Országos Tudományos Diákköri Konferencia

The Phenomenon of Exporting Democracy: What happened in Afghanistan?

Jelige: pdn223

Lezárás dátuma: 2024.05.22.

Table of Contents

Abstract 3

I. Introduction 4

II. Methodology 5

III. The phenomenon of exporting democracy - Literature review 5

III.1. Possible definitions for the concept of democracy 6

III.1.1. The minimalist definition of democracy 6

III.1.2. Definition of democracy by Robert Dahl 7

III.1.3. The maximalist definition of democracy 7

III.1.4. The idea of liberal democracy 8

III.1.5. Democracy according to János Kornai 8

III.1.6. Conclusions 9

III.2. Concepts and definitions in case of democracy export 10

III.3. Why do countries want to export democracy? 12

III.4. The problems of exporting democracy 13

III.4.1. The difficulties of exporting democracy 13

III.4.2. Ethical and moral questions of promoting democracy 17

III.5. The role of the USA in the history of democracy export 17

III.5.1. Early history 17

III.5.2. World War I 18

III.5.3. World War II 19

III.5.4. Cold War 19

III.5.5. 21st century 22

IV. Historical overview of Afghanistan 22

IV.1. The brief history of Afghanistan in the 20th century 23

IV.2. The invasion of the USA 25

IV.3. The withdrawal of the USA 29

V. Findings 31

V.1. Examining different aspects of democracy export in Afghanistan 31

V.1.1. Afghanistan and democracy 32

V.1.2. Rebuilding Afghanistan and elections 32

V.1.3. Consolidating democratic norms and traditions 34

V.1.4. The goals of the USA in Afghanistan 35

VI. Conclusion 36

VI.1. Answer to the research question 36

VI.2. General conclusions of the paper 37

VII. Bibliography 38

Abstract

It has long been a question whether democracy is exportable or not. The possibility of establishing democratic states in the Middle East has been in the focus of discussions in the last two decades. With the withdrawal of the United States of America from Afghanistan in August 2021 the question became even more relevant. Since then, the case of Afghanistan is often mentioned as an example for the failure of democracy export. However, this idea is more complex than a simple statement, thus the main research question of the paper is the following: What are the factors that must be considered when examining whether the export of democracy failed in Afghanistan? The research also investigates whether it is justifiable at all to say that the USA had the intention to export democracy to the country. The aim of the paper is thus to assess the concept of democracy export and to provide details about the phenomenon in case of Afghanistan. Considering the methodology, the paper uses qualitative research methods, since it is based on analysing different pieces of literature. The use of the descriptive analytical method is essential, since the main narratives and key points of the paper are built up after examining the available literature and data. This paper is also a case study, since after analysing the abstract phenomenon of democracy export the ideas are applied and investigated throughout the example of Afghanistan. After applying these methods, the paper determines the most important factors that must be considered when examining whether democracy export failed in Afghanistan. It must be investigated whether building a democratic system is feasible and whether democratic norms and institutions were ever consolidated. The most important factor is whether the USA ever had the intention to export democracy to Afghanistan. The research concludes that it was never the main goal, it was rather one of the means of achieving the interests of the USA. Consequently, since exporting democracy was never the explicit aim, it could not fail in its traditional sense in Afghanistan.

I. Introduction

"*Democracy is the worst form of government, except all the others that have been tried before*."- this statement made by Churchill perfectly describes the controversies regarding the concept of democracy (International Churchill Society, n.d.). It has been a central question for decades whether (liberal) democracy is the ultimate and best possible political system as assumed by Francis Fukuyama in his theory of the "*end of history*" (Fukuyama, 1992). There have been several discussions about the definition and about the characteristics of the concept of democracy. Nowadays we also hold conversations about the structure and the prevailing values of a democratic system. This is certainly not surprising, since most people associate the concept of democracy with positive things, as they believe there is no better alternative. The idea of Churchill seems to be true, as nowadays the vast majority of people seem to agree that the best political system a country can have is democracy. The characteristics of this system and the opportunities offered by it seem far more appealing than those present in an autocratic system or in a dictatorship. Consequently, one would believe that it would be best for the population of the world to establish democracies in all existing countries. Theoretically it might seem like a great idea, but the reality is far harsher than that. This idea shows how when assessing ideas in the field of international relations idealism and realism often conflict with each other.

Promoting and exporting democracy abroad also have been in the focus of discussions for decades now. With the withdrawal of the United States of America from Afghanistan and with the takeover of the Taliban the idea became once again more relevant. Several people claimed that this withdrawal could be seen as a failure of the foreign policy of the USA. It was also stated to be an unquestionable failure of democracy export as the extremist group of the Taliban once again controls Afghanistan. While the first claim might be justified, the idea that Afghanistan is a prime example of the failure of exporting democracy seems to be more complex. The main research question of this paper is thus the following: What are the factors that must be considered when examining whether the export of democracy failed in Afghanistan? This paper also aims to investigate whether it is justifiable at all to say that the USA had the intention to export democracy to the country. The aim of the paper is thus to assess the concept of democracy export and to provide details about the phenomenon in case of Afghanistan.

To analyse these questions after introducing the methodology, the paper first aims to define the concept of democracy, since that seems to be the main starting point. It seems crucial to analyse the ideas and problems surrounding the phenomenon of exporting democracy, including why

countries might want to promote it abroad in the first place. It is of utmost importance to detail the relation of the USA to the idea of promoting democracy through a historical overview as well. Following the introduction of concepts in connection with exporting democracy, it is also needed to focus on Afghanistan in details. Consequently, the next chapter is dedicated to examining the history of Afghanistan. Apart from a brief historical overview of the county there is special attention put on the invasion of the USA and their withdrawal. In the next chapter the previous two parts are compared. It is essential to examine the theoretical findings regarding the concepts and the events in Afghanistan to conclude a case study. Thus, this chapter focuses on examining the goals of the USA in Afghanistan and whether democracy was present in the country at any point at all. The last chapter details the results and arrives at the most important conclusions, just as well as providing an answer to the research question.

II. Methodology

In case of any research, it is essential to introduce the scientific methodology applied, thus this chapter details the used research methods.

This paper mostly relies on qualitative research methods, since it assesses an extensive amount of literature. It is essential to examine the different theories about democracy just as well to analyse the history of Afghanistan. The descriptive analytical method is used the most in this paper, since the main narrative is built after examining and interpreting different pieces of literature, data, and processes. The paper also relies on the tools of the case study method, since after analysing the abstract phenomenon of exporting democracy the examined theories and ideas are applied to the example of Afghanistan.

Concerning the limitations of this research it is important to note that only the example of Afghanistan is examined, since it is the most recent case where the concept of democracy export was frequently mentioned. The paper does not have the capability to examine all possible interpretations of promoting democracy and it is also limited to examine the history of Afghanistan only in the 20th and 21st centuries. These limitations however do not weaken the research, but it is important to bear in mind that they exist when assessing the results of the paper.

III. The phenomenon of exporting democracy - Literature review

This chapter focuses on examining the phenomenon of exporting democracy by analysing different aspects. First different definitions of the concept of democracy are analysed. The next part focuses on providing a definition for democracy export. It is also analysed what reasons are behind the idea of promoting democracy from the side of the developed countries. Since

democracy export is not a simple and easy task it is also examined what kind of problems might be present throughout the process. In the last part the history of the United States of America in connection with the idea of exporting democracy is also introduced.

III.1. Possible definitions for the concept of democracy

When talking about the idea of exporting democracy we first must consider the meaning and the definition of the concept of democracy. This seems to be crucial since it matters a lot how a country defines democracy when they claim to promote it abroad. However, we immediately face the problem that the word "democracy" does not have a clear and universally accepted definition (Isaac, 2017). Consequently, scholars and scientists have been arguing about the possible definitions and interpretations for a long time. Once thing is sure: between political theorists and experts of political science democracy is a deeply contested term. To quote Robert Dahl, an influential figure related to the definition of democracy *"there is no democratic theory-there are only democratic theories"* (Mayhew, 2016). This idea perfectly explains how different approaches seem to exist parallelly to each other which makes it difficult to find the most appropriate and adequate version in case of trying to conceptualize and operationalize the idea of democracy export.

III.1.1. The minimalist definition of democracy

Democracy is often defined as the "*rule of the people*", but that does not seem to explain all that a democratic system contains. Consequently first, the interpretation of Joseph Schumpeter should be examined as that seems to be the simplest and most self-explanatory. The minimalist, procedural definition of democracy can be connected to his name, defining democracy based on the method by which people elect representatives in elections. In his definition the criteria qualifying a country as democracy regarding the electoral procedures is the existence of free and fair elections (Schumpeter, 1950). This definition is simple and makes it easier to distinguish political systems that either fulfil or fail these provided criteria. Schumpeter thus describes democratic rule as the exchange of government policies for votes (Elliott, 1994). In this sense the only criterion defining democracy is connected to the electoral procedures. There are no additional factors in this definition, thus it is usually referred to as the "minimalist" definition of democracy. According to this definition democracy seems to be a system where a bare majority of citizens has the right to change the ruler through elections. However, in an idea raised by Richard Holbrooke an important point is emphasized: *"Suppose the election was declared free and fair," he said, and those elected are "racists, fascists, separatists, who are publicly opposed to [peace and reintegration]. That is the dilemma."* (Zakaria, 1997). This

line of thoughts leads us to further contemplate what we believe a democratic system should constitute of and what values it should represent. If we accept the definition of Schumpeter then we can claim that even in this previous example there is democracy, since the criterion regarding electoral procedures is fulfilled. However, if we attribute other criteria to the definition of democracy especially in connection with the fundamental rights and freedoms of individuals then the picture becomes more complex. Consequently, in the next paragraphs other possible definitions of democracy must be examined.

