

External State-Building and Why Norms Matter

The European Union's Fight against Corruption
in the Southern Caucasus

Tanja A. Börzel/Vera van Hüllen



SFB-GOVERNANCE WORKING PAPER SERIES • No. 59 • JANUARY 2014

DFG Sonderforschungsbereich 700 Governance in Räumen begrenzter Staatlichkeit - Neue Formen des Regierens?

DFG Collaborative Research Center (SFB) 700 Governance in Areas of Limited Statehood - New Modes of Governance?

SFB-Governance Working Paper Series

Edited by the Collaborative Research Center (SFB) 700 “Governance In Areas of Limited Statehood - New Modes of Governance?”

The SFB-Governance Working Paper Series serves to disseminate the research results of work in progress prior to publication to encourage the exchange of ideas and academic debate. Inclusion of a paper in the Working Paper Series should not limit publication in any other venue. Copyright remains with the authors.

Copyright for this issue: Tanja A. Börzel/Vera van Hüllen

Editorial assistance and production: Clara Jütte

All SFB-Governance Working Papers can be downloaded free of charge from www.sfb-governance.de/en/publikationen or ordered in print via e-mail to sfb700@zedat.fu-berlin.de.

Börzel, Tanja A./van Hüllen, Vera 2014: External State-Building and Why Norms Matter. The European Union’s Fight against Corruption in the Southern Caucasus. SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 59, Collaborative Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, January 2014.

ISSN 1864-1024 (Internet)

ISSN 1863-6896 (Print)

This publication has been funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG).

DFG Collaborative Research Center (SFB) 700

Freie Universität Berlin

Alfried-Krupp-Haus Berlin

Binger Straße 40

14197 Berlin

Germany

Phone: +49-30-838 58502

Fax: +49-30-838 58540

E-mail: sfb700@zedat.fu-berlin.de

Web: www.sfb-governance.de/en

Deutsche
Forschungsgemeinschaft

DFG

External State-Building and Why Norms Matter.**The European Union's Fight against Corruption in the Southern Caucasus***Tanja A. Börzel and Vera van Hüllen***Abstract**

This paper asks under which conditions the state-building efforts of external actors in areas of limited statehood are likely to be effective. We argue that the legitimacy of the specific norms promoted by external actors among local actors is crucial for their success in strengthening state capacities. International norms need to resonate with the dominant domestic discourse on political reforms. To substantiate our argument, we focus on the European Union's (EU) anti-corruption programs and their implementation in one of the most corrupt regions in the world, the Southern Caucasus. We show that legitimacy can explain why the EU's fight against corruption helped reduce corruption in Georgia but not in Armenia. In both countries, political elites could selectively use anti-corruption programs as an instrument against political opponents using enhanced state capacities to stabilize the incumbent regime. Only in Georgia, however, the fight against corruption was facilitated by sustained domestic mobilization for anti-corruption policies that added pressure on political elites 'from below.'

Zusammenfassung

In dieser Ausgabe wird untersucht, unter welchen Bedingungen die Bemühungen externer Akteure zum Staatsaufbau (state-building) in Räumen begrenzter Staatlichkeit effektiv sind. Wir argumentieren, dass die Legitimität der extern geförderten Norm unter lokalen Akteuren wesentlich für den erfolgreichen Aufbau von Staatskapazitäten ist. Internationale Normen müssen anschlussfähig sein an dominante innerstaatliche Diskurse über politische Reformen. Empirisch untersuchen wir die Anti-Korruptions-Programme der Europäischen Union (EU) und ihre Implementation in einer der korruptesten Regionen der Welt, dem Südkaukasus. Wir zeigen, dass Legitimität erklären kann, warum die Bemühungen der EU in Georgien zur Verringerung von Korruption beigetragen haben, nicht aber in Armenien. In beiden Ländern konnten politische Eliten die Anti-Korruptions-Programme selektiv als Instrument gegen politische Gegner nutzen und mit Hilfe vergrößerter Staatskapazitäten das Regime stabilisieren. Allerdings wurde nur in Georgien die Korruptionsbekämpfung durch eine dauerhafte innerstaatliche Mobilisierung unterstützt, die zusätzlichen Druck auf politische Eliten zur effektiven Umsetzung institutioneller Reformen aufbaute.

Table of Content

1. Introduction	5
2. The Fight against Corruption, State-Building, and Legitimacy	6
3. The EU's Efforts at State-Building in the Southern Caucasus: The Fight against Corruption	12
4. The Effectiveness of EU Efforts	16
4.1 Formal Institutional Change	16
4.2 Effective Implementation – Levels of Corruption	18
5. Legitimacy	18
5.1 Georgia: Legitimacy and Differential Empowerment of Political Elites	19
5.2 Armenia: Domestic Resistance and External Pressure	21
6. Conclusion	25
Literature	27

1. Introduction¹

During the past twenty years, states and international organizations have become involved in state-building in areas of limited statehood. Much of the scholarly literature has remained skeptical with regard to the extent to which external actors can induce domestic change, particularly when it comes to such complex tasks as (re-)building the institutions of political and social order (ref.). Rather than dismissing their influence altogether, the paper asks under which conditions the efforts of these external actors are likely to be effective. We argue that the legitimacy of the specific norms promoted by external actors among local actors is crucial for their success in strengthening state capacities. Politically relevant audiences in the target state do not only have to accept external efforts of state-building. These efforts have to resonate with the prevalent social norms to be effective.

To substantiate our argument, we focus on the European Union's (EU) anti-corruption programs and their implementation in one of the most corrupt regions in the world, the Southern Caucasus. Given its paramount negative impact on the political, economic and societal institutions of a state, corruption lies at the heart of the state-building agenda which the EU pursues in its Eastern neighborhood to turn it into a ring of well governed countries, particularly because the post-Soviet area is one of the most corrupt regions in the world. To master this complex task, the EU has developed a highly institutionalized and legalized framework, the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP), within which the EU and the Southern Caucasus countries negotiate the reform priorities and measures to be implemented.

Regarding the effectiveness of the EU's efforts at state-building, contracted, highly legalized reform programs and sufficient funding for the implementation have been successful in bringing about legal and institutional changes in all three Southern Caucasus countries that are in line with the EU's demands. However, our comparative study shows that only in Georgia these changes have resulted in lower levels of corruption. Armenia and Azerbaijan, by contrast saw no progress in the control of corruption. Maximizing variation on the dependent variable, we focus on Georgia and Armenia to explain the differential success of the EU's anti-corruption programs by legitimacy, i.e. the existence of norms which render corruption a socially undesired practice. For the institutional constraints on corruption promoted by the EU to be effective, they need to resonate with the social belief in the target state in public integrity, government impartiality and universal access to public resources. Only where such anti-corruption norms prevail over particularism and a culture of privilege, sustained domestic mobilization is likely to emerge inducing political elites to implement legal and institutional changes rendering external state-building efforts effective.

¹ We would like to thank Aila Matanock, Stephen D. Krasner, and Thomas Risse for their most valuable feedback on the various drafts of this paper. We are also grateful to Esther Ademmer for her helpful comments on the Georgian and Armenian case studies as well as Sören Stapel and Bidzina Lebanidze for their general, and as always excellent, research assistance.

In the following section, we elaborate the argument further before we turn to the empirical investigation into the role of legitimacy in explaining the differential impact of the EU's fight against corruption in Armenia and Georgia between 2000 and 2010.² Including Azerbaijan in the comparison would not only go beyond the scope of this paper. It would also impair the control for important alternative explanations, such as the democratic quality of the regime and interdependence with the EU. We first describe the EU's efforts at capacity- and institution-building in the fight against corruption, which are comparable vis-à-vis the two countries in the Southern Caucasus. We then look into the effectiveness of the EU's efforts: Our comparison shows similar formal institutional changes in both countries supported by the EU. Yet, the implementation of institutional constraints of corruption is more or less effective in reducing levels of corruption. Whereas we see some improvements in Georgia, the situation has not changed for the better in Armenia. In order to account for this variation in external state-building efforts, we finally compare the role of the various sources of legitimacy for the EU's differential impact. In both countries, political elites could selectively use the fight against corruption as an instrument against political opponents, using enhanced state capacities to stabilize the incumbent regime. Only in Georgia, however, the fight against corruption was facilitated by a second development that was absent in Armenia: Sustained domestic mobilization for anti-corruption policies put pressure on political elites 'from below' providing important incentives to implement anti-corruption measures. Unlike in Georgia, societal outrage against corruption has been largely absent in Armenia where norms of particularism still prevail. The paper concludes with some reflections on the limits to external state-building efforts if legitimacy as a necessary condition for their effectiveness depends to a large extent on domestic politics beyond the reach of external actors.


2. The Fight against Corruption, State-Building, and Legitimacy

Corruption fundamentally undermines the capacity of states to effectively provide collective goods and services. It is detrimental to a competitive market economy, impairs socio-economic development, deters foreign investment, and impedes innovation (Mauro 1995; Rose-Ackerman 1996; Shleifer and Vishny 1993a). Moreover, corruption erodes the political and public institutions in a democratic state by favoring certain parts of the population and excluding others from political processes (Johnston 2005; Karklins 2005). Finally, the existence of pervasive corruption has a corrosive effect on the territorial integrity of the state and the political community itself, bearing the danger of social unrest (civil war) and state collapse (UNDP 2006; cf. Shen and Williamson 2005). Given its paramount negative impact on the political, economic and societal institutions of a state, corruption is often considered to lie at the heart of failed collective goods and services delivery (Phongpaichit and Baker 2002; Spinellis 1996; Mungiu-Pippidi 2013b: 11-20).

² The empirical data for this case study is drawn from a four-year research project on the EU's good governance promotion in European Neighbourhood Countries, as part of the Collaborative Research Center "Governance in Areas of Limited Statehood" and funded by the German Research Foundation 2006-2009 (cf. Börzel et al. 2010b; Börzel and Pamuk 2011).

