

*Strengthening Coexistence Policy*

*Shaheen Rassoul*

---

**A SURVEY OF COEXISTENCE SENSITIVITY  
IN INTERNATIONAL DEMOCRATIZATION  
& GOVERNANCE POLICIES**

---



Brandeis University

---

Coexistence International

## Preamble

---

Democratization and governance have become key focal points in the international community's response to persistent ethnic and civil conflicts during the last decade. The realization that poorly governed and failing states produce political, military, and economic incentives which threaten regional and international security has led to renewed interest in the domestic dynamics of states. The end of the Cold War also has provided an opportunity to focus attention on the fallout from superpower rivalry on those areas where the Cold War went hot, and was notable as a time intense internal turmoil and international disregard. In the post 9/11 world, establishing and supporting democracy has reemerged as the bedrock of US foreign policy, a policy - the ends if not necessarily the means of which - are endorsed by governments across the political spectrum and around the world. In 2005 USAID's office for Democratization and Governance spent \$10.8 billion on democracy promotion<sup>1</sup>. There is nearly unanimous consensus in the international community that democratic governance is a fundamental prerequisite for maintaining political legitimacy, facilitating the efficient production and equitable distribution of domestic resources, preventing the rise of unstable and tyrannical regimes, and thereby guaranteeing a peaceful international system. Key parties engaged in democracy and governance work such as the United States Institute for Peace (USIP) and various branches of the United Nations and the World Bank have helped to establish a causal link between a lack of accountable and transparent democratic regimes and a range of destabilizing dynamics, ranging from poverty and economic collapse to violent civil and ethnic unrest. These links are reinforced by important developments on the ground. In Nigeria, the Congo, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Iraq, Pakistan, and Korea, unstable or otherwise unresponsive regimes teeter on the edge of civil disorder, poverty, or simple collapse. Meanwhile, in Turkey, Chile, Ukraine, Peru, Afghanistan, Lebanon, Haiti, and Liberia, we see examples in which politicians and military strongmen have responded to the collective voice of citizens standing by their own principles and values, and the international community has provided legitimacy and renewed support.

Coexistence International at Brandeis University (CI) is making important contributions to the democratization and governance field. CI promotes an interdisciplinary and complementary vision of coexistence by addressing a need for developing self-aware, coherent, and cohesive approaches regarding integration of intercommunal coexistence and conflict-sensitive programming in democratization activities. With renewed support from the Alan B. Slifka Foundation, CI is in a unique position to strengthen the work of policy makers, practitioners, researchers, advocates, organizations, and networks promoting coexistence at local, national, and international levels.

This Survey has been prepared to encourage the development of coherent coexistence practice both within and outside of the coexistence and conflict resolution community. The Survey is presented in light of CI's conviction that the promotion of sustainable coexistence in war-torn communities depends on a) increasing the awareness of

---

<sup>1</sup> USAID's Budget Summary for FY 2005. Not inclusive of special programs to address needs of survivors: [http://www.usaid.gov/policy/budget/cbj2006/cent\\_progs/central\\_dcha\\_dg.html](http://www.usaid.gov/policy/budget/cbj2006/cent_progs/central_dcha_dg.html). Accessed March 3, 2006.

coexistence sensitivity in the democratization and governance sector, and b) catalyzing the sharing of knowledge and experience amongst coexistence practitioners from a variety of different sectors. It is designed as a resource that addresses the need for a short and concise study which identifies key organizations that explicitly focus on democracy and governance throughout the world and briefly analyzes the extent to which coexistence-sensitive programming is incorporated into their policies and activities. The material in this Survey yields important insights into the policies, projects, and priorities of key actors from across the political spectrum and over a wide geographic and thematic area.

The importance of incorporating coexistence practices and conflict-sensitive perspectives in conflict-prone areas is becoming ever more pronounced. Mary Anderson's influential work on minimizing the negative impacts of development aid and relief has coincided with heightened conflict awareness by a broad range of actors, for whom unique local customs, histories, and cultural and political needs form integral building blocks in the design and implementation of interventions. The emerging field of peacebuilding is predicated on holistic perspectives in which ethnic identity, interpersonal and inter-communal communication, and native- change dynamics play a determinative role in developing sustainable and effective resolutions to violent conflict. Practitioners who engage in this field utilize critical skills that are proving increasingly important to international relations: the ability to foster dialogue in culturally complex environments; to recognize ethnic and identity conflicts and design participatory processes within which to negotiate their equitable solutions; to make international institutional policies responsive to local conflict dynamics; and to help constructively integrate local customs and traditions with democratic values such as women's rights, respect for ethnic pluralism, and governmental and economic accountability.

As this Survey demonstrates, democratization and governance programs are making conscious efforts to incorporate coexistence-sensitive programming into their activities. For example, intergovernmental organizations such as the Organization of American States increasingly utilize conflict resolution trainings as components of its international civil society and capacity development projects in Latin America. The World Bank's conflict assessment frameworks examine ethnic and intercommunal dimensions of conflict, and similar frameworks are becoming a standard part of other agencies' tool kits. Finally, the Carnegie Endowment's significant work on the links between democracy and conflict have propelled concepts such as *prevention*, *mitigation*, and *resolution* into the international relations lexicon. In part, these developments are based on the fundamental realization that political settlements seeking legitimate government and a return to national sovereignty must be flexible and responsive to the constituencies that they seek to serve. They must promote inclusion, respect for ethnic, religious and cultural diversity, and models of governance established on local conditions and needs.

However, fundamental challenges remain. The coexistence and conflict resolution field still must come to terms with critical theoretical issues such as the nature of peace, war and human and group relations vis-à-vis state institutions. No longer in its infancy, the field also must account for the numerous different approaches, methodologies and perspectives that characterizes its work, thereby catalyzing the developing into a mature and self-aware

set of practices. Academics must work with field staff and practitioners to close the gap between theory and practice, and in doing so help develop potential models for interventions that yield objective, predictable and replicable outcomes. The lack of this type of ‘scientific’ predictability impedes efforts by NGOs and practitioners to secure funds from large donors, for whom predictable and concrete outputs are the *sin qua non* of accountable development policies. Rather than focusing on short-term results and predictability, funders need to re-evaluate their time scales and criteria for success, and the coexistence field must provide systematic criteria from which they evaluate their activities. What’s more, policy makers face strategic geopolitical imperatives defined by the inevitabilities of national security as well as other political realities that collectively determine official programming priorities. Compounding these challenges is the fact that there is a startling lack of clear and coordinated action by the range of different actors engaged in democratization and emerging coexistence work - from small local organizations to NGOs, researchers, academics, advocates, policymakers, and cultural workers who help establish the agendas for multinational bodies. The fragmented landscape amongst coexistence advocates and practitioners impedes the field and undermines the ability for coherent, coordinated, and collective action.