III.1.2. Definition of democracy by Robert Dahl

Apart from Joseph Schumpeter, Robert Dahl is the other well-known political theorist who is often mentioned in connection with the definition of democracy. Dahl introduced the pluralist theory of democracy and the concept of polyarchy. He believed that the definition of democracy is so complex that it seems to be an unattainable "ideal type" (Dahl, 1971). Thus, he claimed that polyarchy is the best approximation of democracy. This system is described with the notion that every citizen has an equal vote and throughout the elections the candidate with the most votes win. Dahl often listed various criteria that an ideal democratic system would satisfy. He emphasized the importance of equality in voting and effective participation. Enlightened understanding, final control over the agenda and inclusion are also among the basic conditions for qualifying as a democracy (Mayhew, 2016). Free and fair elections are a part of this definition as well, but Dahl goes further by emphasizing other factors, such as accountability and freedom of opinion formation. Consequently, less countries of the world can be labelled as democracies if the definition of Dahl is used than if we only consider the criteria of Schumpeter. However, both definitions are popular, and it depends on our personal choice and probably on the issue examined which way of categorization we prefer.

III.1.3. The maximalist definition of democracy

In contrast to the minimalist definition the maximalist definition of democracy also exists. This type of defining democracy has the most criteria and it aims to grasp several features without which a system cannot be democratic (Insua, 2014). Regular free and fair elections and the pluralism of political parties are cornerstones of this approach as well. The sovereignty of people and the importance of representation is also strongly emphasized. What is more, separation of powers, the system of checks and balances and the rule of law all play a crucial role here. Equality before law and the protection of minority rights is also essential. Fundamental human rights and respecting the important basic freedoms can also form part of the criteria. It is important how the idea of a democratic political culture is also emphasized

(Insua, 2014). This means for instance the existence of a strong civil society and independent and plural media. Participation in this political culture and law abidance also belong here. Lastly, the existence of a transparent and open public administration seems to be crucial. This definition seems to be the most complex and this one requires the most criteria to be fulfilled if a country wants to be seen as a democracy.

III.1.4. The idea of liberal democracy

Having introduced the concept of the maximalist definition of democracy, we can see that the basic ideas of liberalism appear in it. Consequently, it must be noted how in recent years the concepts of democracy and liberalism seem to go hand in hand (Isaac, 2017). As a result, it is crucial to see how the so-called liberal democracy can be defined. In case of liberal democracy, the definition of democracy is not only based on the procedure of elections. If we add the label of "liberal" in front of the term democracy, rule of law, separation of powers and the protection of the rights of individuals become inseparable from the concept. However, these characteristics might rather belong to the idea of constitutional liberalism then to the concept of democracy, thus it is interesting that they also appear in the maximalist definition (Isaac, 2017). It is important to see that in contrast to the minimalist definition of democracy, constitutional liberalism does not refer to the process of electing a government but rather to the aims of the government, where the freedom of the individual seems to be the most important political goal (Ball&Girvetz, 2023) Consequently, it can be stated that the concept of liberal democracy should not be completely equal to the definition of democracy itself. It is often rather argued that liberal democracy should be seen as a subtype of democracy. However, nowadays in the West it is quite popular to rely on only the idea of liberal democracy, thus excluding a lot of countries from being labelled as having democratic systems. This point is crucial for this research, since it makes a huge difference whether a country is trying to export democracy in its minimalist form, by setting up a system of free and fair elections in a foreign country, or by trying to promote all the liberal values and ideas as fundamental parts of a democratic system. This difference is important since in most cases of democracy promotion the West seems to focus on its own model of liberal democracy which might do more harm than good in the end of the day (Sowers, 2007).

III.1.5. Democracy according to János Kornai

It is also interesting to analyse how János Kornai introduces the primary and secondary characteristics of democracy, autocracy, and dictatorship (Kornai, 2016). In his view the primary characteristics of democracy are the following: the government can be removed

peacefully; strong institutions guaranteeing the conditions for removing the government; party pluralism and existence of a legal parliamentary opposition; no terror (such as forced-labour camps) (Kornai, 2016). These characteristics from one aspect focus on the definition of Schumpeter regarding the removal of the government through elections. However, with the idea of "no terror" the criteria of freedom and human rights also comes into the picture. The secondary characteristics of democracy are the following: no repressive means are used against the parliamentary opposition; institutions of the checks and balances are well-functioning; relatively few officials are appointed by the ruling political group; strong civil society and no legal constraints against civil protest; significant levels of participation; freedom of press is enforced (Kornai, 2016). Considering this group of criteria, we see how features of the maximalist definition of democracy are predominant. It is important to analyse these ten points of criteria made by Kornai since it gives a clearer understanding how democracy should look like in practice based on the previous theories examined.

III.1.6. Conclusions

Since the concept of democracy and its definition is so complex it is exceptionally difficult to analyse whether a country belongs into the category of democracy as it depends on the criteria we use. Consequently, even when talking about the idea of exporting democracy it is particularly hard to analyse whether the attempt was successful in any country since there are so many aspects to be taken into consideration before deciding whether a country fulfils the democratic criteria. Thus, it seems that labelling a country as democratic is not self-explanatory and not fully objective. This complexity and the ambiguous definition are often used in politics by prominent figures and leaders. Since boundaries between democracies and autocracies are not sharply drawn politicians have the chance to claim to rule in a democratic way even if they violate certain criteria present in the definitions (Zakaria, 1997).

The aim of this research is to examine which factors must be taken into consideration when assessing whether democracy export failed in Afghanistan and to find whether it was ever the aim of the USA to export democracy. Thus, it seemed essential to consider the possible interpretations of democracy in general to be able to draw conclusions in the example of Afghanistan as well. It is important to make it clear already at this point, that it seems as if the USA is trying to promote democracy together with respect for human rights and the protection of minorities, thus it does not seem to be enough to focus on the minimalist, procedural definition of democracy (Fowler, 2015).

Defining the concept of democracy is certainly not an easy task but it contributes to the basis

of this research. This chapter was crucial as it is not possible to examine the phenomenon of exporting democracy without first making it clear what we mean by democracy, since its definition is certainly not self-explanatory.

III.2. Concepts and definitions in case of democracy export

After examining the different definitions of democracy, it seems crucial for the research to analyse the phenomenon of the export of democracy. This chapter aims to introduce the general concepts and ideas regarding the possibility of promoting democracy abroad.

Having analysed the term democracy we also have to take a look at the other crucial factor of democracy export, which is the concept of export. The definition of export is "*to put something from one country into use in other countries*" (Cambridge Dictionary, n.d.). Basically, in our case it is the idea that a democratic state tries to establish democracy in a country where it is not present yet. If we combine it with the definition of democracy, we can define democracy export as trying to bring the system of free and fair elections to other countries. This is the minimalist definition, but we can also argue for the idea that democracy export means the promotion of values generally considered democratic, such as the rule of law or the system of checks and balances, just as well as the respect for human rights and the protection of certain freedoms. Consequently, once again we arrive back to the problem of defining democracy. How we define the export of democracy is completely dependent thus on how we define democracy itself.

First, we must consider whether the political system of democracy has a universal validity within our world or whether it is a Western form of government (Smith&Light, 2001). Since it was established that democracy is believed to be the best system to live in, it could mean that countries already possessing this system are obliged to help its promotion abroad as well. However, it does not seem to be this obvious since the countries of our world are not the same. Although it cannot be claimed that democracy only exists as a form of government in the West, it seems acceptable that Western countries have created their own types of systems which we usually refer to as liberal democracy. Thus, the question arises whether the aim of the Western countries is to promote democracy in the sense of its minimalist definition (free and fair elections) or in its maximalist, liberal version (rights and freedoms). If the latter is the case, what we see is how these developed Western nations try to spread and force their ideal type of democracy upon less-developed nations causing a lot of controversy. In these scenarios it seems that the developed nations sometimes neglect the idea that it can happen that democracy takes up various forms in different countries depending on the local history, traditions, values, social

structure, and the needs of the population (Smith&Light, 2001).

Secondly, it seems necessary to examine when exactly are we talking about an attempt to export democracy. There must be a clear aim from the side of the exporter country of establishing a democratic system in a foreign country. Consequently, what should constitute as democracy export is when a country decides to intervene somewhere else for the explicit aim of bringing democratic reforms to that country. However, this does not happen very often since the idea of establishing democracy rather tends to be a by-product of other events. Consequently, promoting democracy in several cases is rather a consequence of other processes than an explicit aim to help the development of other nations. This idea of democracy export being a consequence rather than the aim itself is understandable in several contexts. In a lot of cases countries try to promote democracy abroad for their own interests and not for the well-being of the other population.

When we have the clear aim present to promote democracy, we have to see that each national case requires a specific own solution (Smith&Light, 2001). What works in one country in Latin-America might not work in the Middle East due to the inherent social, cultural, and political differences (Sowers, 2007). Some might say that the only way to reach a desirable outcome, in this case a consolidated democracy, is through the process of trial and error. That might be the case with some experiments, but when we are talking about a transition from autocracy to democracy within a country there is no time and space for testing different approaches. If there are too many errors during the process of transition the result can be even more counterproductive as it is possible that there will be a reversion to authoritarianism or descent to chaos in the given country (Smith&Light, 2001). Consequently, when a country aims to export democracy, it must find the most suitable model for the particular conditions of the given state.

It seems that similarly to the case of democracy the phenomenon of democracy export does not have a simple and widely accepted definition either. Some believe that it is enough to consider the definition of Schumpeter, thus exporting democracy is when a state tries to establish free and fair elections in another country. However, it can also be stated that even if elections are held with the help of the intervening country, there is no guarantee that the approaches of the elected government will be democratic for instance in the sense of respecting human rights. Another criticism of the idea that democracy export is only about promoting the procedure of democratic elections is the notion that procedures and some institutions are simply not enough to uphold a democratic system. There is also a strong need for the existence of an active civil

society, just as much as for social capital and social trust (Smith&Light, 2001). However, these core pillars of a democratic system are much harder to export than setting up a democratic system of elections. What seems to be agreed on is that democracy export is a phenomenon in which we have two actors: an already democratic country trying to set up a pluralistic political system in a foreign country and the other state where the process of democratization is started.