In these settings, efforts of external actors at state-building aim at strengthening the institutional capacities of states, of which the fight against corruption is a key dimension. Fighting corruption does not only improve the capacity of state institutions to provide collective goods and services resisting the capture by particular interests or groups. It may also promote participation and civil oversight over the allocation of resources affecting the relationship between the government and its citizens (Karklins 2005). Hence, international actors and researchers alike make a strong link between corruption and statehood. Indeed, there is a strong correlation between corruption and statehood (figure 1). Therefore, the fight against corruption has become a prominent strategy of state-building efforts for external actors. It focuses on factors that can be shaped by (external) agency, such as the setting-up of “good governance institutions”, including a comprehensive body of anti-corruption laws and an autonomous judiciary that is capable of enforcing these laws (Wolf and Schmidt-Pfister 2010). However, the formal institutional changes external actors seek to induce do not automatically translate into lower levels of corruption and, hence, higher degrees of statehood (Mungiu-Pippidi 2006; Mungiu-Pippidi 2011; Batory 2012). Adopting anti-corruption institutions, as they are promoted by the EU and other Western donors, are likely to remain decoupled from behavioral practices of corruption if they do not resonate with social norms stipulating that “the allocation of public resources should be universal, fair and lawful and not determined by favoritism due to a particular authority or office holder’s ties to any company, individual or group” (Mungiu-Pippidi 2013b: 21). Similar to societies where particularism and a culture of privilege prevail, corrupt practices may still exist; yet, they do not conform to the “rules of the game” but constitute a “deviations from the norm [of ethic universalism, TAB/VvH]” (ibid: 5). Massive and sustained violations of anti-corruption norms, if publicly disclosed, are likely to trigger moral outrage that can be political mobilized by strategic political elites or civil society actors and provide important incentives for implementing anti-corruption measures.


We agree with the existing literature that domestic politics matters for external state-building. Next to offering incentives to local elites and their domestic support coalitions (Marinov 2005; Escribà-Folch and Wright 2010), external actors need to empower domestic change agents to promote domestic institutional change (Risse et al. 2013; Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier 2004; Vachudova 2005; Börzel 2011; Mungiu-Pippidi 2013a). We argue, however, that external demands need to resonate with social norms in the target state so that strategic political elites have an incentive to implement institutional changes and civil society actors the leverage to pull incumbent elites into (enforcing) compliance with the formal rules. Our empirical study confirms the claim of the special issue that the legitimacy of external actors and their strategies – understood as the resonance of their reform agenda with domestic norms and beliefs – is a necessary condition for the effectiveness of international efforts at state-building (Krasner and Risse forthcoming).

Figure 1: Statehood and Corruption in Areas of Limited Statehood (country/year, 1984-2010)³

Focusing on the fight against corruption, we consider two dimensions of the effectiveness of external efforts. If efforts of external actors at state-building by enhancing state capacities to fight corruption are successful, we should see, first, the introduction of formal institutional changes in accordance with the demands of external actors. Second, these changes have to result in the actual reduction of corruption levels. It is not enough to introduce anti-corruption rules and, for example, create an independent prosecutor; corruption has to be prosecuted and penalized, for which the prevalence of anti-corruption norms in the society is crucial.

In order to analyze the role of legitimacy as a necessary condition for the effectiveness of external efforts at state-building, we investigate the EU's efforts at fighting corruption in the Southern Caucasus between 2000 and 2010. Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia suffer from limited statehood and are among the most corrupt countries in the world. Striving for a secure and well-governed neighborhood, the EU started to address the fight against corruption in bilateral relations around 2000 and made it one of its priorities under the regional frameworks of ENP launched in 2004. The EU effectively induced all three Southern Caucasus countries to introduce formal institutional changes in line with its demands. However, only in Georgia, these changes have resulted in lower levels of corruption. By contrast, Armenia and Azerbaijan saw no progress in fighting corruption (Figure 2).

³ Source: International Country Risk Guide (ICRG) and Political Instability Task Force (PITF); own compilation. The data set consists of about 100 to 130 states but is changing on a yearly basis – mainly because of missing ICRG data or newly emerging states. All in all, 2632 data points are represented in the figure. We measure statehood with a combined indicator of ICRG Bureaucratic Quality and relative PITF in order to capture a state's basic administrative capacity and its monopoly on the use of force (see Lee et al. 2012). Only countries in Areas of Limited Statehood, as opposed to failing or failed states, on the one hand, and consolidated states, on the other, are included (ICRG BQ relPITF $0,9 > X > 0,4$). For a measurement of corruption, we use the ICRG Corruption Indicator which is scaled from 0 to 6 with 0 being the lowest and 6 the highest value. The higher the assigned value, the lower is the degree of corruption in the country.

Figure 2: Corruption in the Southern Caucasus, 1998-2011⁴

The fight against corruption is a complex task. The EU's effort at state-building in this regard is less about the direct transfer of material resources (capacity-building in a narrow sense) but rather about the transfer of norms, rules, and procedures modifying basic state institutions to accommodate fundamental principles of good governance and the fight against corruption. Trying to bring about institutional reforms and behavioral change in all three branches of government, reaching from top-level decision-makers to low-level bureaucrats, the number of interventions necessary and the number of the actors to be coordinated are extremely high. Facing a complex task, the institutional design of external efforts at state-building in the area of corruption requires a high degree of institutionalization, a condition that EU's fight against corruption in the Southern Caucasus clearly fulfills. The ENP provides a standardized and formally institutionalized framework for cooperation with the EU's neighbors, including all three countries in the Southern Caucasus (cf. Börzel et al. 2010a; Börzel et al. 2010b).⁵ It brings together a set of instruments that are highly legalized either by EU decisions (regulations) or in bilateral agreements with the individual neighbor countries. The EU provides sufficient resources

4 Sources: World Bank <http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/index.asp>, last access August 8, 2013. While the ICRG Corruption indicator captures the big picture in a global comparison, it is not very nuanced in tracing smaller variation between countries and changes over time. The World Bank's Worldwide Governance Indicator for Control of Corruption (WGI CC) ranges from -2,5 (high corruption) to 2,5 (low corruption). It captures "perceptions of the extent to which public power is exercised for private gain, including both petty and grand forms of corruption, as well as 'capture' of the state by elites and private interests" (Kaufmann et al. 2010: 4), aggregating individual indicators of corruption from up to 21 different sources. The WGI CC strongly correlates with other measurements of corruption, such as the ICRG Corruption indicator, the Transparency International Corruption Perception Index, the Global Corruption Barometer or the indicators used in the Global Competitiveness Report (cf. Mungiu-Pippidi 2013b: 6-10).

5 The ENP was launched in 2003/2004 and covers the EU's southern and eastern neighbouring countries without an (immediate) membership perspective. Omitted in the European Commission's original proposal of 2003 (European Commission 2003), the countries of the Southern Caucasus were included as partners in the ENP in 2004 (European Commission 2004)

for the implementation of its instruments. The setting of targets and the implementation of measures are embedded in a continuous process of bilateral negotiations, making the EU's fight against corruption in the Southern Caucasus an instance of non-hierarchical contracting. Holding task complexity and the institutional design of the EU's efforts constant, we can focus on the role of legitimacy. Regarding the input legitimacy or participatory quality of the EU's efforts, the ENP prescribes the involvement of all stakeholders in the fight against corruption in all countries. The EU's negotiations of reform priorities and their implementation with ENP countries include first and foremost national governments and the administration, but also parliaments and the judiciary. Non-state actors play a lesser role, which is mostly due to the (semi-)authoritarian character of the regimes and the weak organizational capacities of societal and economic actors. Since EU-induced reforms are contracted, the EU may enjoy a certain degree of legitimacy among domestic actors, particularly with the incumbent regimes. The EU's input legitimacy may have fostered the formal institutional change in all three countries, but cannot explain the differential impact on the levels of corruption. It is too early to tell to what extent the EU enjoys output legitimacy, as we are studying lengthy processes of capacity- and institution-building that yet have to have an effect on domestic perceptions of the EU's problem-solving capacity. The international legitimacy of the EU being constant, we focus on domestic legitimacy, i.e. the domestic resonance or conformity of the norms and rules the EU promotes with the survival strategies of incumbent elites and the prevalent social norms regarding universal vs. restricted access to public resources. In all three countries, the fight against corruption fits the strategic interest of incumbent elites and aligns with their survival strategies. The fight against corruption provides the opportunity and the means to disempower political opponents within or outside of the government and to please external donors, which explains again the formal institutional change in all three cases. However, the resonance with social norms varies significantly. Whereas corrupt practices have triggered moral outrage in Georgia resulting in public demands for effective political reforms, corruption is still widely accepted in Armenia where the norm of particularism and a general culture of favouritism seem to prevail. Sustained mass mobilization in Georgia has thus prompted the political elites to go beyond the strategic and highly selective use of anti-corruption policies and to engage in more comprehensive measures, effectively reducing the levels of corruption in the country.

Taken together, country variation in some dimensions of legitimacy can well explain the differential impact of the EU's fight against corruption in the Southern Caucasus. By contrast, alternative explanations advanced in the literature cannot account for the variation observed. Research on external Europeanization and more generally international democracy promotion, policy transfer and diffusion point to important scope conditions that have to be met for such state-building efforts to be effective (Börzel and Risse 2012; Magen and Morlino 2008). However, neither the countries' degrees of statehood, nor their democratic quality, nor their interdependence with the EU can explain the puzzle of similar institutional change but differential impact on corruption. Rather than exploring their explanatory power, we control for the degree of statehood, democracy, and interdependence, and focus on legitimacy.