This Survey seeks to respond to several of these challenges by presenting a “state of the field.” The information contained in this survey is based exclusively on research of each organization’s home page and other online resources. Although the accuracy of its analysis depends on whether online resources were updated and representative of respective organizations’ activities at the time of research, the Survey is a good starting point for the coexistence field. It represents an ongoing process of learning and discovery for CI and the entire coexistence community. It will be supplemented by follow-up interviews and meetings to better identify challenges, opportunities and lessons in the practice of and advocacy for coexistence work. The outcome of these two exercises will form the basis for additional research, including a lessons learned and best practices handbook, which will assist in an increased coherence in the coexistence field and yield important insights on successfully integrating coexistence practices into democratization and governance policies.

*Shaheen Rassoul is Country Director for Global Rights in Kabul, Afghanistan. He has managed and directed development and emergency relief programs in South/Central Asia. He holds a BA in Chinese Literature and Language from Reed College, and an MA in International Conflict Resolution and Political Development from the School of International Affairs at Columbia University.*

# Table of Contents

<b>1. UNITED NATIONS AGENCIES</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1. UNITED NATIONS DEMOCRACY FUND (UNDF).....	1
1.2. UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (UNDP); BUREAU FOR CONFLICT PREVENTION AND RECOVERY (BCPR) .....	1
1.3. UNITED NATIONS DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL AFFAIRS (DPA); ELECTIONS ASSISTANCE DIVISION (EAD) .....	3
<b>2. INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND MULTILATERAL DEVELOPMENT BANKS</b> .....	<b>3</b>
2.1. WORLD BANK (WB).....	3
i) <i>Asia Development Bank (ADB)</i> .....	4
ii) <i>Inter-American Development Bank (IDB)</i> .....	5
<b>3. OECD AND NATIONAL GOVERNMENTAL PROGRAMS</b> .....	<b>5</b>
3.1. AUSTRALIAN AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT: CENTER FOR DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS (CDI) .....	5
3.2. CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY (CIDA).....	6
3.3. DANISH DEVELOPMENT AGENCY (DANIDA) .....	7
3.4. DEUTSCHE GESELLSCHAFT FUR TECHNISCHE ZUSAMMENARBEIT (GTZ) GMBH .....	7
3.5. JAPAN INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AGENCY (JICA) .....	8
3.6. NETHERLANDS DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION (NDC) .....	9
3.7. NEW ZEALAND AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT (NZAID) .....	9
3.8. NORWEGIAN AGENCY FOR DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION (NORAD).....	10
3.9. OECD DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE (DAC).....	11
3.10. SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY (SIDA) .....	12
3.11. U.K. DEPARTMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT (DFID) .....	12
3.12. UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT (USAID) .....	13
<b>4. REGIONAL / MULTILATERAL GOVERNMENTAL BODIES</b> .....	<b>14</b>
4.1. EUROPEAN COMMISSION – EUROPEAN INITIATIVE FOR DEMOCRACY AND HUMAN RIGHTS (EIDHR).....	14
4.2. ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES (OAS); UNIT FOR THE PROMOTION OF DEMOCRACY-DEPARTMENT OF DEMOCRACIES AND POLITICAL AFFAIRS (DDPA).....	15
4.3. ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE (OSCE) .....	16
<b>5. GRANT-MAKING / PHILANTHROPIC ORGANIZATIONS</b> .....	<b>17</b>
5.1. FORD FOUNDATION .....	17
5.2. NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR DEMOCRACY (NED).....	17
5.3. ASIA FOUNDATION (AF).....	18
5.4. OPEN SOCIETY INSTITUTE (OSI)/SOROS FOUNDATION .....	19
<b>6. THINK TANKS, RESEARCH &amp; ADVOCACY GROUPS</b> .....	<b>20</b>
6.1. AMERICAN ENTERPRISE INSTITUTE (AEI) .....	20
6.2. CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE (CEIP).....	21
6.3. CARTER CENTER.....	21
6.4. CENTER FOR STRATEGIC AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES (CSIS) .....	22
6.5. COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS (CFR) .....	23
6.6. FREEDOM HOUSE.....	23
6.7. FOUNDATION FOR THE DEFENSE OF DEMOCRACIES (FDD) .....	24
6.8. INTERNATIONAL CRISIS GROUP (ICG).....	24
6.9. SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL (SSRC) .....	25
6.10. THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION .....	25
6.11. THE RAND CORPORATION (RAND).....	26

6.12.	THE WASHINGTON INSTITUTE FOR NEAR EAST POLICY (WINAP) .....	27
-------	---	----

**7. NON-GOVERNMENTAL POLITICAL PARTY & DEMOCRATIZATION ORGANIZATIONS.....27**

7.1.	CLINTON FOUNDATION/GLOBAL INITIATIVE .....	27
7.2.	CLUB OF MADRID .....	28
7.3.	COUNCIL FOR A COMMUNITY OF DEMOCRACIES (CDC).....	28
7.4.	DEMOCRACY COALITION PROJECT (DCP).....	30
7.5.	FRIEDRICH EBERT STIFTUNG (FES).....	30
7.6.	RIGHTS AND DEVELOPMENT .....	31
7.7.	INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF ELECTIONS SYSTEMS (IFES).....	31
7.8.	INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR DEMOCRACY AND ELECTORAL ASSISTANCE (IDEA) .....	32
7.9.	NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS (NDI) .....	33
7.10.	NETHERLANDS INSTITUTE FOR MULTIPARTY DEMOCRACY (NIMD).....	34
7.11.	PARTNERS FOR DEMOCRATIC CHANGE (PDC).....	34
7.12.	UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE (USIP).....	35
7.13.	WESTMINSTER FOUNDATION FOR DEMOCRACY (WMF) .....	36
7.14.	WORLD MOVEMENT FOR DEMOCRACY (WMD).....	36

## 1. United Nations Agencies

### 1.1. *United Nations Democracy Fund (UNDF)*

**Background and Mission:** President Bush proposed the United Nations Democracy Fund at the September 2004 session of the General Assembly. Over 141 nations embraced the project as of April 2005, and by July 2005, United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan declared its creation. The Funds' purpose is to provide legal, technical, and financial assistance, and advice to new and emerging democracies. It is designed to function in harmony with other United Nations organs in an "integrated, holistic, capacity-building and demand-driven approach." It is a voluntary fund housed in the United Nations Fund for International Partnerships ([UNFIP](#)), but with its own Executive Head who reports to an Advisory Board of Member States. A dedicated support office will arrange for monitoring, evaluation, and auditing of the program. A trust fund maintained by contributions from member states will provide support for the fund's activities

**Activities:** UNDF has not been in operation long enough to operationalize its mandate. Its activities will include providing electoral assistance in contexts such as Afghanistan and Iraq. UNDF activities will be designed to promote democratic governance specifically by reaching out to marginalized groups and promoting inclusive political processes and mechanisms. Furthermore, it will convene a democracy caucus whose aim will be to "forge common positions on democracy-related resolutions and activities," such as the Community of Democracies. It will also help build post-conflict institutions that will cultivate the rule of law and human rights, and it will bolster security capacities.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** The United Nations has demonstrated firm commitments to pursuing programming that promotes coexistence in newly established democracies. However, this programming has been decentralized and pursued by a variety of different agencies at different times. This programming does not tend to exhibit over-arching policy coherence and often cannot be duplicated in a systematic way. The Democracy Fund seeks to remedy some of these shortcomings in the United Nations' democracy programming by integrating into existing institutions and filling in operational gaps. While the United Nations' record for duplicating policy and developing parallel intuitions and institutional gridlock has resulted in ineffective and uncoordinated activities in practice, there are noteworthy indications that progress is being made towards integrated coexistence practices (see UNDP).