III.3. Why do countries want to export democracy?

Not only is it crucial to examine the concepts and ideas regarding the phenomenon of democracy export, but also to analyse which factors can motivate certain countries to try to promote it abroad. There are ideological, economic, and strategic reasons as well since governments have a variety of motives and interests on the international level.

First of all, the main argument for exporting democracy is the idea that democracies are believed to be better partners and allies on the international field. It is thought that democratic states share the same values and interests in several cases, and for this reason democracy seems to be a requirement to get membership in several international organizations. It is generally accepted that having a democratic system in a country can serve as a constraint against abrupt changes in policy which certainly benefits the partners of the given state (Smith&Light, 2001). Another additional reason still connected to ideology is the belief that democracy is a good system, thus some countries, especially the USA decided to take it up as their responsibility to help its promotion all over the world. This makes sense, since if you believe in something and you think it works well you would be eager to promote it to others as well. However, this possibly brings with itself some thoughts of superiority, since some governments tend to believe that they have the right to intervene into the affairs of other states. Even if these governments are driven by good will and noble aims, controversies still arise about their rights to put themselves into a morally higher position (Marshall, 2016). Consequently, they take it up as their role to try to "reform" these countries and make the world a better place. Although this seems like a noble aim, in several cases the real motives are rather connected to the self-interests of the country wishing to export democracy.

Regarding economic reasons it must be stated that in general democratic societies are believed to be more efficient economically since economic development is often linked to the idea of having a good government (Smith&Light, 2001). Consequently, self-interests regarding different resources within a country or connected to trade often appear as the real, underlying motives behind exporting democracy. If a country succeeds in the promotion of democracy, then it can also be easier for them to control the government and the economic policies it wishes

to pursue, thus beneficial outcomes can be reached for the exporter. However, it is essential to keep in mind that helping the establishment of a capitalist market economy abroad does not necessarily result in the democratic transformation of the country. As Kornai put it *"capitalism is a necessary but not sufficient condition for democracy."* (Kornai, 2016). Consequently, believing that helping the capitalist transformation of a country will certainly result in democratization is a false hope.

Achieving desirable outcomes not only plays a role in economic reasons, but also regarding different questions about strategy and military. Since democracy is usually associated with peace promoting it abroad seems beneficial for guaranteeing the security of the exporter. If we accept the fact that democratic states tend to be more peaceful, then it makes sense that a country might try to export it so as to guarantee peace. Not only is it important to have peace in the surroundings of the specific "democratized" country, but it can also result in more security for the exporter for instance by reducing the probability of terrorism. If we consider the '*democratic peace theory'* of Francis Fukuyama it makes even more sense why democratic states are beneficial for guaranteeing international peace and security. Fukuyama proposed the idea that mature democracies rarely or never go to war with one another (Fukuyama, 1992). However, if this statement seems to be true for countries where democracy has been present for decades then this benefit would only be present in the long run.

III.4. The problems of exporting democracy

Promoting and exporting democracy might seem like a very noble goal at the first glance. However, if we keep thinking about the issue, we might face some problems and controversies. This chapter thus explains the possible difficulties exporters of democracy usually face just as well as some ethical concerns. It is essential to know how a government defines the democracy they wish to export and also whether exporting it is feasible at all.

III.4.1. The difficulties of exporting democracy

First let's analyse what makes it difficult to establish a democratic state abroad. Even though people living in the West tend to believe that there is no better system than democracy it is not necessarily true that people living in other parts of the world have similar views. It is essential to examine whether there is a real demand for democracy within these countries or whether it is just imagined by the exporting country (Marshall, 2016). If the given country has no democratic history or its culture and society is tightly embedded with authoritarian or autocratic rule it could be especially difficult to change the general attitude of the society towards a democratic structure (Sowers, 2007). This seems like a path-dependent approach but is tends

to be true that the lack of democratic traditions and the lack of knowledge about the proper functioning of democracy within a population can predetermine the possible failure of the attempt (Monten, 2014). Even if we assume that democratization can be started successfully, the whole process until we arrive at a fully consolidated democracy will take a lot of time. Ralf Dahrendorf established a theory about the democratisation period. He assumes that for a political system to change six months is needed. However, for the significant change of an economic system six years is needed. If we go further and we hope for a social transformation to happen we need sixty years (Sztompka, 1991). These numbers might seem shocking for the first time; however we can arrive at significant conclusions examining them. It can be stated that for the political change, like setting up elections there is no need for a lot of time, however, to change a society and their general mindset an unimaginably large amount of time is needed. Consequently, this idea proves why it is not enough to set up institutions and procedures when the active civil society believing in democratic values is missing.What is more we also have to be aware of the fact that pondering about the best form of government, or the structure of state is usually the privilege of those living in the developed countries. In developing states people tend to worry more about everyday issues then about comparing different forms of governments. This idea is perfectly represented by the following quote from the book of Tim Marshall: "*if you are hungry and frightened, and you are offered either bread and security or the concept of democracy, the choice is not difficult."* (Marshall, 2016). Consequently, when some governments believe that they will be successful in a developing country with their appealing ideas about democracy and freedom they sometimes tend to forget the harsh reality those people experience. This results in the fact that they might be unable to find a common ground with the local population since their perceptions of problems and reforms are completely different.

It is also important to see how governments define the democracy they wish to promote. Using force for humanitarian purposes has been present in history for a longer time, while promoting human rights seems to be a new foreign policy goal (Smith&Light, 2001). It seems that most governments are not satisfied if they succeed in setting up democratic elections in a country, but they also care about the ideology and the values the elected officials represent. This is mainly due to their self-interests since no country would support elections somewhere if the elected government was to turn against the exporter. Consequently, governments are not satisfied with the minimalist definition of democracy, but they also enlarge the set of criteria they wish to see fulfilled in these states. Thus, we also have to face the dilemma whether the population within a country is the willing recipient of the same kind of liberal democracy the

exporter might wish to set up. This is a key point, as it can explain why most exports of democracy seem to be unsuccessful and why sometimes it seems as if democratic consolidation is elusive in some parts of our world. Consequently, two cases have to be differentiated: democracy fails in its minimalist definition or liberal democracy fails. This is crucial since it is possible that a given population would not be against electing their leader through the democratic procedures, however they might be against all the ideas of liberalism (rights and freedoms) which are promoted together with the system of democracy.

After having this differentiation, we have to examine further why any type of democracy seems to be difficult to export. In this sense we must examine endogenous and exogenous factors as well (Smith&Light, 2001). Endogenous reasons are usually those that are internal problems within the country where democracy is trying to take roots. The lack of democratic history or the absence of civil society can belong to this category. If we can see signs of path-dependency within a country without prior democratic experience it is much more likely that promoting democracy will not be successful. This can be explained by the idea that the population might not be aware of the possible advantages of a democratic system, and they might just see the difficulties of establishing a new structure. In addition, the political elite most probably has no incentive to democratize the country as it might result in losing their power. For this reason, the lack of a civil society and the lack of a stable middle class can hinder the processes of democratization. Among the exogenous factors we can talk about the external difficulties, such as how the efforts of the exporter country might be insufficient. Such inadequate effort might be the idea that the exporter only focuses on setting up free and fair elections without helping the consolidation of habitual democratic processes. Although procedures are important, especially in case of elections those are not enough to consolidate a democracy in the long run. What we see in these scenarios is that the exporter countries fall into the fallacy of legitimating elections as relatively free and fair even if the elected regime coming to power seems to be authoritarian (Smith&Light, 2001). In this case the elected regime has the possibility of hiding behind the term democracy while they can slowly start degrading the system and slowly start the process of democratic backsliding and autocratization of the country (Zakaria, 1997). Consequently, these internal and external factors combined can make it hard for democracy export to be successful.

It can also be noted that in several cases in case of foreign policy the ideas of realism and idealism seem to crash. According to some American realists, like George Kennan or Henry Kissinger when promoting democracy abroad we should not confuse values with interests

(Smith&Light, 2001). This plays a significant role in defining the approaches and goals of foreign policy in general. It seems self-explanatory how in the majority of cases leaders of states tend to follow their own national interests when determining the course of their foreign policy. Consequently, in several cases the ideas of realism seem to dominate as states follow their economic, political or strategic interests abroad. However, idealism can also play an important role in determining the focus of foreign policy, especially in periods following wars or upheavals. In this scenario leaders might decide to formulate some aims of foreign policy in a way focusing on the development of humanity and to provide a better life for more people. Basing foreign policy on the idea of protecting human rights or promoting democracy seems to belong to this category. However, one must be careful when assessing and evaluating these kinds of well-sounding policies, since it is quite possible that a government would disguise its real aims under the "veil of exporting democracy" (Taylor&Botea, 2008). Consequently, this contrast between an idealist and realist foreign policy also makes it difficult to assess the phenomenon of exporting democracy.

Having examined the difficulties, it is also interesting to wonder how one can decide whether the promotion and export of democracy was successful somewhere. This is true mainly because of the fact, that there are no clear determined criteria to decide whether a country is democratic. Even if it seems that the system has consolidated it is quite often the case that democratic backsliding starts to take place after some years. In addition, it is essential to mention again how it is difficult to decide even in which cases we can talk about the phenomenon of democracy export. Since in several cases establishing a democratic system only comes into the picture after a war for instance it cannot be seen as a clear aim but rather as a consequence. What we see in several cases is that countries are driven by their own self-interest, so they decide to invade a country or intervene into its internal politics for these reasons. In these cases, they later realize that if they are already in the country, it would be more beneficial for them to establish their own system in that given country as well. However, the self-interests are often more taken into consideration and the needs of the local population might be neglected, which can explain why these attempts of state building and nation building often fail (Dobbins et. al.,2008). Another possible scenario is that there is no true existing aim to promote democracy within a country however the term democracy export is thrown around to justify the political decisions of a given government regarding their foreign policy. In this sense they are just pretending that the ultimate aim is to consolidate democracy as it sounds so much more noble than for instance admitting the truth about their own interests. Consequently, it is hard to define where democracy export starts and where it ends.