Measuring the existence of social norms is a methodological challenge. The few researchers on corruption that move beyond the role of formal institutions and take norms seriously, use indirect indicators, such as internet access, media and press freedom, political pluralism and participation, or the strength of civil society (Mungiu-Pippidi 2011), which measure the presence of well-informed, potentially critical citizens and their opportunities to mobilize against corruption rather than their acceptance of corrupt practices. Or they focus on the perception of corruption, e.g. that politicians are above the law, the persistence of corrupt practices despite a change in government, or the failure to take legal action against notorious cases of corruption (Mungiu-Pippidi 2006), which carries the risk of circular reasoning, inferring from practices to the prevalence of a norm that is to shape the very practices. Protest religion could be considered as a proxy for anti-corruption norms (La Porta et al. 1999; Treisman 2000), the absence of which, however, is a constant in regions, such as the Southern Caucasus, and hence, cannot explain intra-regional variation. Value surveys, finally, are not too helpful either, because most respondents claim that they hate corruption and would neither give nor take bribes. Sociologists, however, have found a way to know norms when you see them, namely when they are violated. Drawing on the concept of “breaching experiments” (cf. Goffman 1963; Garfinkel 1985), we argue that moral outrage of larger parts of a society against corrupt practices can serve as an indicator for the prevalence of anti-corruption norms over particularism and a culture of favoritism. More specifically, we will draw on data on the willingness of citizens to protest against corruption as well as the number of protest events.

Our empirical study focuses on two out of the three countries in the Southern Caucasus: Armenia and Georgia. They share a legacy of Soviet rule based on endemic corruption (Stefes 2008) and show similar degrees of statehood, democracy and interdependence with the EU in 2000, before the EU launched its efforts at the fight against corruption (see figure 2). Levels of statehood for both Georgia and Armenia improved over time. Yet, this may be a result but is certainly not the driving force of fighting corruption. As we will see, Georgia has strengthened its statehood, not least because the Saakashvili government has managed to reduce corruption within the state administration. Armenia equally improved its statehood, whereas the level of corruption, however, has remained stable. The (un)democratic quality of the two regimes does not correspond to the differential outcomes either – both Georgia and Armenia suffered an authoritarian backlash, admittedly much more dramatically in the latter case. Georgia and Armenia, finally, are equally dependent on EU aid and trade. Azerbaijan, by contrast, featured significantly lower levels of statehood than the other two countries, which corresponds to higher levels of corruption accordingly. Neither corruption nor statehood improved over time, which is what we would expect given the lower legitimacy of the fight against corruption. Yet, the democratic quality of the Azeri regime is much lower and Azerbaijan is far less dependent on the EU due to its rich oil and gas resources, which makes it impossible to isolate the effect of legitimacy (see Table 1).

Table 1: Statehood, Democracy, and Interdependence⁶

	Georgia	Armenia	Azerbaijan
Statehood	-0,62 (2000) 0,29 (2010) → <i>increase</i>	-0,59 (2000) -0,15 (2010) → <i>(slight) increase</i>	-0,89 (2000) -0,84 (2010) → <i>no change</i>
Democratic quality	6,67 (2000) 5,24 (2009) → <i>(slight) decrease</i>	6,25 (2000) 3,57 (2009) → <i>decrease</i>	2,00 (2000) 2,74 (2009) → <i>(slight) increase</i>
Interdependence (EU share of net ODA in %)	79,28% (2000) 80,58% (2010) → <i>no change</i>	70,15% (2000) 70,30% (2010) → <i>no change</i>	65,30% (2000) 51,97% (2010) → <i>(slight) decrease</i>
Interdependence (EU ODA as % of GDP)	4,39% (2000) 4,33% (2010) → <i>no change</i>	7,92% (2000) 2,55% (2010) → <i>decrease</i>	1,72% (2000) 0,16% (2010) → <i>(slight) decrease</i>

Investigating the effectiveness of the EU's fight against corruption and the role of legitimacy in Georgia and Armenia allows us to maximize the variation on the dependent variable and to systematically control for other explanatory factors, including alternative explanations advanced in the literature.

3. The EU's Efforts at State-Building in the Southern Caucasus: The Fight against Corruption

Since the demise of the Soviet Union in 1991, the EU has successively intensified bilateral cooperation with Eastern European countries, including the Southern Caucasus. From the beginning, the EU provided financial assistance under the TACIS program to support the 'triple transition' (Offe 1991) of those countries that were not eligible for the EU's pre-accession

⁶ Sources: World Bank, Quality of Government Dataset, and EU. The statehood indicator used in this special issue captures the big picture (see footnote 3). However, it tends to group together countries in the same region, which vary significantly with regard to their monopoly over the means of violence and their bureaucratic quality. The same holds for most of the Western Newly Independent States and the Southern Caucasus, for the latter of which Georgia is completely omitted. For a comparison between Armenia and Georgia, we therefore use the World Bank's Worldwide Governance Indicator for Government Effectiveness that highly correlates with the statehood index data but paints a more nuanced picture for the countries we are interested in and whose values correspond more closely to the findings of our own qualitative research (cf. Börzel and van Hüllen 2011; Börzel and Pamuk 2011; van Hüllen 2012). Values range from -2,5 to 2,5. To measure the democratic quality, we use an indicator that combines the Freedom House Freedom in the World index with the Polity IV Index (Hadenius and Teorell 2005). It covers procedural and structural elements of democracy and shows a higher validity and reliability than its constituent parts. The scale ranges from 1 to 10. To measure interdependence, we use EU aid dependence measured by the EU (and its member states') share of net ODA in % and EU (and its member states') ODA as % of GDP, European Union, DG External Trade, <http://ec.europa.eu/trade/creating-opportunities/bilateral-relations/statistics/>, last access 15 February 2013. Trade dependence provides an alternative indicator, which, however, is less useful in this case, since the overall trade of Georgia and Armenia with the EU is low.

policy, including Armenia and Georgia.⁷ In the second half of the 1990s, the EU negotiated bilateral Partnership and Cooperation Agreements (PCAs). They entered into force in Armenia and Georgia in 1999 and also aimed at stabilizing the transition to market economy, liberal democracy, and consolidated statehood. In response to the EU's 2004 Eastern enlargement, the EU launched the ENP as a regional framework for cooperation and its state-building efforts. Until today, the ENP remains the main framework for the EU's efforts at state-building in order to foster peace, stability, and prosperity in the EU's neighborhood (European Commission 2004). With the ENP, good governance became a key cross cutting issue in the EU's relationship with Armenia and Georgia. It covers issues such as improving electoral legislation, conducting free and fair elections, ensuring the separation of power (particularly with regard to the judiciary), encouraging the development of political parties and civil society organizations, guaranteeing the independence of media, protecting human rights and civil liberties (particularly minority rights) and fighting corruption (Börzel, Stahn, Pamuk 2010). While the EU's strategy papers underline the importance of its support for anti-corruption strategies, it has not elaborated its own normative framework for the fight against corruption. Instead, it has borrowed international anti-corruption norms and rules from the United Nations (UN), the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), and the Council of Europe.

With its borders moving Eastwards, the EU has developed a regional framework for cooperation to foster peace, stability, and prosperity among its new neighbors in the former Soviet Union (European Commission 2004). The European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) provides the main framework for the EU's efforts at state-building and the fight against corruption has become one of the EU's priorities. It can draw on a proper toolbox that heavily relies on the top-down methods and instruments of its former accession policy with regard to the Central and Eastern European countries (Kelley 2006). In order to implement bilaterally agreed Action Plans (APs), the EU can use negative and positive conditionality, political dialogue, and financial and technical assistance. The ENP thus provides a highly institutionalized, contractual framework for the EU's efforts at state-building that applies to both Armenia and Georgia.

Good governance is mainstreamed into the ENP APs concluded with Armenia and Georgia in 2006. Country reports had highlighted corruption as one of the main challenges to good governance and statehood in 2005, so the fight against corruption gained a prominent place in the APs. The EU asked Armenia and Georgia to accede, ratify and implement international conventions that are related to the fight against corruption, including the UN Convention against Corruption (2003), the Council of Europe's Criminal and Civil Law Conventions on Corruption (1999) or the OECD Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions (1997). Both governments agreed to join international anti-corruption networks, such as the "Group of States against Corruption – GRECO", and implement

⁷ The Technical Assistance for the Commonwealth of Independent States (TACIS) program provided financial and technical assistance to Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan and Russia in 1991-2006. Mongolia joined the programme from 1993-2003. TACIS was replaced by the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument (ENPI) in 2007 that covers countries of the EU's eastern and southern neighbourhood.

their recommendations in order to advance legislative or institutional reforms in this regard. Finally, each AP contained some additional requirements that largely concentrated on promoting anti-corruption measures within the administration and/or the law enforcement agencies or improving the legal framework for the prosecution of corruption-related crimes. The required actions are quite similar for Armenia and Georgia, and only slightly vary with regard to the specificity of certain measures (cf. Börzel, Stahn, Pamuk 2010).

The ENP was explicitly designed to provide an alternative to membership – depriving the EU of its allegedly most successful instrument for external state-building, namely accession conditionality. However, the EU still has a range of institutionalized positive and negative conditionality at its disposal. Basically, the EU offers deeper cooperation and economic integration in exchange for political and economic reforms as agreed in the ENP APs. Under the ENP, the EU can reward progress by upgrading bilateral relations (e.g. association agreements), lifting trade restrictions (e.g. deep and comprehensive trade agreement), simplifying visa regimes or extending the scope of assistance. Based on the PCAs, it may also (threaten to) suspend bilateral agreements, withhold assistance under TACIS/ENPI, and impose political sanctions (e.g. visa bans). The PCAs already established a regular political dialogue with Armenia and Georgia to win over the hearts and minds of governmental actors through persuasion and to socialize them into the norms and rules the EU seeks to promote. Political dialogue in the Cooperation Councils, Committees, and technical sub-committees shall reflect the ‘partnership-based approach’ of joint commitment and ownership, by which the EU seeks to treat the countries subject to its governance transfer as equal partners. With the ENP, political dialogue became tightly linked to the implementation of political conditionality and the APs, as partners use the meetings to agree on reform agendas that identify priority areas and actions for changes in governance institutions, negotiate their implementation and monitor progress.