The Democracy Fund lacks a sufficiently long record from which to determine a preference for models of democracy. However, a short [manifesto](#) on the Fund clearly states that it "will not support any single model of democracy [ . . . ] democracy does not belong to any single country or region."

### 1.2. *United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); Bureau for Conflict Prevention and Recovery (BCPR)*

**Background and Mission:** UNDP is the United Nations' main global development program. It operates on the ground in 166 countries, working with them on their own

solutions to global and national development challenges. UNDP is a primary mechanism for meeting the Millennium Development Goal, and it commissions the Human Development Report. UNDP focuses on 5 main areas: [Democratic governance](#), poverty reduction, crisis prevention and recovery, energy and environment, and HIV/AIDS. While the United Nations is often reluctant to make explicit mention of democratization as a part of its mandate, the HDR notes that strengthening human rights and deepening democracy are fundamental to reducing global poverty. This is based on the increasingly strong correlation between human development, social capacity, and political openness. The Millennium Development Goals consider democratic governance an “enabling environment.”

**Activities:** The correlation between democratic government and social development is part of the reason that UNDP’s mandate has broadened to include indicators such as political and institutional development. UNDP’s core services are designed to support national processes of democratic transitions by focusing on policy advice and technical support; strengthening capacity of institutions and individuals; improving advocacy, communications, and public information; promoting and brokering dialogue; and networking knowledge and sharing good practices. Though UNDP’s services and expertise are scattered throughout the agency, the Bureau for Conflict Prevention and Recovery ([BCPR](#)) is mandated to apply a conflict-sensitive lens in conflict prevention and peacebuilding efforts within the UNDP. BCPR is a new UNDP program with a specialized mandate to enhance UNDP’s efforts for sustainable development, reduce impact of crisis and violence, and help build the foundations for recovery.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** UNDP has taken important steps to mainstream and integrate a conflict-sensitive approach in their development work. Increasingly, participatory programming informs UNDP’s peacebuilding modalities – especially within BCPR. However, there is no explicit evidence of coexistence work within UNDP’s approach to democratization. A [recent BCPR report](#) on UNDP’s activities in prevention does highlight isolated cases of communal level coexistence work – such as that carried out in Niger – but concludes that UNDP struggles to systematize these practices in a coherent theoretical and operational framework. Successful experiences in South and Central America are positive signs in the use of intercommunal approaches to democratization. The [Democratic Dialogues in Latin America & Caribbean](#) supports the contention that the promotion of democracy and good governance must incorporate dialogue as a tool to promote nonviolent ways of addressing conflicts before they turn violent. Civil dialogue in Latin America has reinforced UNDP’s belief in locally arrived-at solutions to political challenges. The Crisis Prevention and Practice Area (CPRA), Conflict-related Development Analysis (CDA), and BCPR are testaments to these developments. Yet while there is recognition that context specific and tailor made approaches should form the background for any peacebuilding work, UNDP acknowledges that – as with many UN initiatives – it is difficult to translate policy into concrete, systematic, and effective programming strategies on the ground.

### 1.3. **United Nations Department of Political Affairs (DPA); Elections Assistance Division (EAD)**

**Background and Mission:** EAD is the focal point within the United Nations system that is responsible for organizing and holding electoral processes to facilitate the return to democratic national sovereignty. Kofi Annan established the office in 1992, following a request by the General Assembly to designate an office to coordinate requests for electoral assistance. The division functions under the purview of the DPA, almost exclusively in post-conflict contexts and internationally sanctioned peacekeeping operations. As a United Nations body, EAD is uniquely qualified to represent and enforce internationally sanctioned criteria for democratic procedures. EAD formulates its mission broadly; “Historically it included advancing the principle of self-determination of peoples through the development of self-government and decolonization. In the [modern period](#), it has entailed establishing and advancing the principle of democracy and political rights.”

**Activities:** EAD provides two main forms of electoral aid: Standard electoral assistance consisting of small scale and technical activities that do not require a General Assembly or Security Council Mandate; and major elections missions that are conducted in the context of a comprehensive mandate and an accompanying peacekeeping presence. EAD activities include evaluating government requests for electoral assistance, conducting needs assessment missions, and collaborating with other United Nations system agencies in the design of electoral assistance project activities and in developing the electoral components of peacekeeping operations. In addition, EAD provides logistical and advisory support to international observer groups, facilitates the coordination of assistance among donor countries and United Nations system agencies, maintains a roster of electoral experts, organizes conferences and training courses, assists in the administration of United Nations electoral trust funds, and serves as the organizations' institutional memory in the electoral assistance field.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** EAD does not make explicit commitments to intercommunity level coexistence work in its programming. It aims to articulate and assure the implementation of internationally sanctioned procedures, and to establish institutions to facilitate this end. EAD's technocratic approach to democratization tends to supercede grass-roots perspectives. EAD's constrained role as a United Nations body frequently compels it to maintain a level of distant impartiality that does not allow for engagement at the intercommunal level. EAD does adhere to the principles of inclusion and participation for promoting self-determination. Nevertheless, it does not advocate for specific approach or any models for achieving these ends in a democratic framework.

## 2. **International Financial Institutions and Multilateral Development Banks**

### 2.1. **World Bank (WB)**

**Background and Mission:** Headquartered in Washington, DC, the World Bank is one of the worlds largest banks, with open membership by developing and developed countries, and one of the world's largest funders of development activities. After emerging as a

post-conflict and reconstruction bank in the 1940s, the WB engaged in strictly financial and developmental assistance. Post Cold War intrastate violence and increasing international attention to fragile and failing states led the WB to develop wider notions of reconstruction that included conflict-sensitivity and political development – an area traditionally beyond the WB’s area of activity.