III.4.2. Ethical and moral questions of promoting democracy

When we talk about the phenomenon of democracy export, we cannot neglect the ethical and moral problems either. First, who defines which country has the right to try to intervene in another one? Even if with the noble aim of helping to spread democracy is present, it will still be a foreign intervention which might violate the sovereignty of the given states. Furthermore, it seems clear that most cases of democracy promotion happen through or at least start with war. Is it acceptable to promote democracy with war? Does the end justify the means in this case? Does establishing a democratic and prosperous ideal state justify the inhuman events of a war? What is more, how can we be sure, that the war is actually started to promote peace and to establish a democracy? Was the war in Iraq justifiable or was it just in the interest of the USA? (Boniface, 2020) How can we make sure that governments really bear in mind the best interests of a given nation and that they wish to help them live in democracy instead of just trying to set up a government which is their ally thus doing all of it only for their self-interests? This research is limited in length; thus, it does not have the capacity to answer all of these questions regarding the moral side of the phenomenon. However, these questions are of utmost importance to see the bigger picture and to be able to analyse what happened in Afghanistan.

III.5. The role of the USA in the history of democracy export

The United States of America has a long history of promoting and fostering democracy and democratic institutions abroad. To be precise, the USA is believed to be the first country who ever tried to export democracy and this goal seemed to become even more important throughout the twentieth century (Fowler, 2015). Furthermore, the concept of democracy export is still often connected to the USA even nowadays.

III.5.1. Early history

The USA from its very existence hoped that it could serve as an example for other countries by showing how a democracy should look like. The Declaration of Independence already describes the establishing values of the country which seem to prevail and define the policy of the USA even nowadays: "*We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness."* (The National Archive, 1776). This quotation gives an explanation what those core values are that the US has been trying to promote in foreign countries as well for decades. According to Smith the origin and first case of promoting democracy by the USA can be traced back to the Spanish-American War of 1898 (Smith&Light, 2001). Although it is believed that mainly economic and strategic aims led to the fights, it can

also be observed how in the end the USA ended up establishing democratic governments locally. Here it was already the case that establishing democracy was just a consequence of a war started out of strategic reasons. Since 1898 it can be observed how this idea of promoting democracy became a crucial point of the foreign policy of the USA. At some points efforts of exporting democracy became more active and sometimes periods with more interventionist methods to achieve this goal can also be seen. For instance, between 1912 and 1932 there were 40 episodes when the USA claimed to promote democracy in Latin-America (Smith&Light, 2001). However, in most cases the USA was driven rather by its own economic and strategic interests, but it seemed easier to intervene in the name of democracy.

III.5.2. World War I

Taking a further look at the twentieth century we cannot dismiss the role the USA played in Europe. The first president of the USA who pursued a foreign policy with active promotion of democracy was Woodrow Wilson (Fowler, 2015). Wilson decided to break the policy of neutrality and entered World War I in order to *"make the world safe for democracy"*(Library of Congress, 1917). This statement itself shows the general attitude of the USA in this century and how they took up the role of being responsible for the spread of democracy around the globe. Following the victory in the war the 14 Points of President Wilson were put forward containing important ideas how the post-war world should look like. These points are often considered as a dramatic endorsement of democracy promotion. Wilson advocated the *"principle of justice to all peoples and nationalities, and their right to live on equal terms of liberty and safety with one another*"(Fowler, 2015). These were very high ambitions and aims which in the end could not be implemented as previously hoped, mainly due to the resistance of Great Britain and France. However, it is important to see how the USA hoped to in a sense "change the world" where international peace and democratic principles would dominate. Basically the 14 Points tried to extend the goals of promoting democracy to Europe rather than only applying them in the countries of the Americas (Smith&Light, 2001). President Wilson hoped that the Paris Peace Conference would guarantee an establishment of a European order of democratic states. Furthermore, all hopes were put into the League of Nations as it was believed to be the organization which could have established and guaranteed international peace and security. However, the failure of the organization discredited the idea of democracy export for a period, and it seemed that the USA was unable to fulfil all its hopes on the European continent (Fowler, 2015).

III.5.3. World War II

The outbreak and the events of World War II led to the re-emerging of the idea of promoting democracy. Shortly after entering the war, Franklin D. Roosevelt introduced a campaign of democratization: *"the American people have made an unlimited commitment that there shall be a free world.*" (Fowler, 2015). Although Roosevelt supported democracy promotion at a limited level, he did bring democratization back into the centre of US foreign policy. After FDR's death, President Harry Truman took democracy promotion to a whole new level, supporting the idea of establishing democracies wherever possible in Europe. The so-called Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan demonstrated how the USA would not return to isolationism and how the USA aimed to support anti-communist forces all around the world (Smith&Light, 2001). The Truman Doctrine declared that democracy promotion was synonymous with national security since totalitarian governments were seen as a threat to US national security (Fowler, 2015). Truman believed that economic aid was the primary method of supporting democracy, thus the Marshall Plan was introduced to help to rebuild Europe. This American foreign policy aimed to support democracies against authoritarian threats and aimed to provide military and economic aid to these countries. Also called "the policy of containment", the Truman Doctrine's main aim lied in the idea of preventing the expansion of communism. In this period, we can see two of the most successful attempts of promoting democracy: Germany and Japan. According to Tony Smith four important aspects were taken into account: demilitarization was the goal and democratization, decartelization, and deprogramming were the means to attain that goal (Smith&Light, 2001). Further considering the Truman-era we can see another important example of democracy promotion in the foundation of the United Nations. This organization was meant to replace the League of Nations and it was and still is very significant on the international field and it also supports democratic values. Consequently, the policies of Truman were by far the most successful democracy programs in the past century. His policies converted fascist governments into democracies (Germany, Italy, Japan, and Austria). What is more his policies also rebuilt Europe while minimizing communist parties, and created an international organization that continues to promote democracy to this day. As a result, Truman was successful in promoting democracy as a means of containing the spread of communism (Fowler, 2015).

III.5.4. Cold War

The beginning of the Cold War and the race between the two superpowers brought a change in the directive of the foreign policy of the United States. In this period the USA certainly saw

itself as the "policeman of the world" whose job was to pay attention to the events of different countries, especially if they seemed to be connected to communism. Democracy was used as a tool to achieve international security by the West. The most significant change of this era was the idea that anti-communism seemed to replace liberal democratic internationalism as a goal of the foreign policy of the USA (Smith&Light, 2001). It seems quite controversial that the USA even took up the policy that in the name of the defence of the free world it was justified to support authoritarian regimes if they were not communist. This policy indicated that the United States felt it was more important to have allies than democratic governments (Fowler, 2015). This change resulted in the idea that containing communism became a priority, while promoting democracy was rather neglected. The word "free" no longer referred to democracies but rather to not communist countries. Eisenhower for instance had the same goal as Truman of ensuring security through the containment of communism. However, Eisenhower did not see democracy as a means to achieve security. He even supported antidemocratic forces to contain communism for instance in Iran, Guatemala or Vietnam (Fowler, 2015).

What is more, this period brought with itself another worrying trend about the concept and definition of democracy. As mentioned in the previous chapters it has never been easy to define the concept of democracy in the first place, due to the several different theories. However, in the years of the Cold War another difficulty emerged since both superpowers began to distort the definition of democracy so as to suit their own ideology. As a result, the terms "liberal democracy" and "socialist democracy" became well-known and frequently used (Smith&Light, 2001). This might not seem problematic at the first glance; however, it must be noted that it further largened the debate about which factors and criteria define whether a state is democratic. Starting to use attributes with the concept of democracy seems to have consequences even nowadays when we face the debates about the idea of illiberal democracy (Isaac, 2017). Consequently, these changing and opposing perspectives on democracy still continue to cause turmoil when trying to find the exact definition.

With President John F. Kennedy coming into office democracy promotion once again came into the forefront of US foreign policy. Similarly to Truman Kennedy also believed that financial aid would lead to economic development which would lead to democracy (Fowler, 2015). Although it was already introduced in this research that this idea is not necessarily true, in that period it was logical that Kennedy focused on economy as a means of promoting democracy. The President also created additional aid programs such as the US Agency for International

Development (USAID). This institution had its lasting impact since it continued to play an important role in the democracy promotion of the US foreign policy.

The Vietnam War slowed down the idea of democracy promotion. Presidents Lyndon Johnson, Richard Nixon, and Gerald Ford showed little interest in promoting democracy as a means to contain communism. They did not really care about the types of governments as long as they were anti-communist (Fowler, 2015). The revival of democracy promotion was thus connected to President Jimmy Carter. However, Carter's main objective was no longer security but the protection of human rights. Carter hoped to create a more moral and humane foreign policy with the idea of focusing on spreading human rights together with democracy (Fowler, 2015). There seems to be an interesting difference between the approaches of President Carter and Reagan. President Carter saw democracy promotion as the cornerstone to improve human rights. He no longer relied on economy, but he hoped that the global improvement of human rights would lead to international peace. On the other hand, Reagan returned to the previous ideas and saw economic prosperity as the key to international peace. Just as Carter saw democracy as the cornerstone to human rights, Reagan saw democracy as the cornerstone to economic prosperity. While having similar means and similar ends, the different assumed connections created a divergence in democracy promotion priorities and the tactical execution of democracy programs. Reagan's foreign policy message wanted to convince countries that if they wanted to prosper, they needed to adopt a free market (Fowler, 2015). Additionally, interestingly he also proposed that in order to have a functional free market, countries needed to democratize. Reagan even assumed that "*these democratic and free-market revolutions are really the same revolution*" (Fowler, 2015). Of course, nowadays we are ever that these are not true since having capitalism does not necessarily lead to having democracy and having a democracy does not necessarily mean economic prosperity (Kornai, 2016). Reagan also reintroduced the idea of military intervention for democratization as he supported "freedom fighters" in Afghanistan, Angola, Cambodia, and Nicaragua.

