335-6.

[7] David A. Lake and Donald Rothchild, "Spreading Fear: The Genesis of Transnational Ethnic Fear," in David A. Lake and Donald Rothchild, eds., *The International Spread of Ethnic Conflict: Fear, Diffusion, and Escalation* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1998), 8.

[8] Harrison Wagner, "The Causes of Peace," in Roy Licklider, ed., S*topping the Killing: How Civil Wars End* (New York: New York University Press, 1993), 263.

[9] Stedman, "Spoiler Problems," 10.

[10] For a classic study, see Guillermo O'Donnell and Philippe Schmitter, *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Tentative Conclusions about Uncertain Democracies* (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986).

[11] Douglass North, *Institutions, Institutional Change, and Economic Performance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990); Terry Lynn Karl, "Dilemmas of Democratization in Latin America," *Comparative Politics* 22 (1990).

[12] Kathleen Thelen and Sven Steinmo, "Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Politics," in Kathleen Thelen, Sven Steinmo, and Frank Longstreth, eds., *Structuring Politics: Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Analysis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 1-32.

[13] Juan J. Linz and Alfred Stepan, *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation: Southern Europe, South America, and Post-Communist Europe* (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), 55.

[14] Yossi Shain and Juan J. Linz, *Between States: Interim Governments and Democratic Transitions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 4.

[15] Adam Przeworski, "Some Problems in the Study of the Transition to Democracy," in Guillermo O'Donnell, Philippe C. Schmitter, and Laurence Whitehead, eds., *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Comparative Perspectives* (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press,

1986), 57, 58. See also Adam Przeworski, "Democracy as a Contingent Outcome of Conflicts,"
in Jon Elster and Rune Slagstad, eds., *Constitutionalism and Democracy* (Cambridge:
Cambridge University Press, 1988), 62; Adam Przeworski, *Democracy and the Market: Political
and Economic Reforms in Eastern Europe and Latin America* (Cambridge: Cambridge
University Press, 1991), 10-14.

[16] On pacts, see Karl, "Dilemmas of Democratization in Latin America"; O'Donnell and
Schmitter, *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule*, 37-47; Frances Hagopian, "Democracy by
Undemocratic Means? Elites, Political Pacts, and Regime Transition in Brazil," *Comparative
Political Studies* 23 (1990): 147-70; Giuseppe Di Palma, *To Craft Democracies: An Essay on
Democratic Transitions* (Berkeley: University of California, 1990), 86-90.

[17] For a discussion on the strategic issues that make pact making difficult see Adam Przeworski
et al., *Sustainable Democracy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 24-30.

[18] J. 'Bayo Adekanye, "Power-Sharing in Multi-Ethnic Political Systems," *Security Dialogue*
29:1 (March 1998): 33.

[19] Kenneth D. McRae, "Theories of Power-Sharing and Conflict Management," in Joseph
Montville, ed., *Conflict and Peacemaking in Multiethnic Societies* (Lexington, Mass.: Lexington
Books, 1990). Classic studies include Arend Lijphart, "Consociational Democracy," *World
Politics* 4:1 (January 1969): 207-25; and Arend Lijphart, *Democracy in Plural Societies* (New
Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1977).

[20] Timothy D. Sisk and Andrew Reynolds, "Democratization, Elections, and Conflict
Management in Africa: Exploring the Nexus," in Sisk and Reynolds, eds., *Elections and Conflict
Management in Africa*, 3-4. See also Ben Reilly and Andrew Reynolds, *Electoral Systems and
Conflict in Divided Societies* (Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, Papers on
International Conflict Resolution No. 2, 1999); Peter Harris and Ben Reilly, eds., *Democracy

and Deep-Rooted Conflict: Options for Negotiators (Stockholm: International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, 1998).