Beside negative and positive conditionality and political dialogue, the EU provides financial and technical assistance in order to enhance state capacities to fight corruption. TACIS covered a wide range of issues, such as support for privatization processes and the development of the private sector as well as the reform of the public administration, of education and social services, of the transport, energy, agricultural and telecommunication sector or nuclear safety and environmental policies. Around 2000, the EU started to link TACIS more closely to its (good) governance agenda, including the fight against corruption. ENPI defined good governance as a central commitment on which the partnerships are based and included the fight against corruption as an explicit goal of assistance. It takes a ‘sector-wide’ approach allocating the assistance by means of direct budgetary aid to the partner governments. Between 2000 and 2010, the three countries of the Southern Caucasus received 385 million Euro, which accounts for 28% of the total EU budget allocated to the Eastern neighborhood countries (cf. Börzel, Stahn, Pamuk 2010).

With few exceptions, the EU’s implementation of these instruments for state-building through the fight against corruption was similar in 2000-2010 in Armenia and Georgia. Overall, the two countries have felt little pressure by the EU to change their governance institutions in ac-

cordance with ENP goals and requirements. The EU has almost exclusively relied on financial assistance to build institutions and capacities for the fight against corruption.

The EU has never formally invoked negative conditionality legalized in the PCAs or TACIS and ENPI regulations. It has, however, in 2003 restricted the provision of assistance to Georgia and decided to fundamentally revise its Country Strategy Paper (CSP) in response of to deteriorating political conditions under the Shevardnadze regime (cf. Börzel, Stahn, Pamuk 2010). While the EU claimed that the “serious deterioration of the security situation” (Georgia CSP 2003, 3) triggered this unprecedented step, it also highlighted “serious problems of governance and continued weak rule of law, including high levels of corruption” (3) as one of the major challenges in Georgia that the EU had previously underestimated.⁸ In order to strengthen the “effectiveness of the conditionality attached to EU assistance”, the EU determined that assistance under TACIS “will only be continued if and insofar as jointly agreed objectives are reached” (4) and “should be focused exclusively on those reform programmes to which the Georgian Government demonstrates credible and sustained commitment” (5), including the fight against corruption. It is difficult to assess the practical implications of these decisions. Only two months after the adoption of the revised programming document, the Rose Revolution brought about an unexpected change of leadership in Georgia and the EU’s approach towards the country switched back to an almost unconditional support. More generally, it was at this point that the fight against corruption prominently entered the EU’s state-building agenda. In 2004, it started active state-building efforts in this area also in other neighboring countries. For both Armenia and Georgia, the National Indicative Programmes (NIPs) 2004-2006 were the first to include the fight against corruption in projects that supported the implementation of the respective PCAs (see below).

The fight against corruption has been an issue of political dialogue in both Georgia and Armenia. Yet, the joint translation of reform priorities into specific measures has been hindered by imprecise goals, the lack of timeframes and the absence of responsible agencies (cf. Börzel, Stahn, Pamuk 2010).

In 2000-2010, Armenia and Georgia received respectively around €140 million and €180 million under TACIS and ENPI. However, it was only in 2004 that the fight against corruption explicitly appeared in the TACIS NIPs for 2004-2006. Under the heading of institutional, legal, and administrative reforms, anti-corruption measures were now included in the respective programs to support the implementation of the PCAs that had been going on for years. In line with the CSP revised in 2003 (see above), the NIP for Georgia also included a new program to support the reform of the judiciary and law enforcement. The TACIS Annual Action Plans for Georgia for 2004-2006 list several programs related to the rule of law more broadly (e.g. with the ministries

⁸ European Commission 2001: Country Strategy Paper 2002 – 2006. Tacis National Indicative Programme 2002 – 2003. Georgia, Brussels (27 December 2001). European Commission 2003: Country Strategy Paper 2003 – 2006. Tacis National Indicative Programme 2004 – 2006. Georgia, Brussels (23 September 2003).

of justice and interior) and more narrowly to the fight against corruption (e.g. with the office of prosecutor general). By 2006, TACIS also funded specific rule of law programs in Armenia.

Table 2: TACIS and ENPI Assistance Levels 2000-2010⁹

National allocation (million €)		Armenia	Georgia
TACIS 2000-2003	Total	20.0	29.0
TACIS 2004-2006	Institutional, legal, and administrative reforms	13.5	11.5
	Total	20.0	28.0
ENPI 2007-2010	Democratic governance	29.52	31.5
	Regulatory reform	29.52	31.5
	Total	98.4	120.4
Total 2000-2010		138.4	177.4

With the new ENPI, the EU significantly increased its funding for state-building efforts. In addition, it systematically integrated the fight against corruption into the programming documents for 2007-2010. Anti-corruption policies became officially part of the first funding priority related to democratic governance, linked to public administration reform in Armenia (sub-priority 1.2) and to the rule of law and good governance in Georgia (sub-priorities 1.2 and 1.3). While the fight against corruption was not explicitly mentioned in relation to regulatory reform, programs under this second funding priority also address issues of institution- and capacity-building in this area. According to the ENPI Annual Action Programmes, the EU financed programs on justice reforms (2008) and support for the implementation of the AP (2010) in Armenia and programs on public finance management (2007, 2010) and reform of criminal justice (2008) in Georgia. Taken together, the EU financed programs in both countries that touched upon all funding priorities relevant for the fight against corruption, namely the reform of public administration, finance management, and civil service; the reform of the judiciary; civil society; and the approximation of legislation (see Börzel, Stahn, Pamuk 2010, 142).

Overall, the EU has relied on soft, partnership-based instruments to negotiate reform priorities and their implementation with Georgia and Armenia in order to tackle the complex task of fighting corruption. The framework for its efforts at state-building is highly institutionalized and it has implemented similar measures in the two countries between 2000 and 2010.

4. The Effectiveness of EU Efforts

4.1 Formal Institutional Change

The EU's efforts at state-building for the fight against corruption have induced institutional changes in the Southern Caucasus. Both Armenia and Georgia have ratified and given effect to the major international conventions on the fight against corruption. This includes the ratification of UN Convention Against Corruption (Armenia 2007, Georgia 2008) and the Council

⁹ Sources: Own compilation based on the National Indicative Programmes for each country.

of Europe's Civil and Criminal Law Conventions (Armenia 2005 and 2006, Georgia 2004 and 2008) as well as the accession to GRECO (Armenia 2004, Georgia 1999). In order to abide by their international obligations and the EU's demands as specified in the ENP APs, the governments of Armenia and Georgia have introduced a number of changes to their governance institutions that are quite similar (see Table 3). They have developed anti-corruption strategies and anti-corruption action plans, which are drafted by Anti-Corruption Councils and whose implementation is supervised by special Commissions. Moreover, the public prosecutor's offices were charged with the investigation and prosecution of crimes related to corruption. Finally, Armenia and Georgia have introduced several legislative changes by issuing new legislation and amending existing laws. Overall, the EU has been successful in promoting the reform of formal anti-corruption institutions and policies, enhancing state capacities for effectively fighting corruption in Armenia and Georgia between 2000 and 2010.

Table 3: Domestic Institutional Change in the Southern Caucasus¹⁰

	Armenia	Georgia
Anti-corruption agencies		
Drafting policies	Anti-Corruption Council (2004) Expert group (2008)	Anti-Corruption Policy Coordination Council (2001) National Security Council (2005) Inter-Agency Coordination Council of Combating Corruption (2008)
Implementing policies	Anti-Corruption Strategy Monitoring Commission (2004)	Department for Coordinating Anti-Corruption Policies (2001) State Minister of Reform (2005)
Investigating and prosecution	Anti-corruption Department in Prosecutor-general's Office (2004)	Inter-Agency Coordination Council of Combating Corruption (2008) Prosecutor's Office (2005)
Anti-corruption policies	Anti-corruption Strategy (2003-2007, 2009-2012) Implementation Action Plan (2003-2007, 2009-2012)	National Anti-corruption Strategy (2005; 2010) Action Plan for the Anti-corruption Strategy (2005-2006)
Anti-corruption legal changes (examples)	Law on the Office of the Public Prosecutor (2007) Law on Operational Investigative Activities (2007) Law on the Organization and Implementation of Inspections (2007) Law on the Declaration of Property and Income of Physical Person (2007)	Amendment of the Criminal Code (2006) Law on Chamber of Control (2008) Amendments to Law on Conflicts of Interest and Corruption in Public Services (2009)

¹⁰ Sources: Freedom House 2006: Nations in Transit- Country Report Armenia, available at: <http://www.freedomhouse.org/template.cfm?page=47&nit=388&year=2006>; Greco 2006: Joint first and second Evaluation Round – Evaluation Report on Armenia, adopted on 10th March, 2006, GRECO Eval I-II Rep (2005)2E; Transparency International 2009: Global Corruption Report, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. Freedom House 2005: Nations in Transit – Country Report Georgia, <http://www.freedomhouse.org/template.cfm?page=47&nit=363&year=2005>; Greco 2009: Second Evaluation Round – Compliance record of Georgia, adopted on 15th May, 2009, Greco RC-II (2008) 9E, Strasbourg.

4.2 Effective Implementation – Levels of Corruption

Given the high levels of corruption in both countries and the little pressure the EU exerted, these changes in governance institutions are not trivial. However, the EU's state-building efforts differed in their impact on the levels of corruption in Armenia and Georgia.