While Reagan's foreign policy followed the political science theory that democracy caused economic prosperity, the Bush administration introduced another idea. They based their foreign policy on the theory that free markets led to democracy (Fowler, 2015). Once again, this was refuted by Kornai, however at that time it seemed to be an acceptable assumption (Kornai, 2016). Bush's democratization policy was a modest plan, as it limited its scope to Latin America and Eastern Europe. President Bill Clinton continued to follow Reagan's and Bush's idea of having a connection between economy and democracy (Brinkley, 1997). He argued that

"Democracies create free markets that offer economic opportunity, make for more reliable trading partners, and are far less likely to wage war on one another." (Fowler, 2015). Basically, this statement shows the combination of the key ideas why it is in the interest of the United States to have more democracies in the world.

III.5.5. 21st century

President George W. Bush continued the policy of using both economic and military force to spread democracy. Considering economy Bush provided economic assistance based on conditions on progress toward democratization, market liberalization, and other factors (Fowler, 2015). Regarding military force, the Bush administration endorsed democracy as a key component to its counterterrorism strategy, such as in Afghanistan or Iraq (Dobbins et. al., 2008). Regarding President Barack Obama's democracy promotion policy, we can see a return to rhetorical support for democracy. However, President Obama gave democracy promotion a prominent role in his foreign policy: *"because governments that respect these values are more just, peaceful, and legitimate. We also do so because their success abroad fosters an environment that supports America's national interests. Political systems that protect universal rights are ultimately more stable, successful, and secure."* (Fowlers, 2015). For these reasons President Obama voiced support for democracy in the Middle East, Tunisia, Burma, Egypt, and Ukraine. Interestingly, once again the promotion of democracy is clearly connected to the national interests of the USA and how having democratic countries offers more stability to the world.

The idea of exporting democracy came into the centre of attention with the withdrawal of the USA from Afghanistan in August 2021. Generally, newspapers and the public claimed that once again we could witness the failure of democracy export in the Middle East. The next chapters will focus on analysing the war in Afghanistan and what we can conclude about the possibility of the USA conducting democracy promotion in the country.

Overall, this chapter showed how the history of the USA and the idea of promoting and exporting democracy is strongly intertwined. It was necessary to examine these ideas from the twentieth century and how the aims and means of promoting democracy kept on changing as this seems to be significant in case of Afghanistan as well.

IV. Historical overview of Afghanistan

So as to understand the context of exporting democracy to Afghanistan we first have to analyse the history of the country briefly, putting a special focus on its relations with the USA. The following sections will examine the reasons why the USA entered the country in the first place,

just as well as the circumstances of the withdrawal. By the end of this chapter, it will be clearer whether the USA ever had the goal to export democracy to Afghanistan.

IV.1. The brief history of Afghanistan in the 20th century

The history of Afghanistan is certainly not a simple and easy one. On the contrary, looking at the events of the twentieth century it gets even more turbulent, full of suffering, coups, and wars. In the last sixty years several forms of governments were tried, and the country has seen many ideologies in power.

The beginning of the century was characterized by the Third Anglo-Afghan War in 1919. Interestingly before signing the treaty with the British about ending the war, the Afghans concluded a treaty of friendship with the new Bolshevik regime in the Soviet Union (Dupree et.al.,2023) Consequently, Afghanistan became one of the first states to recognize the Soviet government, which had significant impacts on the later Afghan history as well. A "special relationship" evolved between the two governments that lasted until December 1979, when the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan (Dupree et.al.,2023) The most significant monarch of the century seems to be Mohammad Zahir Shah who ruled between 1933 and 1973. During his reign Prime Minister Daud Khan (1953–63) came into power who turned to the Soviet Union for economic and military assistance. As a result, the Soviet Union soon became Afghanistan's major trade partner and they also provided aid. Afghanistan aimed to remain neutral and did not to take sides in the Cold War, still in a way the Soviets and the West were still competing in the nonaligned country.

The King tried to establish a constitutional monarchy, thus a constitution was drafted in 1964. However, the transformation and the constitutional processes seemed to stagnate, thus Daud Khan, the prime minister seized power in 1973 in a bloodless coup (Dupree et.al.,2023).He abolished the constitution of 1964 and established the Republic of Afghanistan, so the years of monarchy came into an end in the country. Daud Khan attempted to initiate socioeconomic reforms and he tried to reduce the dependency of the country on the SU and on the USA. However, he was not completely successful, so in 1978 he was assassinated.

Between 1979 and 1989 the country was characterized by a communist phase. In February 1979 the US ambassador to Afghanistan was killed, which meant that the USA no longer provided assistance to the country. The pro-Soviet government of the period could not consolidate his power sufficiently thus the Soviet Union decided to invade Afghanistan on the night of 24th of December 1979 (Dupree et.al.,2023). This invasion was not supported by the whole population of Afghanistan. By early 1980 several regional groups, collectively known as mujahideen had

united to resist the Soviet invaders and the Soviet-backed Afghan army. Pakistan, the United States, China, and several other states started to provide financial and military aid to the mujahideen. One of the most important and effective commanders was Ahmad Shah Massoud, who fought the Soviets in the Panjshir valley northeast of Kabul. Massoud is still considered as an important figure and a hero in Afghan history (Marshall, 2016). As the resistance was receiving more and better weapons from abroad the Soviet and Afghan forces started to have more casualties. As the war did not seem to end soon during the 1980s, talks between the foreign ministers of Afghanistan and Pakistan were held to decide about the timetable for the withdrawal of Soviet troops and to agree on the cessation of arms supplies to the mujahideen. Peace accords were finally signed in April 1988. Mikhail Gorbachev kept his earlier promise and began withdrawing Soviet troops in May and the last Soviet soldier left Afghanistan in February 1989 (Dupree et.al., 2023).

The period between 1989 and 1996 was once again characterized by civil war. In 1987, during the Soviet invasion Najibullah was elected to the post of president. Even as the Soviet troops were withdrawn from the country the civil war continued as Najibullah remained in power. The mujahideen formed an interim government in Pakistan and kept on resisting Najibullah's reconciliation efforts. The mujahideen parties were heavily disunited thus they could not remove the communist government. As the Soviet Union broke up it could not provide more military and economic assistance to the Afghan government, thus Najibullah was finally ousted from power in April 1992 (Dupree et.al.,2023). A coalition made up of the mujahideen parties that had fought the communists set up a fragile interim government. However, general peace and stability seemed like a distant hope, since militias started to rival against each other and tension between the different ethnic groups was also rising. The situation got worse and more serious when President Rabbani refused to give the power to his successor after the expiration of his two-year term in office. Over the next three years, rocket attacks by opposition forces caused severe damage to large sections of the capital and a civil war was once again the reality. In the countryside law and order broke down quickly. Afghanistan thus became a country ruled by militia leaders and warlords who ruled their territories arbitrarily.

As there was chaos in the country, different groups, even extremist ones could be established. The Taliban emerged in the fall of 1994. The movement's spiritual and political leader was a former mujahideen fighter, Mullah Mohammad Omar, who mainly recruited students. The Taliban first gained international attention when it was able to defeat groups preying on the transit trade and when it succeeded in getting rid of the corrupt governors of Kandahar (Dupree

et.al.,2023). In the beginning the Taliban could succeed extending its territorial control since the Afghan population was worn down by war. What is more, they were successful in recruiting since a lot of people joined the students, including fighters and some mujahideen defectors. As the Taliban was quickly expanding, they could capture Herat, Afghanistan's third largest city in September 1995. A year later the Taliban succeeded in getting control over the capital, Kabul, defeating both the other anti-government and the Rabbani troops. The northern city of Mazar-e Shari also fell in August 1998. Consequently, by 2001 the Taliban controlled over more than nine-tenths of the country, and in most areas they succeeded in disarming the local inhabitants (Dupree et.al.,2023). However, a loose coalition of mujahideen militias known as the Northern Alliance maintained control of a small section of northern Afghanistan. One of the commanders of the Northern Alliance was the already well-known Ahmad Shah Massoud. His fighters remained the only major obstacle to a complete Taliban victory.

Since the Taliban controlled almost all of Afghanistan it was a question whether their leadership would be recognized internationally. Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates were the only countries which gave formal recognition to the Taliban government after the fall of Kabul (Dupree et.al.,2023). However other countries and the United Nations denied the recognition and criticized the group heavily for its extreme views and human rights abuses, especially regarding the situation of women. UN sanctions were thus also levied on the regime in November 1999 and again in January 2001 (Dupree et.al.,2023). Fighting between the Taliban and the Northern Alliance continued, but the Taliban managed to relatively consolidate its power and control over the majority of the Afghan population.

Taking a look at the brief historical overview of Afghanistan seems to be essential, since it shows the changes and sufferings the population had to go through. The impacts these war-torn years had on the general attitude of the society can provide explanations towards their attitude of foreign actors and towards the concept of democracy as well. While at the beginning of the century the form of government was monarchy, throughout the years the country was turned into a republic, experienced communist rule and also had an extremist regime.

IV.2. The invasion of the USA

After examining the history of Afghanistan in the 20th century this paper goes on examining the events of the 21st century. Starting from 2001 until 2021 the history of the country became inseparable from the USA, since these were the years of the Afghanistan War, which is usually referred to as the longest war on foreign soil the USA has ever fought (Witte, 2023). It is generally known that the USA decided to launch this war as a consequence of the 9/11 terrorist

attacks in 2001, however it seems crucial to examine the further details of this twenty-year period to be able to analyse the question of democracy export.