[21] Arend Lijphart, "The Power-Sharing Approach," in Montville, *Conflict and Peacemaking in Multiethnic Societies*; Arend Lijphart, "Constitutional Choices for New Democracies," in Larry Diamond and Marc F. Plattner, eds., *The Global Resurgence of Democracy* (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993). For a skeptical view on the applicability of PR to African cases, see Joel D. Barkan, "Rethinking the Applicability of Proportional Representation for Africa," in Sisk and Reynolds, eds., *Elections and Conflict Management in Africa*.

[22] Donald Horowitz, *Ethnic Groups in Conflict* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985).

[23] Reilly and Reynolds, *Electoral Systems and Conflict in Divided Societies*, 7.

[24] Pauline H. Baker, "Conflict Resolution versus Democratic Governance: Divergent Paths to Peace?" in Chester Crocker and Fen Osler Hampson with Pamela Aall, eds., *Managing Global Chaos: Sources of and Responses to International Conflict* (Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace, 1996); Eva Bertram, "Reinventing Governments: The Promise and Perils of United Nations Peace Building," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 39:3 (September 1995), 397.

[25] Krishna Kumar and Marina Ottaway, "General Conclusions and Priorities for Policy Research," in Kumar, ed., *Postconflict Elections, Democratization, and International Assistance*, 234-35; Sisk and Reynolds, "Democratization, Elections, and Conflict Management" 14.

[26] Victor Tanner, "Liberia: Railroading Peace," *Review of African Political Economy* 25:75 (March 1998): 140.

[27] John Chiahemen, "Liberians Vote in Peace against War," Reuters, July 19, 1997. Another voter is quoted as saying, "Charles Taylor spoiled this country, so he's the best man to fix it." See Donald G. McNeil Jr., "Under Scrutiny, Postwar Liberia Goes to Polls," *New York Times*, July 20, 1997. Yet another is quoted as saying, "He killed my mother, and he killed my father

and I don't care – I love Charles Ghankay Taylor." See Donald G. McNeil Jr., "Early Returns in Liberia Put Rebel Leader Far Ahead," *New York Times*, July 21, 1997.

[28] International Crisis Group, *Elections in Bosnia and Herzegovina*, 22 September 1996.

[29] Cited in Susan L. Woodward, "Bosnia and Herzegovina: How Not to End Civil War," in Walter and Snyder, eds., *Civil Wars, Insecurity, and Intervention*, 96.

[30] Judy Ledgerwood, "Patterns of CPP Political Repression and Violence during the UNTAC Period," in Steve Heder and Judy Ledgerwood, eds., *Propaganda, Politics, and Violence in Cambodia: Democratic Transition under United Nations Peace-keeping* (Armonk, N.Y.: M. E. Sharpe, 1996), 117, 130.

[31] Cited in Kate Frieson, "The Politics of Getting the Vote in Cambodia," in Heder and Ledgerwood, eds., *Propaganda, Politics, and Violence in Cambodia*, 200.

[32] Alex Vines, *Renamo: From Terrorism to Democracy in Mozambique?* (London: James Currey, 1996), 159.

[33] Tommie Sue Montgomery, *Revolution in El Salvador: From Civil Strife to Civil Peace* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1995), 266.

[34] Yossi Shain and Juan J. Linz, *Between States: Interim Governments and Democratic Transitions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 3-21.

[35] Kalevi Holsti, *Peace and War: Armed Conflict and International Order* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 353. See also Louis Kriesberg, *Constructive Conflicts: From Escalation to Resolution* (Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield, 1998), 322-23; Fen Osler Hampson, *Nurturing Peace: Why Peace Settlements Succeed or Fail* (Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace, 1996), 3.

[36] Snyder and Jervis, "Civil War and the Security Dilemma."

[37] Donald Rothchild, "Bargaining and State Breakdown in Africa," *Nationalism and Ethnic*

Politics 1:1 (1995): 54-72. See also Timothy D. Sisk, *Power Sharing and International Mediation in Ethnic Conflict* (Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace, 1996), 115, 85.