**Activities:** The Conflict Prevention and Reconstruction Unit ([CPR](#)), developed in 1997, was the WB’s response to the necessity for integrating conflict factors into poverty reduction activity. The Unit administers the [Post-Conflict Fund](#) (PCF), which supports planning, piloting, and analysis of groundbreaking activities through funding governments and partner organizations in early stages of transition from conflict. In conjunction with the Bank’s operational policy on Development Cooperation and Conflict, the CPR has developed a Conflict Analysis Framework ([CAF](#)) focusing on six areas: social and ethnic relations; governance and political institutions; human rights and security; economic structure and performance; environment and natural resources; and external factors. The CAF offers analytical tools for the assessment of, and recommendations on, strategies for effectively targeting areas with latent or full-blown conflict. These tools and strategies are integrated into WB’s Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers, and the WB attempts to operationalize them as policy ends in its country programming.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** At the policy level, the CAF is highly sensitive to coexistence practice and suggests a number of different strategies for democratization. For example, among de-escalatory indicators for increased equity of governance and political institutions, the CAF cites the encouragement of inclusionary unitary governments with increased autonomy and guaranteed minority rights, or federalized or consociation models of government. Measures of de-escalation for social and ethnic groups include fostering cohesion, intercommunal respect, and crosscutting collaboration among groups; increasing incentives for cooperation and coexistence through political and economic measures; and working with dominant social myths and cultural traditions to increase intercommunal cohesion and peace. In theory, the WB CAF suggests substantial flexibility with regard to models for democratization and it articulates a framework for coexistence practice and intercommunal work. However, the extent to which Framework is implemented in practice remains unclear. Interviews, consultations, and research on [specific projects](#) are needed to determine the scope of implementation and success of programming.

The WB explicitly endorses decentralized local government and parliamentary institutions. This reflects WB’s concerns for accountability, transparency, and the promotion of open markets and competition in public and economic life.

#### **i) Asia Development Bank ([ADB](#))**

**Background and Mission:** Established in 1977 with headquarters in the Philippines, ADB is a major regional bank under the WB. Its 2000 staff members work to reduce poverty throughout Asia and the Pacific. ADB has a lead role in the reconstruction and rehabilitation in Afghanistan, East Timor, and post-tsunami South East Asia.

**Activities:** ADB's website makes casual mention to post-conflict intercommunal work. There is no mention of democracy or governance work.

**Coexistence-Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** None.

## ii) Inter-American Development Bank (IDB)

**Background and Mission:** IDB is one of the oldest self-contained regional funding institutions in the world. It was founded in 1959 on an agreement established by the Organization of American States (OAS). IDB's mission is to help Latin America and the Caribbean develop through social, economic, education, and health programs and institutions, to promote regional integration, and to provide direct support to the private sector, including micro enterprises.

**Activities:** IDB's main activity is to provide loans, grants, and guarantees to encourage the development of economic activity. It also provides policy advice and technical assistance in a range of different [areas](#).

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** IDB's efforts in promoting democracy and peaceful coexistence throughout Latin America and the Caribbean fall into several different categories. It has published its own literature on [indigenous development and democracy](#), including a collection of essays that explores issues such as autonomy and indigenous participation in democratic institutions. IDB also supports programming to promote coexistence in regional initiatives in countries experiencing conflict, such as a [project](#) in Columbia, *Developing Citizenship Competencies to Prevent Violence and Build Democracy*. The project utilizes curriculums based on coexistence conflict resolution theory to be applied throughout schools in Bogotá, Columbia. In addition, IDB has helped finance a \$100 million project, *Support for Peaceful Coexistence and Citizen Security*, designed to consolidate the peace process in several cities in Columbia. IDB has built on experiences with this programming, as demonstrated in its commitments to support activities outlined in the latest [report](#) to the Summit of the Americas, published in Nov 2005. The report sets out specific activities to promote democratic governance and political development by advocating for decentralized political structures, further commitments to ensure the participation of marginalized ethnic groups and other demographics, and coexistence programming in Honduras, Nicaragua and Guatemala.

## 3. OECD and National Governmental Programs

### 3.1. ***Australian Agency for International Development: Center for Democratic Institutions (CDI)***

**Background and Mission:** The CDI is an initiative of the Australian government's external aid program, Australian Aid. It was established in June 1998 to assist in supporting good governance initiatives in developing countries, in particular the development and strengthening of democratic institutions in the Pacific area. The CDI is based at the Research School of Social Sciences, Australian National University. It works with Australian institutions to provide support to developing countries through

information exchange, training, short-term placements, and networking. Within two broad themes of anti-corruption and human rights, the CDI focuses its activities on four key sectors: parliamentary processes, judicial processes, the media, and civil society.

**Activities:** CDI combines technical assistance and capacity building programs with networking and interpersonal knowledge exchange, including the dissemination of CDI's research on democracy and its institutions. Its focus countries include Indonesia and Timor-Leste in South East Asia and Papua New Guinea, Fiji, Solomon Islands, and Vanuatu in Melanesia. CDI seeks to improve the operation and understanding of parliamentary machinery by members of parliament and parliamentary staff in partner countries; to strengthen political parties in key countries in the region through improving the knowledge and skills of members and officials of political parties; and to extend networks in the region between Australian political party officials, parliamentarians, and their counterparts.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** The CDI's programs focus on delivering technical assistance to facilitate in building political parties and parliamentary governance. Given that it operates in regions with considerable ethnic conflict and facilitates the consolidation of peace processes such as those in Afghanistan and Timor Leste, it's surprising to find that it doesn't integrate any coexistence programming into its activities.

CDI does not provide information indicating specific models or methodologies for democracy programming. However parliamentary procedures and multi-party political mechanisms are among stronger areas of programming.

### 3.2. **Canadian International Development Agency ([CIDA](#))**

**Background and Mission:** CIDA is a Canadian government agency, formed in 1968, and it is responsible for implementing Canadian international foreign aid and development cooperation. Its mission is to "facilitate the efforts of the people of developing countries to achieve self-sustainable economic and social development in accordance with their needs and environment, by cooperating with them in developing activities, and to provide humanitarian assistance, thereby contributing to Canada's political and economic interests abroad in promoting social justice, international stability and long-term relationships for the benefit of the global community."

**Activities:** CIDA implements comprehensive programs in international development, emergency relief, humanitarian aid, foreign aid, and development cooperation in the area of 13 [global issues](#). CIDA's activities are based on the MDGs and are informed by human security perspective.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** [Human Rights, Democratization, and Good Governance](#) conduct CIDA activities for democratization. As a strong proponent of human security approaches, CIDA explicitly endorses coexistence and conflict-sensitive approaches in its programming. In addition, CIDA's focus on human rights within the democratization agenda leads to a priority on inclusiveness, equity, and recognition of the importance of peacebuilding approaches in all its work.

A review of recent CIDA projects in governance combined with other resources demonstrates that CIDA supports local governance and reform, decentralization, and the incorporation of ethnic, conflict, and gender sensitivity.

### 3.3. **Danish Development Agency ([DANIDA](#))**

**Background and Mission:** DANIDA is the agency responsible for implementing the government of Denmark's foreign assistance and development activities.

**Activities:** DANIDA focuses on promoting sustainable development through poverty-oriented economic growth. It acts as a funder to multilateral organizations through bilateral agreements with governments, as a sponsor of its own activities and those of partner organizations through the ground. DANIDA's main areas of focus are: social and economic development; human rights, democratization, and good governance; stability, security, and the fight against terrorism; refugees, humanitarian assistance, and regions of origin; and the environment. The majority of DANIDA's funding is allocated for programming in Sub-Saharan Africa; however, it does make significant contributions to other target area projects in Afghanistan and in Southeast Asia. DANIDA development policy is somewhat unique in that it makes equally clear commitments to focus on improving international human rights as well as tackling the threats of terrorism.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models of Democracy:** Although DANIDA does not make an explicit policy choice to integrate coexistence programming into its development activities, one can find a high degree of sensitivity in both its programs and policy statements. The [Vision for Priorities](#) policy document establishes links between terrorism and lack of self-determination and repressive regimes in a similar vein as USAID policy. DANIDA indicates that its democracy and governance policy will "help eradicate the basis for radicalization and extremism that may lead to religious intolerance and terrorism. As a new priority, the Government will focus particularly on efforts that can contribute to promoting the dialogue between cultures and religious tolerance."