Although the Taliban regime was at its peak of success in 2001 the invasion of the USA brought an end to their rule. Following the unprecedented terrorist attacks on the World Trade Centre on September 11, 2001, it was clear that the USA had to react and retaliate. Consequently, President George W. Bush announced a comprehensive plan to find and stop terrorists all around the world. This campaign was the so-called "Global War on Terror" (Witte, 2023). Since the terrorists of 9/11 belonged to the Muslim extremist group of al-Qaeda based in Afghanistan the USA demanded the extradition of their leader, Osama bin Laden. However, the Taliban refused these repeated U.S. demands about extradition and about dismantling terrorist training facilities in Afghanistan (Witte, 2023). Consequently, the United States and the United Kingdom soon launched an intensive bombing campaign against the Taliban. What is more, they provided significant support to the Northern Alliance forces hoping that together they could defeat the Taliban. These hopes were fulfilled as a well-coordinated ground offensive launched in mid-November by Northern Alliance troops and U.S. special forces resulted in the fall of the Taliban regime. On December 7 the Taliban surrendered Kandahar, the last city under its control (Dupree et.al., 2023) Consequently, the first phase of the war, where the aim was toppling the Taliban came into an end relatively quickly (Witte, 2023). However, although the control was taken away from the Taliban their group was not completely defeated and Osama bin Laden was not captured, thus the USA still felt the urge to remain in Afghanistan.

The second phase of the war, between in 2002 and 2008 was characterized by the US strategy of having to defeat and dismantle the Taliban and thus the roots of terrorism militarily (Witte, 2023). However, it also became an objective to rebuild the core Afghan institutions, since that was key to ending the spread of potential terrorism (Dobbins et.al.,2008). First, an interim administration was introduced which held power until June 2002. Then a Loya Jirga was convened that selected a transitional government to rule the country until national elections could be held. In January 2004 a new constitution was approved, which called for a directly elected president and a two-chamber legislature. The elections were held in October 2004, in which Hamid Karzai was elected president (Dupree et.al.,2023). Even though the fact that elections were held, and attempts were made to consolidate the institutional base of Afghanistan the ongoing violence throughout 2005 increased significantly and worsened considerably in the following year. Instability and warfare spread as attacks between the U.S.-led coalition and the Taliban forces became more frequent. In July 2006, North Atlantic Treaty Organization

(NATO) troops replaced the U.S.-led coalition assuming control of international military operations across the entire country (Witte, 2023). Fighting between NATO and Taliban forces continued. Civilian casualties remained numerous and in fact in 2008 they reached their highest levels since the start of the war (Dupree et.al.,2023).

The third phase of the war, which was marked by a counterinsurgency doctrine, began in 2008 (Witte, 2023). It accelerated with President Barack Obama's 2009 decision to temporarily increase the U.S. troop presence in Afghanistan so as to guarantee greater attention and commitment from the side of the USA. The larger force was used to implement a strategy of protecting the population from Taliban attacks (Dupree et.al., 2023). A timetable for the withdrawal of the foreign forces from Afghanistan was also drafted. It was believed that from 2011 security responsibilities would be gradually handed over to the Afghan military and police. However, this new approach failed to achieve its aims since insurgent attacks and civilian casualties remained high. What is more, the Afghan military and police units taking over security duties were not prepared enough to resist the Taliban forces. The U.S. and NATO formally ended their combat mission in Afghanistan on December 28, 2014, but retained a reduced force of approximately 13,000 troops to support and train Afghan troops (Dupree et.al., 2023).

Meanwhile the military changes took place the political scenario of the third phase of the war should also be examined. Karzai's term as president was due to expire in May 2009. However mainly due to security reasons the approaching presidential election was postponed from May to August of that year. Karzai believed that he should remain in office until the election took place. However, critics were concerned that maintaining his position would give Karzai an electoral advantage. Consequently, they urged him to step down as obliged by the constitution and turn power over to an interim government. However, in March 2009 the Supreme Court ruled that Karzai could legally retain his position until the election in August. The presidential election was held in August and was followed by weeks of political turmoil. In September a preliminary count awarded Karzai almost 55 percent of the vote, thus indicating that he had won. However, there were more than 2,000 complaints of fraud and intimidation, thus the United Nations-backed Electoral Complaints Commission (ECC) began an investigation into fraud allegations. In mid-October the ECC ruled that the fraudulent activity was pervasive enough to invalidate votes from more than 200 polling stations (Dupree et.al., 2023). As a result, almost one-third of Karzai's votes were invalidated, and his proportion of the vote slipped to 49.7 percent, so a second round of election was needed. Although Karzai first resisted, a second

round of polling was scheduled for November. However, his opponent Abdullah withdrew from the race, claiming that this was in the country's best interest. The runoff election was cancelled, and shortly Karzai was inaugurated as president for a second term (Dupree et. al., 2023).

In 2014 Afghanistan held a presidential election again to pick a successor to Karzai, who was constitutionally barred from seeking another term in office. The first round of voting was held on schedule in April and a runoff was held between Abdullah Abdullah and Ashraf Ghani in June. A preliminary count placed Ghani ahead, but Abdullah demanded a recount as he believed that electoral fraud took place again. Both candidates were claiming victory, thus a period of deadlock followed. The United States put pressure on the candidates, thus in July both sides agreed to accept the results of an internationally supervised audit of the vote (Dupree et. al., 2023). What is more they also agreed to form a national unity government. In this scenario the winner would take the position of president and the losing side would nominate someone to occupy a newly created office with powers similar to those of a prime minister. The situation, however, remained delicate and disagreements continued. On September 21, Ghani and Abdullah signed an agreement under which Ghani would become president and Abdullah accepted the prime minister-like position, which had more of an advisory role.

President Ghani faced a whole new situation. Although NATO's combat mission ended, some U.S. troops remained to train Afghan forces and to assist in counterterrorism operations (Witte, 2023). However, the resurgent Taliban was becoming stronger which posed a threat to how the central government could control Afghanistan. Ghani attempted to stabilize the country, so he began pursuing peace negotiations with the Taliban and other militant groups in 2015. The first formal meeting between the central government and the Taliban was held in July, however the insurgency continued. In 2017 the United States again increased its troop presence boosting support to the central government against the Taliban and other insurgents. However, they were not successful in halting the advance of the Taliban.

As the 2018 parliamentary elections approached, the Taliban aimed to undermine their legitimacy. They called on Afghans to boycott the elections and threatened violence at the polls. The elections were held but an election complaints committee declared votes in Kabul to be invalid, citing fraud and mismanagement, but the election commission rejected the invalidation (Dupree et.al., 2023). With about one-fourth of all votes nationwide cast in Kabul, the dispute over the city's vote endangered the legitimacy of the poll altogether. Final election results were released in May 2019. Meanwhile, in the midst of the electoral count, the push for peace talks was renewed in mid-December 2018 as the United States, Saudi Arabia, and Pakistan met with

the Taliban to discuss how to advance the peace process. Just days later the United States announced its intention to withdraw thousands of its troops from Afghanistan (Witte, 2023). This showed the seriousness of the USA about wanting to end the war and reach a peace deal. However, this announcement caused some difficulties as well, since Afghanistan's central government had not been informed of the decision before it was announced. Consequently, Afghan officials were shocked at the United States' lack of coordination with the government, but they also noted that Afghan forces already handled most security operations anyway (Dupree et.al., 2023). Talks with the Taliban continued into 2019, and U.S. troop levels were sustained during the negotiations.

Because of the many problems with the previous parliamentary elections and the renewed attempt toward peace talks with the Taliban, the presidential election originally set for April was delayed. The election was finally held in September, but due to threats from the Taliban and lack of trust in the electoral process, turnout was significantly lower than in previous presidential elections. Shortly after the election once again the top candidates, Ghani and Abdullah both declared victory. The official vote tally released in early 2020 showed that Ghani had received more than 50 percent of the vote, so Abdullah agreed to a new power-sharing deal in May. Days after the results of the election were released, the United States and the Taliban announced that they had reached an agreement: the United States would withdraw its troops on the condition that the Taliban would pursue peace negotiations with the Afghan government and prevent al-Qaeda and the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant from operating within Afghanistan. The deal was signed on February 29, 2020, and became known as the Doha Agreement (Dupree et.al., 2023).

IV.3. The withdrawal of the USA

This chapter briefly introduces the events of the withdrawal of US troops in 2021. However, the focus is rather on the reasons why the Taliban could take over so quickly, and what this means for the foreign policy of the USA.

Following the Doha Agreement, the USA started to withdraw its troops gradually and the last American soldier left Kabul on August 30, 2021. The events of the withdrawal however sparked controversy since it happened in the midst of the takeover of the Taliban. By August 15, 2021, the Taliban captured Kabul without resistance and President Ghani fled the country. By mid-August thus the Taliban controlled virtually all of Afghanistan, including Kabul (Dupree et al., 20239. Since then, they have reintroduced several measures which were in place during their previous regime before 2001. The oppressive measures set up discriminating women are

particularly concerning. UN experts warn that 20 years of progress for the rights of women have been erased since the Taliban once again came into power (UN OHCHR, 2023). Consequently, the USA has been heavily criticized for the outcome of their final withdrawal from the country. Many claim that these 20 years have been wasted since the resurgence of the Taliban during the withdrawal left the country in almost the same situation as when U.S. forces had arrived in 2001 (Murtazashvili, 2022).

It is worth examining what reasons led to the quick takeover of the Taliban and how all of it contributed to the perceived failure of the USA. Why the narrative of the "wasted 20 years" seems to be very strong is because the Taliban was able to take over quickly and thus once again an extremist group is in power which can discredit the achievements of the USA throughout their presence for instance regarding the improvements in education or in the situation of women (Murtazashvili, 2022). Possible explanations for the relatively simple takeover process of the Taliban contain the idea that the Afghan population was generally fed up with the idea of foreign interventions and invasion, since they have experienced both the presence of the Soviet Union and the USA. Consequently, it is possible that they started to see foreigners as the enemy. What is more it is possible that the population was fed up with the constant wars and sufferings, since 1979 the country did not have peaceful years. Consequently, it is possible that the majority decided to just accept the Taliban takeover as they are tired of fighting and at least they are not foreign invaders.