[38] Stephen John Stedman, "UN Intervention in Civil Wars: Imperatives of Choice and Strategy," in Donald C. F. Daniel and Bradd C. Hayes, eds., *Beyond Traditional Peacekeeping* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995), 57; Stedman, "Negotiation and Mediation in Internal Conflict," 345-51; See also Rui J. P. de Figueiredo Jr., and Barry R. Weingast, "The Rationality of Fear: Political Opportunism and Ethnic Conflict," in Walter and Snyder, eds., *Civil Wars, Insecurity, and Intervention*.

[39] Montgomery, *Revolution in El Salvador*, 233-34. Holiday and Stanley criticize COPAZ for its slow and cumbersome decision making, compelling endless rounds of negotiations among parties. From the perspective of building new norms to demilitarize politics, such continuous discussion is a strong asset. See David Holiday and William Stanley, "Building the Peace: Preliminary Lessons from El Salvador," *Journal of International Affairs* 46:2 (winter 1993), 427-9.

[40] Richard Synge, *Mozambique: UN Peacekeeping in Action, 1992-1994* (Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace, 1997), 52.

[41] J. Michael Turner, Sue Nelson, and Kimberly Mahling-Clark, "Mozambique's Vote for Democratic Governance," in Kumar, ed., *Postconflict Elections, Democratization, and International Assistance*.

[42] Michael W. Doyle, "War and Peace in Cambodia," in Walter and Snyder, eds., *Civil Wars, Insecurity, and Intervention*, 203, 205.

[43] Margaret Joan Antsee, *Orphan of the Cold War: The Inside Story of the Collapse of the Angolan Peace Process, 1992-93* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996).

[44] Radio Nacional de Angola, 10 December 1991, cited in Keith Somerville, "The Failure of

Democratic Reform in Angola and Zaire," *Survival* 35 (1993): 62.

[45] Antsee, *Orphan of the Cold War*, 47.

[46] Mats R. Berdal, *Disarmament and Demobilisation after Civil Wars* (London: International Institute for Strategic Studies Adelphi Paper 303, 1996), 39.

[47] Marina Ottaway, "Angola's Failed Elections," in Kumar, ed., *Postconflict Elections, Democratization, and International Assistance,* 147-48.

[48] Tanner, "Liberia."

[49] In Angola, for example, Fortna blames the United Nations for failing to "insist" on compliance with demobilization before elections took place. Virginia Page Fortna, "Success and Failure in Southern Africa: Peacekeeping in Namibia and Angola," in Donald C. F. Daniel and Bradd C. Hayes, eds., *Beyond Traditional Peacekeeping* (New York: St. Martin's, 1995), 293. See also Hampson, *Nurturing Peace*, 88. For a critique with regard to Liberia, see Friends of Liberia, "Liberia: Opportunities and Obstacles for Peace," (Washington, D.C., December 1996).

[50] Fred Tanner, "Post-Conflict Weapons Control: In Search of Normative Interactions," paper presented at the International Studies Association Meeting, Washington, D.C., February 1999, 2.

[51] Brian Hall, "Blue Helmets, Empty Guns," *New York Times Sunday Magazine*, January 2, 1994, p. 24.

[52] Annika S. Hansen and Lia Brynjar, *The Role of International Security Assistance in Support of Peace Agreements in War-Torn Societies* (Kjeller, Norway: Forsvarets Forskingsinstitut [Norwegian Defense Research Establishment], FFI Rapport no. 98/05291, December 1998).

[53] Berdal, *Disarmament and Demobilisation*, 73.

[54] Joanna Spear, "The Disarmament and Dembolisation of Warring Factions in the Aftermath of Civil Wars: Key Implementation Issues," paper presented at the International Studies Association Conference, Washington, D.C., February 1999, 3. See also Joanna Spear, "Arms

Limitations, Confidence-Building Measures, and Internal Conflict," in Brown, ed., *The International Dimensions of Internal Conflict*, 406-8.

[55] Marina Ottaway, "Liberation Movements and Transition to Democracy: The Case of the A.N.C.," *Journal of Modern African Studies* 29:1 (March 1991).