Policy papers and a list of projects posted on DANIDA's Tools and Papers [site](#) indicate a preference for [decentralization](#), regional political structures, and parliamentary governance.

### 3.4. **Deutsche Gesellschaft fur Technische Zusammenarbeit ([GTZ](#)) GmbH**

**Background and Mission:** GTZ is frequently mischaracterized as a governmental agency such as USAID. In fact, it is a private corporate entity that operates with federal oversight. It specializes in international technical assistance and international development. It was established in 1975 and is owned by the German National Bank. GTZ's main client is the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ). However, it does provide services to other public and private clients on a for-profit basis. All profit that it makes is channeled back into its developmental objective of improving peoples' living conditions on a sustainable basis.

**Activities:** GTZ runs nearly 3000 projects in 131 countries. Project areas include rural development, economic development and employment, good governance, and social

development. GTZ themes that cut across all these areas are gender, crisis prevention, youth, AIDS, emergency aid, poverty, food and nutrition, and social and ecological standards.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** GTZ's program on [Good governance](#) runs activities to promote [democracy and the rule of law](#), and [decentralization](#). Although specific activities are not posted on GTZ's site, the program claims to undertake programming to strengthen disadvantaged and marginalized populations by facilitating networks within civil society. A [report](#) which lays out GTZ's policy on the promotion of good governance in post conflict sensitivities demonstrates that it does incorporate coexistence-sensitive policies in its democracy programming, albeit through a relatively structural, procedural, and top-down approach. GTZ proposes institutional mechanisms to promote ethnic inclusiveness in post-conflict and ethnically charged contexts, for example, through proportional representation or by enabling multi-ethnic coalitions within political institutions.

GTZ's policy on governance advocates for models of democracy that provide institutional guarantees for ethnic and regional autonomy, power sharing structures, and "integrative decentralization." Reconciliation and remembrance are the only activities explicitly endorsed to deal directly with intercommunal violence.

### 3.5. *Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)*

**Background and Mission:** JICA traces its roots to post-WWII Japanese technical assistance programs. These programs were consolidated in 1962, accompanied by a trend towards more comprehensive and coherent policies for assisting Japanese immigrants and others overseas. In 1974, the group of programs responsible for developing and implementing overseas assistance activities were once again consolidated into a single office called JICA. JICA became an independent administrative institution in 2003. The current President of JICA is Sadako Ogata, the former UN High Commissioner for Refugees, and a pioneer in the field of human security. JICA's mission is "to support endeavors of developing countries and their people through promoting a 'human security' concept in its activities. Greater attention should be given to the participation and empowerment of people in the development process in order to enhance ownership at the national and community level and ensure sustainability of activity results."

**Activities:** JICA's strengths derive from its traditional role as a technical service provider. Its main activities are institution building, organization strengthening, and human resources development designed to enable developing countries to pursue their own sustainable development. In addition to the standard range of activities pursued by national development agencies, JICA fulfills its mission to promote sustainability with programming for fisheries, energy and mining, transportation, and natural environment conservation.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** JICA's [governance](#) programming relates to 3 areas: The building and operation of a democratic political system for the state, the state's administrative organs themselves, and the cooperative relationships

between the government, civil society, and the private sector. Based on a brief look at [publications](#) on democratization and governance, including a list of JICA's projects on democratization, coexistence sensitivity does not appear to form an explicit part of its programming. JICA's experience in the field of [peacebuilding](#) has been gained from its work in Afghanistan, Cambodia, Sri Lanka, and East Timor. This experience forms part of JICA's [policy on peacebuilding](#). While the policy establishes a comprehensive and pragmatic framework from which to utilize coexistence and conflict-sensitive approaches, it does this with respect to development and aid activities, rather than in a context of democratization.

### 3.6. ***Netherlands Development Cooperation (NDC)***

**Background and Mission:** Headquartered at the Hague, the NDC coordinates all Dutch foreign policy in the area of international aid and development policy. The Netherlands frames most all of its development aid policy entirely within the context of fulfilling the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), and it [rates](#) as one of the highest quality federal aid programs in the world. The Netherlands invests heavily in its development activities and is one of the few countries in the world to fulfill international standards of allocating 0.8 percent of its GNP to development policy.

**Activities:** The NDC bases its programming on MDGs; thus, primary areas of activity are poverty alleviation, education, HIV/AIDS, water, the environment, and reproductive health. The NDC attempts to implement its development policy by conducting [partnerships](#) with groups in civil society and through integrative regional approaches. NDC also channels money through several [international organizations](#) in bilateral agreements to [governments](#) of developing countries, to like-minded donor [countries](#), and to [NGOs](#). A quarter of its budget is allocated to various United Nations agencies. NDC partnerships are based on a policy [framework](#) that involves intensive dialogue and discussion. NDC also sponsors [research](#) supporting its development activities.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** NDC utilizes a comprehensive and long-term approach to development policy in a range of different contexts. Thus, it is surprising that an explicit commitment to coexistence sensitivity does appear in any of its programming. NDC does support conflict resolution activities indirectly in post-conflict countries such as Rwanda and Afghanistan; however, third parties and grantees carry out these activities on their own, and apparently without any explicit coexistence-sensitive policy framework set out by NDC.

Governance is a strong theme in the MDGs and the topic receives some attention in the economic investment climate, various official procedures and practices, and NDC development policy, albeit mostly with regard to improving transparency. NDC does not explicitly endorse any one model for democracy.

### 3.7. ***New Zealand Agency for International Development (NZAID)***

**Mission and Background:** NZAID was established in July 2002 as an independent agency with its own minister and vote. Its aim is to implement New Zealand's national development aid policy, especially in the Pacific region.

**Activities:** NZAID implements programming in 10 key areas: Education, health, sustainable livelihoods, environment, human rights, leadership and government, economic development, peace building and conflict prevention, humanitarian support, and community safety. It also commissions [research](#).

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** NZAID is a relatively new office and there is an insufficient track record from which to gauge success of its programming. Nevertheless, NZAID does not explicitly endorse intercommunal solutions to conflict, nor does it articulate a policy on democratization. Its [Peacebuilding and Conflict Prevention Program](#) is active in Southeast Asia and the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC) recognized NZAID's work on conflict at the intercommunal village-level in Indonesia. In addition, NZAID has commissioned Indonesian academics to produce 2 [reports](#) on conflict resolution.

Democratization is not a policy objective of NZAID, however it has laid the groundwork for increased participation in local government through civil-society/governance programming in the Southern Pacific Island of [Vanuatu](#).