What can also be seen in the process of withdrawal is that the system which was primarily supported by the United States seemed to collapse quickly. This manifested both in the military and the political aspect. From one part, the Afghan troops trained by the USA did not take up the fight against the Taliban. It is possible that they did not feel confident enough to do so, thus they rather decided to avoid bloodshed. From the other aspect President Ghani rather fled the country instead of trying to avoid the takeover. It has to be seen that the government was strongly centralized which was not able to control all parts of the countryside, which can partly explain the quick takeover. Additionally, the government was also said to be corrupt, and it did not have the trust of the general population in several cases. Consequently, the two pillars of the presence of the USA, the trained military forces and the established government both failed to uphold against the Taliban (Murtazashvili, 2022).

Consequently, what can be observed is that several reasons led to the fact that the emboldened Taliban could make rapid gains amid the withdrawal. Among these factors we find the lack of coordination among the government's armed forces and their lack of responsiveness to the

insurgency, which meant that the government was left with no devices. The USA had too much hope in the Afghan forces, and they believed that the Taliban would not be able to take control over the country before all US troops are withdrawn. However, this did happen which resulted in a chaotic ending for the US withdrawal.

How the events of the last part of the withdrawal unfolded led to the idea that many observers saw the chaotic failure of the US foreign policy. The chaotic images from the airport of Kabul and the picture of the last US soldier leaving the Afghan soil in the middle of the night certainly contributed to the idea that how the withdrawal was carried out meant that the US lost some part of its reputation and prestige regarding foreign policy (Murtazashvili , 2022). Since the Taliban could take over so rapidly the war ended on a bitter note for the USA. Several critics concluded that because of this "shameful" ending the USA has lost its war in Afghanistan since the "democratic system" they built up throughout the years easily collapsed. However, when assessing whether this war was a failure it is important to look at the original aims of the USA and not just the last few months of the war.

V. Findings

After examining and analysing the phenomenon of exporting democracy and the history of Afghanistan this paper provides a case study on democracy export in Afghanistan. Following the withdrawal of the United State of America from Afghanistan in August 2021 conclusions were drawn quickly regarding the events. Several different media outlets and scholars started to analyse and evaluate the twenty years the USA had spent in the country. Most source claimed that once again we could witness the failure of democracy export and the Biden administration was blamed for the "shameful events" that took place during the quick withdrawal process. However, it seems crucial to examine whether we can talk about the goal of democracy export in case of Afghanistan at all. If yes, it is necessary to evaluate its result to a deeper extent than declaring it a clear failure. If the answer is no, then it is needed to analyse why it is still perceived as an example for the failure of democracy promotion in the eyes of the public.

V.1. Examining different aspects of democracy export in Afghanistan

Since the first chapter examined the concept of exporting democracy and the second chapter examined certain questions regarding Afghanistan now it is time to analyse these two main parts together. Since it is the aim of the research to examine the factors that are necessary for determining whether democracy export failed in Afghanistan, we have to analyse these different aspects.

V.1.1. Afghanistan and democracy

First, it is important to note whether building up a democratic system seems feasible in Afghanistan at all. Considering the bloody history of the country it seems self-explanatory that the population had more important things to think about in the last decades than the idea of whether democracy would make things better in the country (Marshall, 2016). What is more, Afghanistan is a multi-ethnic and multicultural country thus it is very hard to unite all of it. This mistake was also made by the government of Karzai and Ghani since they aimed to have a centralized state (Murtazashvili, 2022). However, they might have succeeded in keeping Kabul under control, but they could not extend their influence into further parts of the countryside which is usually controlled by warlords and other local influential people. Consequently, as it was already introduced, the lack of a strong civil society and the lack of democratic history and institutions make it almost impossible to set up a democratic system out of nowhere (Sowers, 2007). Consequently, even if the USA had hopes of exporting democracy to the country, they had to face several challenges. It cannot be stated that Afghanistan is a place where democracy is simply impossible, but it is likely that the population is not prepared for such a change.

V.1.2. Rebuilding Afghanistan and elections

To be able to determine whether democracy export failed, it has to be analysed whether the USA had any intention at all to build up a democratic system in the country in practice. In order to have an answer for this it has to be examined why the USA started the war in Afghanistan and why they stayed in the country for an unexpectedly long time. As it was already stated the main reason for the invasion was to retaliate the 9/11 attacks and to destroy the terrorist groups present in the country. However, as the Taliban was ousted from power other questions arose. How could the USA guarantee that terrorism will not continue to flourish in Afghanistan if they do not help to set up a government which can control its population? Consequently, US troops stayed within the country, and even when the combat forces left, some troops remained so as to train the Afghan forces hoping that they would be effective enough to protect the government.

Following years of war, the first thing that needs to be done is the setting up of institutions (Smith&Light, 2001). The USA thus tried to support the establishment of an Afghan government which could take responsibility for what was happening in the country, and more importantly which would cooperate with the USA in continuing the fights against the Taliban. Consequently, we have to analyse the situation of the Afghan governments and their "democratic institution" between 2001 and 2021. Until 2004 we can talk about an interim administration and a transitional government. The first important point is the new constitution

which was accepted in 2004 and which determined how the structure of the Afghan political system would look like. The constitution described the need for a two-chamber legislation and a directly elected president (Dupree et.al.,2023). This idea shows that the newly set up Afghan government was supposed to be centralized and having a clear figure of authority in the office of the president. Although this idea and the notion of having general elections seem to be democratic it does not necessarily mean that the elections which were carried out in practice really were democratic. In the first presidential elections Hamid Karzai clearly won with 55% of the votes, however when his presidency was due to expire in May 2009 matters got more complicated. As the presidential election was postponed from May to August it was not clear who would govern the country during these months. According to democratic practices the best solution could have been handing over the power to an interim government, since Karzai was obliged by the constitution to step down in May. However, eventually the Supreme Court allowed him to stay in power (Dupree et.al., 2023). As a result, it is possible that Karzai could get electoral advantage as he could use those three extra months for campaign and to influence the voters while remaining in power. This idea seems to violate the institution of democracy and shows how a certain figure of authority was given extra time to be in power.

What is more, we also must examine whether the presidential and parliamentary elections taking place in the last decades where free and fair in Afghanistan. It was already stated, that by allowing Karzai to remain in power the "fair" aspect of the electoral procedure might have been violated. Apart from that it is also crucial to examine what happened when once the 2009 elections were held in August. Basically, political turmoil characterizes this period, since it was not clear which candidate had won the election. There were 2000 complaints of fraud and intimidation thus an investigation was started by the Electoral Complaints Commission which was supported by the United Nations (Dupree et.al., 2023). The organization found that frauds did happen as a result a lot of votes were invalidated. Once again what we see is that a similar event should not happen in a democratic system, thus the institutions did not function well enough to prevent electoral frauds. It is also interesting that before the runoff election the opponent of Karzai decided to step down. It is possible that he believed that would be the best for the country, but it could also happen that he was pressurized to give up, which again could be a sign of undemocratic practices. In the next presidential elections, in 2014 Karzai was not allowed to run anymore since the constitution only allowed two terms for presidency. Consequently, the two major candidates were Abdullah and Ghani and similarly to the previous elections accusations of electoral fraud were made. As we could see both candidates claimed victory causing a political deadlock and the pressure coming from the USA was needed to ease

the situation. In the end again an international supervised audit of the votes decided, thus Ghani became president, and a new office was established for Abdullah (Dupree et.al., 2023). What seems to be interesting, is that again electoral frauds took place and international assistance was needed to legitimate who would lead the country. The 2019 presidential election was quite similar with once again both candidates claiming victory, and in the end Ghani being victorious.

V.1.3. Consolidating democratic norms and traditions

These examples seem to explain why it is not possible to talk about a well-functioning democracy even in the sense of its minimalist definition. The Afghan presidential elections might have been labelled as "democratic" as women were allowed to vote and more candidates competed, but in effect they were not well-functioning. The idea of electoral frauds and the need for intervention from the international community to determine the final results shows how these elections were not free and fair completely. Consequently, they should not be seen as completely legitimate democratic elections.

When assessing whether democracy was exported to Afghanistan, we have to analyse whether democratic traditions and norms could consolidate. As the basis of democracy, the system of elections was already analysed, and it can be stated that the criteria of being free and fair was not completely fulfilled. What is more, it also must be seen whether the "democratic spirit" was transferred to the Afghan population. First, we have to see that turmoil surrounding the elections certainly undermined the trust of the society within the system. What they saw were the power struggles and how it took an immensely long time after every election to determine who the winner was. No wonder, that this system was not appealing to the population, and that they did not see a well-functioning system as the idea of a democracy. In addition, turnout during the elections was not high and it seemed to reduce, and it was especially low in 2019, being less than 20 percent (Dupree et.al., 2023). This can be explained by the fact that people were disappointed in the system, and they had other problems to worry about than voting. However, it is also true that the Taliban tried to prevent people from being able to vote, thus the factor of fear was also high (Dupree, et.al., 2023). Since the government was also considered corrupt by the majority of the population it can be seen why they did not trust the system. Overall, these factors show how the norms and the general trust in a democratic system was not managed to be transferred to the Afghan population. Without the trust in the system and without the understanding and practicing of democratic rights and traditions a democracy cannot be consolidated (Dobbins et.al., 2008).