[56] Gerardo L. Munck, "Beyond Electoralism in El Salvador: Conflict Resolution through Negotiated Compromise," *Third World Quarterly* 14:1 (1993), 87.

[57] Montgomery, *Revolution in El Salvador*, 253.

[58] United Nations, *Further Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Observer Mission in El Salvador (ONUSAL)* S/26005 (New York, June 29, 1993), para. 11.

[59] William Stanley, *The Protection Racket State: Elite Politics, Military Extortion, and Civil War in El Salvador* (Philadelphia, Penn.: Temple University Press, 1996), 220, 254-55. See also Sara Miles and Bob Ostertag, "D'Aubuisson's New ARENA," *NACLA Report on the Americas* 23 (July 1989): 14-38.

[60] Carrie Manning, "Constructing Opposition in Mozambique: Renamo as Political Party," *Journal of Southern African Studies* 24:1 (March 1998): 161-90. See also Donald Rothchild, *Managing Ethnic Conflict in Africa: Pressures and Incentives for Cooperation* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 1997).

[61] A. Ajello, "O Papel da ONUMOZ no Processo de Democratização," in B. Mazula, ed., *Moçambique: Eleições, Democracia e Desenvolvimento* (Maputo: Inter-Africa Group, 1995), 127, cited in Martinho Chachiua and Mark Malan, "Anomalies and Acquiescence: The Mozambican Peace Process Revisited," *African Security Review* 7:4 (1998): 22. See also *Report of the Secretary-General on ONUMOZ,* S/25518 (New York, April 2, 1993), para. 58.

[62] Vines, *Renamo*, 146.

[63] "Mozambique: Funding for Peace," *Africa Confidential* 34:10 (14 May 1993): 4.

[64] Stedman, "Spoiler Problems," 41.

[65] Frieson, "The Politics of Getting the Vote in Cambodia."

[66] For more details, see Terrence Lyons, *Voting for Peace: Postconflict Elections in Liberia* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 1999).

[67] Peter Harris, "Building an Electoral Administration," in Harris and Reilly, eds., *Democracy and Deep-Rooted Conflict*, 310.

[68] Guy S. Goodwin-Gill, *Free and Fair Elections in International Law* (Geneva: Inter-Parliamentary Union, 1994).

[69] There is an extensive literature on election observation. See Jennifer McCoy, Larry Garber, and Robert Pastor, "Pollwatching and Peacemaking," *Journal of Democracy* 2:3 (fall 1991): 102-14; Thomas Carothers, "The Observers Observed," *Journal of Democracy* 8:3 (July 1997): 17-32; Jørgen Elklit and Palle Svensson, "What Makes Elections Free and Fair?" *Journal of Democracy* 8:3 (July 1997): 32-47. For a reaction see Robert A. Pastor, "Mediating Elections," *Journal of Democracy* 9:1 (January 1998): 154-63.

[70] When Renamo leader Dhlakama charged fraud and announced a boycott of the election, the Renamo representatives on the CNE joined their colleagues in rejecting the charges unanimously.

[71] Turner, Nelson, and Mahling-Clark, "Mozambique's Vote for Democratic Governance."

[72] Montgomery, *Revolution in El Salvador*, 248-59; *Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Observer Mission in El Salvador* S/26606 (New York, October 20, 1993).

[73] Enrique A. Baloyra, "El Salvador: From Reactionary Despotism to *Partidocracia*," in Kumar, ed., *Postconflict Elections, Democratization, and International Assistance*, 21.

[74] Catharin Dalpino, "Democratization Isn't an Overnight Process," *Los Angeles Times*, August 31, 1998. See also Catharin E. Dalpino and David G. Timberman, "Cambodia's Political Future:

Issues for U.S. Policy," Asia Society Working Paper, March 1998, found at

http://www.asiasociety.org/publications/cambodia_policy.html.

[75] In each of these cases, of course, a number of courageous individuals and groups struggled for

human rights. In Liberia, the work of the Catholic Justice and Peace Commission and the Inter-

Faith Mediation Committee were particularly notable.