In the early 2000s, before the EU started its external state-building efforts to fight corruption, Georgia and Armenia showed similar levels of corruption (see Table 1 above). In both Armenia and Georgia, tightly organized patronage networks permeated the public sphere and helped sustain a stable equilibrium of informal institutions. The extensive misuse of social networks for particularistic purposes favored certain political interests and excluded others from the distribution of public goods (Drury, Kriekhaus, Lusztiig 2006; Stokes 2007). Finally, uncontested control of the incumbent regime, the lack of economic alternatives, and a comparatively weak civil society further added to the institutionalization of oligarchic monopolies (Shleifer and Vishny 1993b). Corruption has not only yielded huge private rents but also allowed incumbent elites to control the access to power and resources securing the loyalty of key domestic actors (International Crisis Group 2004). Ten years later, both countries still face enormous challenges in fighting corruption. However, in Georgia, formal institutional changes have resulted in significantly less corruption according to the World Bank and other corruption indicators (cf. Rimple 2012; Tsitsishvili 2010). Armenia, by contrast, has made no progress in lowering corruption levels (cf. Center for Regional Development 2006).

The comparison of Armenia and Georgia demonstrates that the state-building efforts of external actors can induce changes in domestic anti-corruption institutions and policies, which, however, do not necessarily result in a more effective fight against corruption. In the following, we demonstrate that it is the higher legitimacy or domestic resonance of anti-corruption as the norm the EU seeks to promote, which explains why the EU's governance transfer has been more successful in Georgia than in Armenia.

5. Legitimacy and the Fight against Corruption

The analysis of the EU's fight against corruption in the Southern Caucasus shows that two important sources of legitimacy do not vary between Armenia and Georgia, and hence cannot explain the varying effectiveness of the fight against corruption in the two countries.

First, in terms of input legitimacy or participatory quality, the EU not only negotiated the reform priorities and their implementation with both governments, making its efforts at state-building an instance of non-hierarchical contracting. It also urged both governments to cooperate with civil society and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) on corruption related reforms. The APs of Armenia and Georgia explicitly call upon the EU's partner governments to involve non-state actors defining, implementing and monitoring anti-corruption measures. The same applies to financial and technical assistance. Unlike TACIS, ENPI allows for a direct cooperation with business and civil society actors and requires the beneficiary partner governments to in-

involve all relevant stake-holders in the implementation of programs. Yet, unlike in other foreign policy frameworks, the EU has refrained from upgrading the status of non-state actors (Börzel, Stahn, Pamuk 2010). The new Eastern Partnership Civil Society Forum, which shall facilitate a dialogue between the governments and local civil society organizations, has not changed this as yet (Boonstra and Shapovalova 2010). In practice, however, domestic societal and economic actors have hardly been involved in the implementation of the EU's fight against corruption in the Southern Caucasus. This can be explained by the overall limited organizational capacities and lack of autonomy of civil society and the clientelistic nature of business in these countries.

Second, the EU refers to the same set of international anti-corruption norms vis-à-vis Armenia and Georgia and can thus claim the same formal international legitimacy conveyed by the UN, the OECD, and the Council of Europe.

Despite the reliance on internationally accepted norms, incumbent elites have been reluctant to endorse the EU's anti-corruption agenda. The adaptation costs for implementing the EU's demands regarding the fight against corruption were enormous in Armenia and Georgia, given the similarly high levels of corruption in the early 2000s. As the remainder of this section will show, the EU's efforts nevertheless aligned with the survival strategies of incumbent elites in both countries. The contracting of anti-corruption reforms between the EU and Georgia and Armenia has given the incumbent regimes of both countries a strong say on which measures they shall adopt. In a (semi-)authoritarian context where the rule of law and the separation of powers, and in particular the independence of the judiciary, are deficient, incumbent elites can selectively use anti-corruption policies in order to disempower their political opponents or satisfy the demands of external donors. This strategic interest facilitated formal institutional changes in line with international demands. What varied significantly between Armenia and Georgia, has been the resonance of the EU's efforts at fighting corruption with local norms. In the case of Georgia, the contracted anti-corruption program coincided with public outrage and domestic mobilization on charges of corruption against the Shevardnadze government. The domestic acceptance of and support for the fight against corruption was therefore much higher in Georgia than in Armenia. The new government under President Saakashvili thus responded to both international and domestic demands when it implemented the institutional reforms more systematically than its Armenian counterpart and fought corruption more effectively.

5.1 Georgia: Legitimacy and Differential Empowerment of Political Elites

In the first decade after its transition, Georgia had done little to fight the pervasive corruption that crippled its state institutions and its economy (Tsitsishvili 2010; Darchiashvili and Nodia 2003; Kikabidze and Losaberidze 2000). President Eduard Shevardnadze depended on clientelistic networks and widespread corruption to consolidate and maintain his power, as he lacked the support of a strong and well-organized ruling party (Spirova 2008; Zürcher and Wheatley 2008). Consequently, little changes occurred with regard to the fight against corruption under his presidency. However, Shevardnadze's system of widespread corruption soon became a major point of domestic and international criticism in the early 2000s. As a consequence, the EU

restricted its assistance provision to Georgia in 2003 for the first time (see above). In addition, the then minister of justice, Mikheil Saakashvili, left the government in 2001 and founded the United National Movement, pledging to take issue with the Shevardnadze regime over corruption.

After Shevardnadze had tried to steal the vote in the 2003 elections, mass popular protests and international pressure forced him to resign from office. In the following presidential and parliamentary elections, Mikheil Saakashvili and his party could secure large parts of the electoral support. He declared the fight against corruption to be the core of his government policies (Wheatley 2005) and was supported by the EU with financial and technical assistance (see above). The new government immediately took action against corruption within the law enforcement agencies, which resulted in the complete dismantling of the traffic police, which had been considered as one of the most corrupt institutions in the country. Reforms of the police forces continued with investments in modern equipment, the creation of a new Police Academy, mandatory exams and training for police officers, and considerable increases in salaries. At the same time, draconian fines for minor offences were adopted. Petty corruption was upgraded as a serious crime, warranting several years of imprisonment (Boda and Kakachia 2005; Hiscock 2006; Tsitsishvili 2010). The second major reform addressed the university admissions system that was ridden by corruption and subject to repeated public protest (Mungiu-Pippidi 2011: 67-69).

Saakashvili placed the fight against corruption under the direct control of his government. Since 2006 and 2008, respectively, the Minister of State Reform and the Minister of Justice, who heads the Inter-Agency Coordination Council of Combating Corruption, have been charged with the drafting and implementation of anti-corruption policies. The changes introduced to the governance institutions resulted in a significant decline of corruption (see figure 2).

These improvements notwithstanding, corruption remains a problem. Georgia still belongs to the nearly three quarters of the 178 countries in the Transparency International Index that score below five, on a scale from 10 (highly clean) to 0 (highly corrupt). While state authorities targeted petty corruption at lower levels of bureaucracy, Sakaashvili has been accused of turning a blind eye to major corruption and abuse of power among his closest allies, whom he himself had allegedly placed in many prominent positions. Thus, corruption has not been eradicated but rather transmogrified into elite corruption (Chiabrishvili 2009; Tsitsishvili 2010). Next to rewarding his closest associates, Saakashvili has also used the fight against corruption to oust political opponents (Di Puppò 2009). Yet, public outrage has continued, too. When the former minister of defense and close associate of Saakashvili, Irakli Okruashvili, left the government in 2006, formed an opposition party, and accused the President of corruption, he was himself arrested on corruption charges. The accusations met with public protest as a result of which Saakashvili lost much of his public support. When riots broke out in November 2007 calling for Saakashvili's resignation, he declared a state of emergency and was heavily criticized by international human rights organizations for the use of violence against civilians in trying to quell the riots. Meanwhile, a court had found Okruashvili guilty of large-scale extortion and sentenced him to 11 years in prison. What was widely perceived as political persecution sparked

further mass protests and contributed to the rise of antigovernment rallies (Freedom House 2008; Tsitsishvili 2010). Sakaashvili resigned in December 2007 only to be re-elected in a snap election in January 2008. Having lost his credentials as a fighter against corruption, he shifted his political agenda towards nationalist issues. He appealed to wide-spread anti-Russian sentiments fueled by Russia's support for the separatist regions of Abkhazia and South Ossetia.

While Sakaashvili kept using corruption charges as a weapon against his political opponents, control of corruption has stagnated after it had peaked in 2006 (see figure 2). Freedom House, Amnesty International, the Council of Europe and other international organizations not only criticized Georgia for human rights violations but also denounced rampant corruption among high-ranking governing officials. Domestic protest against Sakaashvili continued. The broadcasting of video footage of prisoners being beaten and sexually abused by allegedly corrupt security forces resulted in massive street protest two weeks before the parliamentary elections in 2012 and contributed to the first peaceful transition of power in the history of Georgia. The new Prime Minister, Bidsina Ivanishvili, promised to purge Georgia of high-level corruption. Prosecutors indicted five of Saakashvili's ex-ministers and several officials of his party on charges including misuse of public funds and contract killings, the most prominent being Ivliane Merabishvili, former prime minister and interior minister, Saakashvili's close ally and potential successor as president. It remains to be seen whether Ivanishvili will deliver on his promise to improve universal access to public services or whether he will use the fight against corruption as "selective justice" and "for political revenge", as claimed by the European People's Party, Saakashvili's main ally.¹¹


5.2 Armenia: Domestic Resistance and External Pressure

Unlike in Georgia, post-independence governments in Armenia have faced substantially less political mobilization against corruption. This is less related to the lower levels of corruption in the 1990s. Rather, Armenia's historical irredentism as well as the Karabakh conflict have created a strong sense of national identity that has bound together the country's various rivaling elite factions and makes them more reluctant to engage in internal power struggles. At the same time, political conflicts coagulate along nationalistic issues, such as Karabakh and Turkey (Hovannisian 2008), which supersedes any grievances the population might suffer from corruption and renders the strategic use of anti-corruption measures as means to win or consolidate political power difficult. Most importantly, even though the government is characterized by a 'hyper'-executive with far-reaching competences dominating the state apparatus (Shahnazaryan 2003), it largely relies on the support of a wealthy business elite, the Armenian 'oligarchs', as a power base. While the oligarchs enjoy preferential access to the Armenian economy, they reportedly support the incumbent regime, mainly associated with the Republican Party of Armenia, "helping to rig elections and suppress the opposition" (Danielyan 2006, unpaginated). They have also increasingly assumed membership in parliament (Freedom House 2008a), where they sided with the incumbent government, rather than challenging it (Freedom House 2006). The

¹¹ EU observer, July 29, 2013, <http://euobserver.com/foreign/120991>, last access August 8, 2013.


close ties between political and economic elites are thus both the source of high degrees of corruption (Stefes 2008; Bertelsmann Stiftung 2010) and the power basis of the incumbent regime. Hence, unlike in Georgia, there has not been sufficient moral outrage against corruption which would have allowed political actors or civil society organizations to use (EU) anti-corruption policies in mobilizing the public against the incumbent regime. Public protest against corruption is lower in Armenia as compared to Georgia (see figure 3).