### **3.8. Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation ([NORAD](#))**

**Background and Mission:** NORAD is a directorate under the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Norwegian development assistance began at the end of the 1940s with joint-UN programming in India, then later in Tanzania. In 1968, the Norwegian government consolidated the administrative structures for these activities into NORAD. NORAD gives technical advice and coordinates all governmental aid. Its aims are to “contribute towards lasting improvements in economic, social and political conditions for the populations of developing countries, with particular emphasis on ensuring that development aid benefits the poorest people.”

**Activities:** NORAD implements a comprehensive development portfolio including programming for children, HIV/AIDS, culture, environment, education, women and human rights, corruption, and heavy investment in civil society and private enterprise.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** Although not referred to as such, NORAD does integrate coexistence practices in its human rights and democracy activities. These activities are carried-out from a human security perspective, rather than a strictly political one. As such, NORAD has supported programming to effect political conditions on the village by working with [children](#)'s education. NORAD's support for human rights and democracy in [Bangladesh](#) aimed to improve community level governance by transforming popular awareness and perceptions, integrating grassroots work such as inter-community and inter-NGO dialogue, as well as other participatory processes to address issues of social equality, discrimination, and gender.

NORAD does not endorse a single model of democracy; however, it participates in governance as a funder and source for the [evaluation](#) of other programs. Reports on NORAD's website indicate that primary concerns in the sector of governance and democratization include ethnic equity, access to resources, consistency of practices across a range of local and international actors, the practice of democratic values, and adherence to democratic principles by key actors.

### 3.9. **OECD Development Assistance Committee ([DAC](#))**

**Background and Mission:** OECD is a multilateral body comprised of 30 industrialized countries that are committed to democracy and market democracies. OECD provides comparative data, analysis, and forecasts that are designed to help governments compare policy experience, seek answers to common problems, identify good practice, and coordinate policies. In 1961 the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) took over for the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC). OEEC's primary task was to administer Canadian and American reconstruction aid for the reconstruction of post-WWII Europe under the Marshall Plan. Except for several notable exceptions, OECD membership has traditionally been accorded to an exclusive group of countries representing the economic North. Although OECD has traditionally been focused on issues within its own member-countries, since 1961 it has sought to “build strong economies in its member countries, improve efficiency, hone market systems, expand free trade and contribute to development in industrialized as well as developing countries.” The Development Assistance Committee (DAC) is OECD's primary body responsible for cooperation with developing countries.

**Activities:** DAC is a forum of bilateral donors that work together to maximize effectiveness, sustainability, and efficiency of development activities. DAC does not provide funds or other resources. Rather, it concentrates on promoting development aid practices that increases the capacity for aid recipients to participate in the international community, and on reducing poverty and increasing citizens' participation in society. DAC focuses on 14 main topics related to the development and administration of development assistance. The DAC Network on Conflict, Peace, and Development Cooperation ([CPDC](#)) is a forum that brings together experts from bilateral and multilateral bodies, NGOs, and civil society, to “define and develop common approaches to peace.” CPDC publishes a [manual](#) of entry points and issues for preventing conflict and promoting peace, a set of [guidelines](#) on prevention and violent conflict, a series of [issue briefs](#) that concentrate on various specific aspects of peace work in conflict settings, as well as policy briefs for governments and practitioners. DAC's Fragile States Group convenes experts on governance and conflict prevention to “facilitate co-ordination and share good practice to enhance development effectiveness in ‘fragile states’”. The Group works on 4 focus areas: principles for good international engagement, service delivery, aid flows, and whole of government approaches. In addition to its authoritative [Development Cooperation Report](#), DAC maintains databases with statistics on aid and development and posts a series of [publications](#) on best practices, case studies, reports, policy materials, and other resources for the development assistance community.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** A survey of DAC's policies and [guidelines](#) in CPDC prevention reveals a mature, comprehensive, and pragmatic awareness of the relationship between peacebuilding strategies that address ethnic and gender marginalization and the development and support of democracy in all levels of society. DAC's comprehensive expertise in a broad range of development assistance - including post-conflict resolution - allows for a range of practical suggestions in implementing programming to maximize the possibility for supporting coexistence within a democratization framework.

DAC explicitly endorses decentralizing governance and political management, due in large part to its recognition that maximizing diversity and civil-participation depends on supporting institutions that are based on local cultures and histories. DAC's governance materials, however, appear to pay less explicit attention to the links between peacebuilding and governance; its focus here is on coordination between external and internal bodies, transparency, and maximizing efficiency of delivery systems for international development assistance.

### 3.10. *Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA)*

**Background and Mission:** SIDA is a central government agency that operates under the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs and is responsible for just over 60 percent of Sweden's Official Development Assistance (ODA). "The overriding goal of Swedish development cooperation is to contribute to making it possible for poor people to improve their living conditions."

**Activities:** SIDA's main role is to act as a funder to partner organizations that are contributing to SIDA's [development priorities in its areas of interest](#). SIDA also provides human resources and analysis for development programming. SIDA's horizon of activities range from short-term emergency interventions to long-term sustainable development. Its perspective is grounded in a rights-based approach and it works to improve conditions for the poor, marginalized, and disempowered.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** SIDA implements conflict and peace programming out of its [Division for Peace and Security](#), which operates within the [Department for Co-operation with NGOs, Humanitarian Assistance, and Conflict Management](#). The Division does not contextualize its conflict programming within a democratization agenda, but rather focuses on making the strategies and activities of international development assistance more conflict-sensitive. As such, its conflict assessment, related publications, and policy are directed more towards the international community than to the societies in which they operate.

SIDA's [Department for Democracy and Social Development](#) contains the [Division for Democracy and Governance](#). The division is responsible for the "operative area democratic governance, which includes issues concerning democracy, human rights, popular participation, good governance, and the principles of rule of law." The division is presently concerned with decentralization and local democracy, as well as principles for financial management to support rule of law in governance. Unlike SIDA's peace activities, its democracy programming does integrate conflict resolution mechanisms. A few examples include inter-ethnic and inter-communal approaches to conflict in [Colombia](#), [El Salvador](#), [Sri Lanka](#), [Rwanda](#). There is no evidence that SIDA endorses a specific model of democracy. However, it does provide earmarked support for central, regional, and local level public administration, as well as a range of legislative processes.

### 3.11. *U.K. Department for International Development (DFID)*

**Background and Mission:** In 1929, the government of the UK assumed official responsibility to oversee continuing aid to its colonial territories. Since then, the task of setting policy for the administration of aid to those territories has been assumed by a

range of different political bodies, culminating in the development of a cabinet-level department in 1997. Today, DFID is the primary governmental department responsible for the allocation of 0.3 percent of Britain's GNP to international aid. DFID is committed to halving the number of people living in extreme poverty and hunger, ensuring that all children receive primary education, promoting sexual equality and giving women a stronger voice, reducing child death rates, improving the health of mothers, combating HIV & AIDS, malaria and other diseases, making sure the environment is protected, and building a global partnership for those working in development.