V.1.4. The goals of the USA in Afghanistan

If we assume that the USA wanted to export democracy into Afghanistan then why did not they do more, if they saw that the system was failing? To answer that question, we have to examine whether the USA ever had the intention to build up a democratic system. As it was already examined the USA did not go to Afghanistan to build a flourishing democracy, but rather to start a war on terrorism (Dupree et. al., 2023). However, as the first phase of the war was over, they of course needed to do something with the political system as well. Consequently, they helped to set up a system under the idea of building a democratic state. However, we have to bear in mind that the main focus was still on military operations and dismantling the terrorist organizations and not on consolidating democracy. Even if we assume that the USA had the noble goal of consolidating democracy it has to be seen that conducting military operations and fighting a war means that it is impossible to start to rebuild a country and introduce a democratic system simultaneously (Monten, 2014). This is mainly true because of the fact that the means needed to be used to win a war often go against the means of rebuilding a country. However, what seems to be more realistic because of this idea is that what the USA needed was a strong government able to help them in their operations, thus it did not matter if it was not completely democratic. The USA wanted to dismantle the Taliban and they wanted to win the war, thus building up a democracy was never the explicit aim. As it can be seen they did not do much to consolidate democratic norms or to set up several institutions, they only seemed to focus on setting up elections, which were also not completely democratic. Democracy was thus not a goal of the invasion of the USA, but it rather became a core part of the reconstruction strategy, at least rhetorically (Fowlers, 2015).

The most important point that has to be seen is that the idea of trying to build up a system similar to a democracy was never the end in Afghanistan, but it was rather the mean. As examined, the West including the USA knows one well-functioning political system, which is democracy, thus of course they try to set up something similar abroad as well if they intervene. As examined, having democracy in a foreign country can be beneficial for several reasons for the USA: economic development, trade, similar values thus less likely to wage war, or in this case the most important point being the idea of providing national security (Smith&Light, 2001). For the USA the most important point was to have a system in Afghanistan which guarantees that nothing similar to 9/11 could happen again. However, to achieve that end it was not necessary to democratize all Afghanistan it might have been enough to set up a strong government which can control its country, and which is loyal to the USA. Consequently, we

have to see that it was not necessarily democracy the USA wanted to achieve, but rather a system which was beneficial for its own interests.

It has to be seen, that the USA would not subordinate its own national interests under the idea of promoting democracy across the world (Fowlers, 2015). Democracy export is rather used as a means of achieving the self-interest of the USA, let them be connected to economy or security. Presidents usually choose democracy promotion as a foreign policy tool to either justify a foreign intervention under the façade of this noble goal, or to achieve a desired end, in this case US national security.

VI. Conclusion

This chapter provides answer to the research question by listing the factors that are necessary to be considered when assessing whether democracy export failed in Afghanistan. What is more, some general conclusions are also drawn from the research and an overall evaluation is provided.

VI.1. Answer to the research question

After examining the phenomenon of democracy export in Afghanistan it became clear what those factors are which must be considered to decide whether it was truly a failure.

First, it was important to examine whether if we consider even the minimalist definition of democracy the criteria were fulfilled or not. In case of Afghanistan, it can be stated that the elections between 2001 and 2021 were not completely free and fair, thus they were not fully democratic. It also has to be examined whether the norms and traditions of democratic systems could be transferred to the population. However, as it was assessed the Afghan population did not have trust in the system and the turnout at the elections was quite low which further weakens the possibility of having a functioning democracy. What is more, it was also analysed whether establishing a democracy seems feasible at all regarding the historical past of a country. In case of Afghanistan, it cannot be stated that it would be impossible to build a democratic system, however it is sure that there are several obstacles and difficulties if someone wishes to do so.

The most important aspect when examining whether democracy export failed in Afghanistan was to analyse whether the USA ever had the explicit intention of exporting it. The answer to this question was the idea that democracy export was never the aim of the USA in the first place, since the main goal was to fight against extremism and terrorism. The idea of democracy only came into the picture when trying to establish a new system with new institutions, but even then, effectiveness seemed to be more important than being fully democratic. Consequently, the case of Afghanistan is not necessarily an example of democracy export, thus it could not fail

there in its traditional sense.

VI.2. General conclusions of the paper

After answering the research question, it also seems to be important to provide a general overview of the research with the most important conclusions.

First it seems important to mention how difficulties regarding definitions and terms can make it harder to use the correct terminology and to effectively examine different phenomena. As it was presented the lack of a universally accepted and clear definition of the concept of democracy makes it difficult to define and to examine the idea of democracy export. Secondly, it is also important to mention that providing a historical overview seems to be of utmost importance when assessing the political system of a country, since several reasons that explain the difficulties of exporting democracy derive from the past. Thirdly, it is also crucial to pay attention to the use of correct terminology, especially when deciding what constitutes as an example of promoting democracy.

Regarding the results of this research, it is important to mention that we have to be careful when assessing what we see as a success or as a failure in the field of international relations. The media generally jumps to conclusions quickly, as they did for instance when they published articles about the withdrawal of the USA meaning the failure of democracy export in Afghanistan. It is possible that it was true that the foreign policy of the USA suffered some grievances due to the events and the outcome of the withdrawal. However, whether the USA failed its original aims of fighting against terrorism seems to be more complex, thus it is left for further research to examine. What is relevant in this case is to further emphasize that when examining whether democracy export failed the most important factor to look at is if it was ever an aim. As it could be seen democracy export was not the end and was not the goal of the USA, and it was not a serious tool, rather something that supported the efforts of the USA in its rhetoric. Consequently, democracy export could not fail in Afghanistan if it was never the real aim of the USA. Still, it is true that with the takeover of the Taliban any hopes of building a democratic system shattered. It remains unclear that even if democracy export would be the clear aim and was supported by all means possible, a democratic system could ever be established in Afghanistan.

VII. Bibliography

Ball, T. & Girvetz, H. K. et. al. (2023, April 4). *Liberalism*. Encyclopedia Britannica. https://www.britannica.com/topic/liberalism

Boniface, P. (2020). *A nemzetközi kapcsolatok atlasza*. Pallas Athéné Könykiadó Kft.

Brinkley, D. (1997). Democratic Enlargement: The Clinton Doctrine. *Foreign Policy*, No. 106 (Spring, 1997), pp. 110-127. Slate Group, LLC

Cambridge Dictionary. (n.d.). *The meaning of „export".*

Dahl, R.A. (1971). *Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition).* Yale University Press.

Dobbins, J.& Poole, M.A. et. al. (2008). *Post-9/11 Nation-Building: Afghanistan and Iraq.* After the War: Nation-Building from FDR to George W. Bush. RAND Corporation

Dupree, N. H. & Allchin, F. R. et. al. (2023, April 13). *Afghanistan*. Encyclopedia Britannica. https://www.britannica.com/place/Afghanistan

Elliott, J. E. (1994). Joseph A. Schumpeter and The Theory of Democracy. *Review of Social Economy*, *52*(4), 280–300. http://www.jstor.org/stable/29769747

Fowler, M. W. (2015). A Brief Survey of Democracy Promotion in US Foreign Policy. *Democracy and Security*, *11*(3), 227–247. https://www.jstor.org/stable/48602372

Fukuyama, F. (1992). *The End of History and the Last Man.* Free Press.

Insua, T. (2014). *A Maximalist Approach to Measure Democracy: Lessons from the EIU Democracy Index.* Harvard Kennedy School.

International Churchill Society. (n.d.). *The worst form of government (Quote).*

Isaac, J.C. (2017.08.09.) *Is there illiberal democracy?; A problem with no semantic solution.* Eurozine. https://www.eurozine.com/is-there-illiberal-democracy

Kornai, J. (2016). *The system paradigm revisited: clarification and additions in the light of experiences in the post-socialist region.* Acta Oeconomica, 66(4), 547–596. http://www.jstor.org/stable/26574616

Krouse, R. W. (1982). Polyarchy & Participation: The Changing Democratic Theory of Robert Dahl. *Polity*, *14*(3), 441–463. https://doi.org/10.2307/3234535

Library of Congress (1917). *Woodrow Wilson before Congress: Transcript.* https://www.loc.gov/exhibitions/world-war-i-american-experiences/about-this-exhibition/arguing-over-war/for-or-against-war/wilson-before-congress/

Marshall, T. (2016). *Prisoners of Geography: Ten Maps That Explain Everything About the World*. Elliott and Thompson Limited

Mayhew, D.R. (2016). *Robert A. Dahl: Questions, concepts, proving it.* Imprint Routledge.

Monten, J. (2014). *Intervention and State-Building: Comparative Lessons from Japan, Iraq, and Afghanistan*. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 656 (001). p. 19.

Murtazashvili, J. B. (2022). The Collapse of Afghanistan. Journal of Democracy, 33(1), 40–54.

Schumpeter, J. (1950). *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy.* Harper.

Smith, K., & Light, M. (Eds.). (2001). *Ethics and Foreign Policy* (LSE Monographs in International Studies). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511491696

Sowers, J. (2007). *Why is democracy elusive in the Middle East?* The University Dialogue.

Sztompka, P. (1991). The Intangibles and Imponderables of the Transition to Democracy. *Studies in Comparative Communism*, *24*(3), 295–311. http://www.jstor.org/stable/45367110

Taylor, B. D., & Botea, R. (2008). Tilly Tally: War-Making and State-Making in the Contemporary Third World. *International Studies Review*, *10*(1), 27–56. http://www.jstor.org/stable/25481929

The National Archive (1776). *Declaration of Independence: A Transcription.* https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/declaration-transcript

United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR).(2023, March 8). *Afghanistan: UN experts say 20 years of progress for women and girls' rights erased since Taliban takeover (Press release).* https://www.ohchr.org/en/press-releases/2023/03/afghanistan-un-experts-say-20-years-progress-women-and-girls-rights-erased

Witte, G. (2023, April 6). *Afghanistan War*. Encyclopedia Britannica. https://www.britannica.com/event/Afghanistan-War

Zakaria, F. (1997). The Rise of Illiberal Democracy. *Foreign Affairs*, *76*(6), 22–43. https://doi.org/10.2307/20048274