Figure 3: Protest Events in Georgia and Armenia, 2001-2012¹²




These differences in public protest are not related to the organizational capacity and viability of civil society organizations, which have not varied between Georgia and Armenia over the past 10 years (see figure 4).

¹² Source: Own compilation based on the protest event database by Bidzina Lebanidze, Freie Universität Berlin. Figure 3 counts protest events that predominantly relate to corruption or corruption and related issues. Most protests address several issues. We included protests against particular events related to corruption, against government pressure on the press and media, against political murders or the politically motivated (lack of) investigations, and against illegal detention of prisoners, torture of prisoners, and for the release of “political prisoners”. To reduce the data bias caused by the absence of information, particularly in Armenia, only news published in English and Russian languages are included for both countries.

Figure 4: Civil Society Organization Sustainability Index, Armenia and Georgia, 1998-2012¹³

Rather, Georgians show a higher propensity to mobilize against corruption than Armenians. In 2013, more than twice declared their willingness to get involved in the fight against corruption and participate in peaceful protests or demonstrations against corruption (see Figure 5).

Figure 5: Willingness to Get Involved in the Fight against Corruption, Armenia and Georgia, 2013¹⁴

Our argument about the lower prevalence of anti-corruption norms in the Armenian society is further supported by a public opinion survey in 2006. The number of respondents thinking that “public tolerance of corruption” and a “culture of kick-backs and giving gifts” had increased by 2.5 times over a period of four years (from 36,5% and 30,2%, respectively, in 2002, to 87,8% and

¹³ Source: Own compilation based on data from the CSO Sustainability Index for Central and Eastern Europe and Eurasia, <http://www.usaid.gov/europe-eurasia-civil-society/>, last access August 8, 2013. The USAID Index analyzes and assigns scores to seven interrelated dimensions: legal environment, organizational capacity, financial viability, advocacy, service provision, infrastructure, and public image.

¹⁴ http://www.transparency.org/gcb2013/in_detail, last access August 8, 2013.

75,1%, respectively in 2006).¹⁵ Moreover, the two main motives of corruption, consistently identified by the respondents between 2002 and 2010, are that “there is no other way to get things done” and “to speed up processes/procedures”.¹⁶

Rather than public mobilization driven by the prevalence of anti-corruption norms, the limited fight against corruption beyond formal institutional changes in Armenia has largely been a response to the policy-specific conditionality of external donors. In the early 2000s, two developments gave rise to the practical implementation of anti-corruption measures. First, international donors other than the EU started to step up their financial support for the fight against corruption. Next to the EU’s financial and technical assistance, the World Bank provided a \$345,000 grant to develop an Action Plan for the fight against corruption, while at the same time officials of both the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank insisted on its publication by the end of 2003 (Freedom House 2004). Second, the Armenian Diaspora voiced concerns and increasingly supported the implementation of domestic reforms of the public administration and judiciary, customs, tax, education, public health and other sectors (Transparency International Armenia 2006). Consisting of very disparate groupings including various organizations and parties in the United States, France, and Lebanon, the Diaspora provides considerable financial aid and other resources to the country (Gillespie and Okruhlik 1991; IOM 2008). Furthermore, genuine political parties that enjoy support from influential Diaspora organizations have succeeded in building a stronghold in parliament (Dudwick 1993), particularly the Armenian Revolutionary Federation - Dashnaksutyun (ARF-D) that re-entered the political landscape under President Kocharian in 1998. Corruption and take-overs of shares by the state have been a major impediment for Diaspora investors (Manaseryan 2004). The ARF-D, as the main Diaspora related political organization, backed President Kocharian in his run for presidency in 2003,¹⁷ while putting the fight against corruption on its political agenda. It was also the Diaspora loyal ARF-D that pressed for the establishment of an anti-corruption council, introduced fight against corruption related policy changes into parliament and accused Kocharian of protecting big businesses instead of fighting corruption (Danielyan 2004).¹⁸ Under increasing international pressure, the Armenian government moved beyond formal institutional changes and launched publicly visible attempts to crack down on corruption, including the sacking of corrupt officials in the tax department, customs service and police. Given their lack of systemic effect, such changes in personnel have been criticized for being merely symbolic (Grigoryan 2008). A similar process marked the aftermath of the presidential elections of 2008, in which Robert Kocharian handed over power to his preferred successor Serzh Sargsyan. Sargsyan was, similar to his predecessor, renowned for holding close ties to the oligarchic

¹⁵ Center for Regional Development 2002; Center for Regional Development 2006. Unfortunately, subsequent public surveys have not considered this question anymore.

¹⁶ Center for Regional Development 2002; Center for Regional Development 2006; http://old.crrc.am/store/files/corruption/2010_Corruption_Household_Survey_Findings_Presentation_English.pdf, last access August 8, 2013.

¹⁷ ‘ARF to back Kocharian in 2003 Polls’, 2002. available at: <http://www.azg.am/EN/2002112601>, accessed 15 February 2013.

¹⁸ ‘ARF Presses Reforms Fight Against Corruption’, 2003. available at: <http://asbarez.com/48744/arf-presses-reforms-fight-against-corruption/>, accessed 15 February 2013.

business community of Armenia (Freedom House 2004). However, as a reaction to the violent suppression of protests in the aftermath of the 2008 presidential elections, the US government froze and suspended its assistance for Armenia in the framework of the Millennium Challenge Account program on grounds of a lack of democratic governance (Bertelsmann Stiftung 2010). Sargsyan subsequently declared the fight against corruption a priority for his Republican Party. His attempts to tackle corruption, however, have not yet resulted in measurable improvements. Initiatives only targeted lower governmental levels, leaving the source of corruption on the top-levels of government and business untouched (Grigoryan 2009) and Armenia's corruption score unchanged.

6. Conclusion

The comparison of the EU's promotion of anti-corruption policies vis-à-vis Armenia and Georgia in 2000-2010 has highlighted the role of legitimacy for the effectiveness of external effort at state-building. Tackling the complex task of changing institutions and enhancing capacities for the fight against corruption with a highly institutionalized framework for cooperation under the ENP, the EU's efforts were more successful in Georgia than Armenia. Incumbent elites in both countries chose to adopt legal and institutional changes in line with the EU's expectations because they resonated with their strategic interest. Especially in a (semi-) authoritarian context, anti-corruption policies open the opportunity to selectively prosecute political opponents on corruption charges. However, only in Georgia, the formal changes have been more systematically implemented, effectively reducing the country's level of corruption whereas Armenia has not seen any progress. Unlike in Armenia, the external EU's efforts at state-building resonated the prevalent anti-corruption norms in Georgia and continued mass mobilization increased the incentive of Saakashvili regime to fight corruption. Subscribing to anti-corruption policies became not only a means to disempower political opponents but also to win elections. As a result, Georgia saw some substantial improvements in state-building between 2003 and 2006. The eradication of entrenched corruption has strengthened the capacity of state institutions to provide collective goods and services and fostered economic growth (World Bank 2010; European Stability Initiative 2010).

Our findings corroborate that legitimacy of external state-building efforts is a necessary condition for their effectiveness. They are supported by recent development in Central and Eastern Europe, where the sustainability of the formal domestic changes induced or at least locked in by EU accession are increasingly questioned. Many of the new member states have dismantled the anti-corruption institutions the EU had imposed on them (Mungiu-Pippidi 2011: 77-80). Unlike Romania or the Czech Republic, Bulgaria has been facing massive anti-corruption protests creating electoral incentives for stopping the roll back and implementing anti-corruption measures (Spendsharova and Vachudova 2012). At the same time, our study on the Southern Caucasus points to an important limitation of external actors in enhancing state capacities in areas of limited statehood. Our paper clearly shows that successful institution-building is not enough to ensure the effective provision of public goods and services. Without the political willingness of domestic actors, we see a decoupling between formal institutions and actual

practices. This explains why legitimacy is key. Yet, if legitimacy is a function of the resonance of the norms and rules external actors promote with the prevalent social norms in the target state, the effectiveness of external actors' efforts at state-building are confined to cases where domestic politics is 'right'. Unlike the participatory quality of their institutional design, external actors have only limited means to change norms in a society. Moreover, norm-building programs need to be sustained for an extended time period that usually goes beyond the project-oriented approach of most external actors (Mungiu-Pippidi 2011: 25). The same is probably true for their perceived problem-solving capacity or the trust in their knowledge and moral authority, particularly if they do not engage with those who suffer from corruption but the predatory elites who are in power (Mungiu-Pippidi 2006: 87). In the context of the EU's fight against corruption in the Southern Caucasus, this points to the risk of adverse effects of its efforts which are part of a broader state-building agenda. The cases of Armenia, and to a lesser extent also Georgia, demonstrate how incumbent elites can instrumentalize the efforts at state-building of the EU and other external actors to silence political opposition and use enhanced state capacities to stabilize their (semi-) authoritarian regimes. This goes against the proclaimed objective of external actors not only to build state-capacity but also to promote democratic (and not just 'good') governance.