**Activities:** DFID participates in comprehensive aid, relief, and development activities. It has implemented activities in over 25 overseas offices and it has more than 2,500 staff working in nearly every country in the world. Most DFID aid is allocated for programming in Asia and Africa. In addition to implementing its own programming, DFID provides bilateral aid to governments. Forty-three percent of DFID's budget is allocated to multilateral agencies such as the World Bank, the United Nations, and the European Union.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** DFID does not make an explicit commitment to any type of coexistence programming; however, it has provided funds for programs that pursue inter-community work in a democratization agenda. The [Political Participation Fund](#) for Iraq seeks to support inclusive political processes that promote social cohesion by addressing marginalized, poor, and vulnerable groups. DFID does also promote programming indirectly through its funds and grants to other organizations and multilateral agencies.

DFID policy does not take a position with regard to different models for democracy.

### **3.12. *United States Agency for International Development (USAID)***

**Background and Mission:** USAID traces its roots to the Marshall Plan, the joint political, economic, and military initiative to rebuild post-WWII Europe. In 1961, the John F. Kennedy administration reorganized various US foreign assistance programs under one office, thereby establishing USAID. A strong link between foreign aid and US security, economic, and political interests - the basis for the Marshall Plan - has always driven USAID policy. Today, USAID is the primary channel for US foreign assistance, and its activities are designed to reinforce the relationship between the alleviation of international poverty and the promotion of democracy with advancement of a range of strategic and long-term US national interests. As such, USAID's "work in development joins diplomacy and defense as one of the three key pieces of the nation's foreign policy apparatus." Its mission is to "create a more secure, prosperous, and democratic world for the benefit of the American people and the international community."

**Activities:** USAID provides assistance in sub-Saharan Africa, Asia and the Near East, Latin America and the Caribbean, and Europe and Eurasia. The agency works in 100 developing countries and in close partnership with private voluntary organizations, indigenous groups, universities, American businesses, international organizations, other governments, trade and professional associations, faith-based organizations, and other U.S. government agencies. USAID has working relationships, through contracts and

grant agreements, with more than 3,500 companies and over 300 U.S.-based private voluntary organizations. USAID provides assistance for technical assistance and capacity building, training and scholarships, food aid and disaster relief, infrastructure construction, small-enterprise loans, budget support, and enterprise funds credit guarantees.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** Conflict management and resolution is a central concern in USAID's strategic framework. The Office for Conflict Management and Mitigation ([CMM](#)) has a cross-cutting mandate to "integrate or 'mainstream' best practices of conflict management into more traditional development sectors such as democracy and governance, economic growth, natural resource management, security sector reform, social development, and peace building." CMM's activities inform USAID's democracy programming, and coexistence-sensitive programming is found throughout its policies. This is evidenced in CMM's publications, such as its Conflict Assessment [Framework](#), Land and Conflict [Toolkit](#), and Youth and Conflict [Toolkit](#). Each advocates for integrating peacebuilding/management activities to address ethnic and religious conflicts through cross-communal and intercommunal programming.

As a key objective of US foreign policy, democracy and governance are principal areas for USAID activity. The Agency assumes responsibility for the creation, support, and consolidation of democratic political movements throughout the world, particularly in the Middle/Near East and Eastern Europe. A primary US governmental repository for the implementation details of these developments, USAID's democracy website provides a wealth of technical and policy material on the promotion of democracy. Its [technical publication series](#) includes reports on conducting democracy assessments, a handbook on decentralization and local democratic governance, and a guidebook for democracy and governance indicators. USAID's democracy and governance strategic [framework](#) provides a comprehensive policy, which takes pains to make clear that USAID advocates for no single model of democracy. Although insufficient time has passed to gauge success, recent experience in Afghanistan and Iraq indicate that USAID's investments in short-term procedural outcomes such as elections and the development of political institutions are not matched with sufficient-term strategies to cultivate democratic values at the grassroots level.

## **4. Regional / Multilateral Governmental Bodies**

### ***4.1. European Commission – European Initiative for Democracy and Human Rights ([EIDHR](#))***

**Background and Mission:** EIDHR is a EU program that is administered through Europe Aid. Europe Aid is the EC's external aid implementing instrument. EIDHR has been in operation since 2001. It seeks to protect and promote democracy and human rights in "third countries."

**Activities:** Approximately €100 million is available annually to support human rights, democratization, and conflict prevention activities to be carried out primarily in partnership with NGOs and international organizations. The partners eligible for financing are regional and international organizations, non-governmental organizations,

national, regional, and local authorities, official agencies, and other community-based groups. EIDHR's goals in democracy, good governance, and human rights are a reflection of the EU's broader commitments: Working together with civil society to raise awareness of human rights issues, supporting the promotion and entrenchment of democracy, promoting the participation of all segments of society and building local civil networks, building the capacity of national and local institutions to support democracy and justice, and encouraging good governance and the rule of law.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** EIDHR's policy goals regarding democratization are infused with a deep respect for the principles of liberty and freedom as presented in various international conventions for social and political rights. In addition, internal working documents indicate these principles form the bedrock of EIDHR's outlook. However, there are no concrete examples of EIDHR's commitments to integrating conflict resolution approaches in its actual programming.

The situation with democratization is similar; there are clear policy-level commitments to mainstreaming a holistic conflict-lens in democracy programming, but few concrete examples to demonstrate these commitments in action.

#### **4.2. *Organization of American States (OAS); Unit for the Promotion of Democracy-Department of Democracies and Political Affairs (DDPA)***

**Background and Mission:** The OAS is a regional organization founded in 1948 and composed of 34 democratic countries of the Western Hemisphere. Its purpose is to strengthen cooperation and advance common interests. Deeply invested in the promotion and protection of regional and global democracy, OAS's unequivocal commitment to democracy is articulated in the American Democratic Charter, *Peoples of the Americas have a right to democracy and their governments have an obligation to promote and defend it.*" The Department of Democracies and Political Affairs in the Unit for the Promotion of Democracy is the OAS's key institution for strengthening and defending regional democracies.

**Activities:** The objective of the DDPA is to "promote democracy as the best option for promoting poverty reduction, economic and social development, individual liberties, freedom of expression and of the press, respect for human rights, and the strengthening of the security and identities of the people, as well as various other key elements of liberty and opportunity." DDPA comprises three offices: The [Office for the Prevention and Resolution of Conflicts](#), the [Office for the Promotion of Democracy](#), and an office for member states.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** DDPA's Office for Conflict Prevention and Resolution runs several programs that incorporate [dialogue](#), [conflict resolution and management](#), and [participatory approaches](#) for the consolidation of local democratic government. It also conducts research that systematizes and analyzes experiences with these methodologies in countries such as [Guatemala](#) and [Nicaragua](#). None of these programs appear to have an explicitly intercommunal or inter-ethnic dimension. However, OAS's program on democracy's High-Level Inter-American

Network on Decentralization, Local Government and Citizen Participation ([RAID](#)) aims to research, systematize, and implement processes to connect high level officials and experts from the ministries and government agencies responsible for decentralization, strengthening regional and municipal administrations and civil society participation. Examples of RAID's work areas include processes for formulating, designing, coordinating and executing public policies which incorporate a gender perspective; strengthening decentralization, regional and municipal administrations, citizen participation and civil society; the constitutional and legal framework governing relations among various levels of government; the transfer of responsibility from the central to the local level, including funding options and means of strengthening technical capabilities and their impact on democratic governance; and opportunities and mechanisms for citizen participation at the regional, municipal, and community levels, as well as policies and strategies for promoting them. RAID also convenes a symposium on local government. [This example](#) sets out an action program with specific strategies for the Caribbean.