Literature

- Batory, Agnes 2012: Why Do Anti-corruption Laws Fail in Central Eastern Europe? A Target Compliance Perspective, in: *Regulation and Governance* 6 (1) 66-82.
- Bertelsmann Stiftung 2010: BTI 2010 — Armenia Country Report.
- Boda, Jozsef/Kakachia, Kornely 2005: The Current Status of Police Reform in Georgia, in : E Cole and PH Fluri (eds) 2005: *From Revolution to Reform: Georgia's Struggle with Democratic Institution Building and Security Sector Reform*, Geneva.
- Boonstra, Jos/Shapovalova, Natalia 2010: The EU's Eastern Partnership: One Year Backwards, FRIDE Working Paper (99) 1-14.
- Börzel, Tanja A./Risse, Thomas (eds.) 2012: *From Europeanization to Diffusion. Special Issue of West European Politics*, Vol 35 (1).
- Börzel, Tanja A. 2011: When Europe Hits ... Across its Borders. Europeanization and the Near Abroad, in: *Comparative European Politics* 9 (4) 394-413.
- Börzel, Tanja A./Pamuk, Yasemin 2011: Europeanization Subverted? The EU's Promotion of Good Governance and the Fight Against Corruption in the Southern Caucasus, KFG Working Papers. Research College "The Transformative Power of Europe". Freie Universität Berlin, 26.
- Börzel, Tanja A./Stahn, Andreas/Pamuk, Yasemin 2010: The European Union and Its Fight Against Corruption in its Near Abroad. Can it Make a Difference? in: *Global Crime* 11 (2) 122-144.
- Börzel, Tanja A./van Hüllen, Vera 2011: Good Governance and Bad Neighbours? The Limits of Transformative Power Europe, KFG Working Papers. Research College "The Transformative Power of Europe". Freie Universität Berlin, 35.
- Center for Regional Development, Transparency International Armenia 2002: Country Corruption Assessment: Public Opinion Survey, Yerevan: Center for Regional Development, Transparency International Armenia; <http://transparency.am/dbdata/Survey-eng.pdf>.
- Center for Regional Development, Transparency International Armenia 2006: Corruption Perception in Armenia, Yerevan: UNDP Armenia; http://transparency.am/dbdata/UNDPbook_eng_web_2.pdf.
- Chiabrishvili, Maria 2009: The Democratic Transformation of Georgia, in: S Collmer (ed), 2009: *From Fragile State to Functioning State. Pathways to Democratic Transformation in a Comparative Perspective*, Berlin.
- Danielyan, Emil 2004: Armenia's Ruling Coalition Beset by Renewed Infighting, Eurasianet.org <http://www.eurasianet.org/departments/insight/articles/eavo21304.shtml>.
- Danielyan, Emil 2006: Kocharian Again Slams Armenian Tax Collection: Armenia Liberty, Yerevan.
- Di Poppo, Lili 2009: The Externalization of JHA Policies in Georgia: Partner or Hotbed of Threats? in: *Journal of European Integration* 31, 103-118.
- Drury, A. Cooper/Kriekhaus, Jonathan/Lusztig, Michael 2006: Corruption, Democracy, and Economic Growth, *International Political Science Review* 27 (2) 121-136.
- Dudwick, Nora 1993: Armenia: the Nation Awakens, in: I Bremmer and R Taras (eds), 1993: *National Politics in the Soviet Successor States*, Stanford.
- Escribà-Folch, Abel/Wright, Joseph (2010): *Dealing with Tyranny: International Sanctions and the*

- Survival of Authoritarian Rulers, in: *International Studies Quarterly* 54 (2) 335-359.
- European Commission* 2003: *Wider Europe Neighbourhood: Proposed New Framework for Relations with the EU's Eastern and Southern Neighbours*. In D RELEX (ed), Brüssel.
- European Commission* 2004: *European Neighbourhood Policy. Strategy Paper*, Brussels: 12.05.2004.
- European Stability Initiative* 2010: *Part III: Jacobins in Tbilisi*. Berlin, Tbilisi, Istanbul.
- Freedom House* 2008: *Nations in Transit - Country Report Georgia*, Washington, DC.
- Freedom House* 2006: *Country Report - Armenia*, Washington, DC.
- Freedom House* 2004: *Country Report - Armenia*, Washington, DC.
- Garfinkel, Harold* 1985: *Studies in Ethnomethodology*, Cambridge.
- Gillespie, Kate/Okruhlik, Gwenn* 1991: *The Political Dimensions of Corruption Cleanups: A Framework for Analysis*, in: *Comparative Politics* 24 (1) 77-95.
- Goffman, Erving* 1963: *Behavior in Public Places: Notes on the Social Organization of Gatherings*, New York.
- Grigoryan, Marianna* 2009: *Armenia: Yerevan's Anti-Corruption Campaign Going Nowhere Fast - Experts*, Eurasianet.org <http://www.eurasianet.org/departments/insight/articles/eav120909a.shtml>
- Grigoryan, Marianna* 2008: *Armenia: Getting Serious About Corruption*, Eurasianet.org <http://www.eurasianet.org/departments/insight/articles/eav071108.shtml>.
- Hadenius, Axel/Teorell, Jan* 2005: *Assessing Alternative Indices of Democracy*, Mexico City.
- Hiscock, Duncan* 2005: *The Commercialisation of Post-soviet Private Security*, in: E Cole and PH Fluri (eds) 2005: *From Revolution to Reform: Georgia's Struggle with Democratic Institution Building and Security Sector Reform*, Geneva.
- Hovannisian, Raffi K.* 2008: *Forward to the Past: Russia, Turkey, and Armenia's Fate*, Yerevan: Armenian Center for National and International Studies (ACNIS), October 17, 2008.
- Iankova, Elena A.* 2001: *Governed by accession? Hard and soft pillars of Europeanization in Central and Eastern Europe*, paper is part of a larger book project about Europeanization and Domestic Change on Central and Eastern Europe's Accession to the European Union, Washington.
- International Crisis Group* 2004: *Azerbaijan: Turning Over a New Leaf?*, Yerevan; Tbilisi; Brussels.
- IOM* 2008: *Review of Migration Management in Georgia - Assessment Mission Report*, Tbilisi.
- Johnston, Michael* 2005: *Syndromes of Corruption: Wealth, Power and Democracy*, Cambridge.
- Karklins, Ramsa* 2005: *The System Made Me Do It: Corruption in Post-Communist Societies*, New York, London.
- Kaufmann, Daniel/ Kraay, Aart/and Mastruzzi, Massimo* 2010: *The Worldwide Governance Indicators. Methodology and Analytical Issues*.
- Kelley, Judith G.* 2006: *New Wine in Old Wineskins: Promoting Political Reforms through the New European Neighbourhood Policy*, in: *Journal of Common Market Studies* 44 (1) 29-55.
- Kikabidze, Koba/Losaberidze, David* 2000: *Institutionalism and Clientelism in Georgia*, Tbilisi.
- Krasner, Stephen D./Risse, Thomas* (forthcoming): *External Actors, State-Building, and Service Provision in Areas of Limited Statehood*. 'Governance, Special Issue, October 2014.
- La Porta, Rafael/Lopez-de-Silanes, Florencio/Shleifer, Andrei/Vishny, Robert W.* 1999: *The Quality of*

- Government, *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization* 15 (1) 222-279.
- Magen, Amichai/Morlino, Leonardo (eds.) 2008: *Anchoring Democracy: External Influence on Domestic Rule of Law Development*, London.
- Manaseryan, Tatoul 2004: *Diaspora - The Comparative Advantage for Armenia*, Armenian International Policy Research Working Paper Series, 14: <http://www.aiprg.net/UserFiles/File/wp/jan2004/14.pdf>.
- Marinov, Nikolay 2005: *Do Economic Sanctions Destabilize Country Leaders?* in: *American Journal of Political Science* 49 (3) 564-576.
- Mauro, Paolo 1995: *Corruption and Growth*, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 10 (3) 681-712.
- Mungiu-Pippidi, Alina 2006: *Corruption: Diagnosis and Treatment*, in: *Journal of Democracy* 17, (3) 86-99.
- Mungiu-Pippidi, Alina (ed.) 2011: *Contextual Choices in Fighting Corruption: Lessons Learned*. Norad Report 4/2011, Oslo
- Mungiu-Pippidi, Alina 2013a: *Controlling Corruption Through Collective Action*, in: *Journal of Democracy* 24 (1) 101-115.
- Mungiu-Pippidi, Alina 2013b: *The Good, the Bad and the Ugly. Controlling Corruption in the European Union*, *Advanced Policy Paper for Discussion in the European Parliament*, <http://www.againstcorruption.eu/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/ANTICORRP-Policy-Paper-on-Lessons-Learnt-final.pdf>.
- Offe, Claus 1991: *Capitalism by Democratic Design? Democratic Theory facing the Triple Transition in East Central Europe*, *Social Research* 58 (4) 865-892.
- Phongpaichit, Pasuk/Baker, Chris 2002: *Good Governance, Money Politics, and Honest Mistakes*: Monash University, Asia Institute Working Paper (2 May 2002)
- Rimple, Paul 2012: *Who Owned Georgia. 2003-2012*, Tbilisi: Transparency International Georgia.
- Risse, Thomas/Ropp, Stephen/ Sikkink, Kathryn (eds.) 2013: *The Persistent Power of Human Rights. From Commitment to Compliance*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rose-Ackerman, Susan 1996: *When is Corruption Harmful?*, Washington, D.C.
- Schimmelfennig, Frank/Sedelmeier, Ulrich 2004: *Governance by Conditionality. EU Rule Transfer to the Candidate Countries of Central and Eastern Europe*, in: *Journal of European Public Policy* 11 (4) 661-679.
- Shahnazaryan, Nelson 2003: *Oligarchs in Armenia*, Yerevan. Armenia - Business and Legal Advisors and Auditors.
- Shen, Ce/Wiliamson, John B. 2005: *Corruption, Democracy, Economic Freedom, and State Strength: A Cross-national Analysis*, *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 46 (4) 327-345.
- Shleifer, Andrei, and Vishny, Robert W. 1993: *Corruption*, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc, May.
- Spendzharova, Aneta/ Vachudova, Milada Anna 2012: *Catching-Up? Consolidating Liberal Democracy in Bulgaria and Romania*, in: *West European Politics* 35 (1) 39-58.
- Spinellis, Dionysios 1996: *The Phenomenon of Corruption and the Challenge of Good Government: OECD Symposium on Corruption and Good Governance*. OECD Working Papers 78, Paris.
- Spirova, Maria 2008: *Corruption and Democracy - The "Color Revolutions" in Georgia and*

- Ukraine, in: *Taiwan Journal of Democracy* 4 (2) 75-90.
- Stefes, Christoph H.* 2008: Governance, the State and Systemic Corruption: Armenia and Georgia in Comparison, in: *Caucasian Review of International Affairs* 2 (2) 73-83.
- Treisman, Daniel* 2000: The Cause of Corruption. A Cross-National Study, in: *Journal of Public Economics* 76 (3) 399-457.
- Tsitsishvili, David* 2010: Georgia. Civil Society Against Corruption, http://www.againstcorruption.eu/uploads/rapoarte_finale_PDF/Georgia.pdf.
- UNDP 2006: Governance for the Future: Democracy and Development in the Least Developed Countries, in: *UND Programme* (ed) New York.
- Vachudova, Milada Anna* 2005: *Europe Undivided. Democracy, Leverage and Integration After Communism*, Oxford.
- van Hüllen, Vera* 2012: Europeanization Through Cooperation? EU Democracy Promotion in Morocco and Tunisia, in: *West European Politics* 35 (1) 117-134.
- Wheatley, Jonathan* 2005: *Georgia From National Awakening to Rose Revolution. Delayed Transition in the Former Soviet Union*, Aldershot.
- Wolf, Sebastian/Schmidt-Pfister, Diana (eds.)* 2010: *International Anti-Corruption Regimes in Europe. Between Corruption, Integration, and Culture*, Baden-Baden: Nomos.
- World Bank 2010: *World DataBank*, Washington DC.
- Zürcher, Christoph/Wheatley, Jonathan* 2008: On the Origin and Consolidation of Hybrid Regimes. The State of Democracy in the Caucasus, *Taiwan Journal of Democracy* 4 (1) 1-32.

Previously published Working Papers from the SFB-Governance Working Paper Series

- Hönke, Jana/Börzel, Tanja A.* 2013: Restraint of Statehood and the Quality of Governance by Multinational Companies in Sub-Saharan Africa, SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 65, Collaborative Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, December 2013.
- Daxner, Michael/Schrade, Urs* 2013: Higher Education in Afghanistan. Governance at Stake, SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 63, Collaborative Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, November 2013.
- Krieger, Heike* 2013: A Turn to Non-State Actors: Inducing Compliance with International Humanitarian Law in War-Torn Areas of Limited Statehood, SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 62, Collaborative Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, June 2013.
- Kocak, Deniz* 2013: Security sector reconstruction in a post-conflict country: Lessons from Timor-Leste, SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 61, Collaborative Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, October 2013.
- Kode, Johannes* 2013: On the Social Conditions of Governance: Social Capital and Governance in Areas of Limited Statehood, SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 60, Collaborative Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, September 2013.
- Kötter, Matthias* 2013: Wie viel Recht steckt in Good Governance? Eine Betrachtung aus juristischer Perspektive, SFB-Governance Working Paper Series Nr. 58, DFG Sonderforschungsbereich 700, Berlin, September 2013
- Wrase, Michael* 2013: Wie wirkt Recht? – Überlegungen zur Rechtswirkungsforschung unter den Bedingungen konsolidierter und begrenzter Staatlichkeit, SFB-Governance Working Paper Series Nr. 57, DFG Sonderforschungsbereich 700, Berlin, Juni 2013
- van Hüllen, Vera/Börzel, Tanja A.* 2013: The EU's Governance Transfer. From External Promotion to Internal Protection? SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 56, Collaborative Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, June 2013.
- Chojnacki, Sven/Engels, Bettina* 2013: Material Determinism and Beyond: Spatial Categories in the Study of Violent Conflict, SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 55, Collaborative Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, June 2013.
- Lohaus, Mathis* 2013: Governance Transfer by the Organization of American States. A B2 Case Study Report, SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 49, Collaborative Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, December 2013.
- van der Vleuten, Anna and Hulse, Merran* 2013: Governance Transfer by the Southern African Development Community (SADC). A B2 Case Study Report, SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 48, Collaborative Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, December 2013.
- Hartmann, Christof* 2013: Governance Transfer by the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS). A B2 Case Study Report, SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 47, Collaborative Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, December 2013.

- Duina, Francesco* 2013: Governance Transfer in the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). A B2 Case Study Report. SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 46, Collaborative Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, December 2013.
- Bothe, Lukas/Grundmann, Kai* 2013: Legitimitätsressourcen im Übergang von antiker zu mittelalterlicher Staatlichkeit. Zwei Perspektiven auf postimperiale Governance, SFB-Governance Working Paper Series Nr. 44, DFG Sonderforschungsbereich 700, Berlin, Juni 2013
- Böhnke, Jan/Koehler, Jan/Zürcher, Christoph* 2013: Assessing the Impact of Development Cooperation in Northeast Afghanistan: Approaches and Methods. SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 43, Collaborative Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, February 2013.
- Börzel, Tanja A./van Hüllen, Vera/Lohaus, Mathis* 2013: Governance Transfer by Regional Organizations. Following a Global Script?, SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 42, Collaborative Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, January 2013.
- Goikhman, Izabella/Herrmann, Barbara* 2012: The Governance Discourse in China. SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 41, Collaborative Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, November 2012.
- Willms, Jan* 2012: Justice through Armed Groups' Governance – An Oxymoron? SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 40, Collaborative Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, October 2012.
- Ickler, Christian/Wiesel, John* 2012: New Method, Different War? Evaluating Supervised Machine Learning by Coding Armed Conflict, SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 39, Collaborative Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, September 2012.
- Livingston, Steven/Walter-Drop, Gregor* 2012: Information and Communication Technologies in Areas of Limited Statehood, SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 38, Collaborative Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, September 2012.
- Schüren, Verena* 2012: Two TRIPs to Innovation. Pharmaceutical Innovation Systems in India and Brazil, SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 37, Collaborative Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, June 2012.
- Sonderforschungsbereich 700*: Grundbegriffe der Governanceforschung, SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 36, 2. revised edition, Collaborative Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, June 2012.
- Eimer, Thomas R.* 2012: When Modern Science Meets Traditional Knowledge: A Multi-Level Process of Adaption and Resistance, SFB-Governance Working Paper Series, No. 35, Collaborative Research Center (SFB) 700, Berlin, June 2012.

These publications can be downloaded from www.sfb-governance.de/publikationen or ordered in printed versions via e-mail to sfb700@zedat.fu-berlin.de.

The Authors



Professor Tanja A. Börzel holds the Chair for European Integration at the Otto Suhr Institute of Political Science, Freie Universität Berlin. She co-directs the Research College “The Transformative Power of Europe.” She mainly focuses on questions of governance and institutional change as a result of Europeanization, as well as on the diffusion of European ideas and policies within and outside of the EU. The latter is part of her current research, which addresses compliance with EU norms and rules in member states, accession countries, and neighboring countries. Within the SFB 700, Tanja Börzel co-directs the project D2 on “Business and Governance in Sub-Saharan Africa” and project B2 on “Governance Export by Regional Organizations.”

Contact: tanja.boerzel@fu-berlin.de



Vera van Hüllen is assistant professor for international relations at Leuphana Universität Lüneburg, Germany. She investigates international cooperation and the role of regional organizations in the Middle East and North Africa. From 2010 to 2013, she was postdoctoral research associate in the B2 project “Governance Export by Regional Organizations” at the SFB 700. Her book “International Democracy Promotion and Authoritarianism in the EU and MENA” is forthcoming from Palgrave Macmillan.

Contact: vera.vanhuelen@fu-berlin.de

Research Framework

Governance has become a central theme in social science research. The Collaborative Research Center (SFB) 700 *Governance in Areas of Limited Statehood* investigates governance in areas of limited statehood, i.e. developing countries, failing and failed states, as well as, in historical perspective, different types of colonies. How and under what conditions can governance deliver legitimate authority, security, and welfare, and what problems are likely to emerge? Operating since 2006 and financed by the German Research Foundation (DFG), the Research Center involves the Freie Universität Berlin, the University of Potsdam, the European University Institute, the German Institute for Global and Area Studies (GIGA), the German Institute for International and Security Affairs (SWP), and the Social Science Research Center Berlin (WZB).

Partner Organizations

Host University:
Freie Universität Berlin



University of Potsdam



German Institute for International and Security Affairs (SWP)



Social Science Research Center Berlin (WZB)



German Institute of Global and Area Studies (GIGA)