#### **4.3. Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe ([OSCE](#))**

**Background and Mission:** The OSCE is the world's largest regional security organization with 55 member states. Chairmanship rotates annually and is held by the Foreign Minister of a participating state. The Organization employs about 3,000 staff in 18 missions and field operations located in South-Eastern Europe, the Caucasus, Eastern Europe, and Central Asia. Missions work on the ground to facilitate political processes, offer a forum for political negotiation, prevent or settle conflicts, and promote civil society and the rule of law.

**Activities:** OSCE's activities include anti-trafficking, arms control, border management, combating terrorism, conflict prevention, and democratization. Its aims in democratization are to bring "people together across borders at a professional level to discuss issues and develop capacities necessary for the consolidation of democratic culture . . . including methods of governance, participation of women and men in political life, respect for the rule of law and the development of transparent legislation."

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** Many OSCE activities are designed to build or support political and/or military regimes and institutions. The maintenance and support of international statist structures is one of OSCE's primary responsibilities - an area from which it obtains the most competitive advantage. The OSCE key institution responsible for promoting democratization is the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights ([ODIHR](#)), which operates in the fields of democratic development, human rights, tolerance, nondiscrimination, and rule of law. ODIHR's activities in democratization take account of the need to garner support of civil society through institutional building and the promotion of a "culture of democracy." Key activities for ODIHR include inclusion and participation, legislative processes, and political parties. Each activity is structural in nature and geared towards increasing awareness of, and participation in, democratic mechanisms and institutions by different track-one stakeholders. Conversely, OSCE's [Tolerance and Nondiscrimination Program](#) seek to build "democratic and pluralistic societies, where ethnic, cultural, and religious diversity

is not only tolerated but respected and valued.” The office’s key areas are in interfaith and intercultural dialogue, education on the holocaust, and promotion of freedom of religion or belief. No specific activities were found in this area. While the Conflict Prevention Center ([CPC](#)) under the Secretariat plays a key role in the areas of crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation, many of its activities fall under information exchange and track-one political/military engagement. Based in the Hague, OSCE’s [Office of the High Commissioner on National Minorities](#) has taken a lead on problems involving ethnic and communal violence by working to promote “respect for standards that guarantee minority rights protection, to encourage dialogue between communities, to create opportunities for minority language use, to protect cultural identity, and to encourage minority participation in public affairs.” The High Commissioner utilizes quite diplomacy informed by a rights-based approach, advocating to the international community; promulgating policy suggestions and public statements, and cultivating political space to engage in dialogue with other high level diplomats and national leaders.

## **5. Grant-Making / Philanthropic Organizations**

### ***5.1. Ford Foundation***

**Background and Mission:** Edsel Ford and other Ford company executives chartered the Ford Foundation in 1936 to administer Ford Company funds for charitable purposes. The Ford Foundation has operated under the directorship of several highly placed and influential American statesmen, and has historically maintained close ties within the US intelligence and policy community. Today the Ford Foundation is a non-profit, independent organization that seeks to bring about large-scale societal impacts. Its goals are to strengthen democratic values, reduce poverty, and promote international cooperation and human achievement.

**Activities:** The Ford Foundation distributes generous grants and loans through its 12 global offices in New York, Africa, the Middle East, Asia, Latin America, and Russia. It invests in asset building and community development; education, media, arts, and culture; and peace and social justice.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** In its [governance](#) activities, the Ford Foundation seeks to “strengthen the responsiveness of state and local governments, improve the ability of national government institutions to secure peace and social justice, and build democratic global governance in the arenas of international economics, conflict and security.” Although the Foundation makes no explicit claim to support coexistence programming or any specific approach to democratization, it has provided funds for a number of [organizations](#) identified here with explicit commitments to coexistence practice, such as the Carnegie Endowment.

### ***5.2. National Endowment for Democracy ([NED](#))***

**Background and Mission:** The NED is a private, nonprofit organization created in 1983 to strengthen democratic institutions around the world through nongovernmental efforts. An independent, nonpartisan board of directors governs the Endowment. The NED is the umbrella organization for the National Democracy Institute (NDI) and the International

Republican Institute (IRA). The Endowment is a result of US congressional efforts to integrate formerly covert programs for promoting political outcomes in foreign countries into an open and accountable process for the promotion of international democracy. “The Endowment is guided by the belief that freedom is a universal human aspiration that can be realized through the development of democratic institutions, procedures, and values. Democracy cannot be achieved through a single election and need not be based upon the model of the United States or any other particular country. Rather, it evolves according to the needs and traditions of diverse political cultures. By supporting this process, the Endowment helps strengthen the bond between indigenous democratic movements abroad and the people of the United States -- a bond based on a common commitment to representative government and freedom as a way of life.”

**Activities:** With its annual congressional appropriation – totaling \$42 million in 2004 - NED provides hundreds of grants per year to support pro-democracy groups in Africa, Asia, Central and Eastern Europe, Latin America, the Middle East, and the former Soviet Union. The NED supports projects that promote political and economic freedom, a strong civil society, independent media, human rights, and the rule of law. Under the [NED Forum](#), the NED publishes the [Journal of Democracy](#), one of the most widely read journals on the promotion of democracy throughout the world. It also convenes research and seminars and acts as a clearinghouse for groups and institutions working to build and maintain democracy throughout the world, runs a fellowship program, and maintains an extensive Democracy Resource Center. The NED [Democracy Projects Database](#) provides information on 6000 projects supported by seven international grant giving foundations: the National Endowment for Democracy (USA); Westminster Foundation for Democracy (Great Britain); Rights & Democracy (International Centre for Human Rights and Democratic Development) (Canada); the Foundation Jean Jaurès (France); the Swedish International Liberal Centre (Sweden); the Alfred Mozer Foundation (The Netherlands); and Fondation Robert Schuman (France).

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** NED does not make explicit reference to specific models for democratization, nor does it mention mainstreaming activities to promote coexistence. Rather, it promotes democratization through supporting a number of distinct and ostensibly unrelated areas. As a funder, the NED has dispensed numerous and substantial grants for activities such as conflict resolution and the promotion of tolerance and resolution of ethnic, religious, or other conflicts. Examples include inter-community and community based dialogue and training, holistic training in development, reconciliation initiatives and coalition building, and public awareness campaigns. Grants dispensed to promote “Women” “Youth,” and “Human Rights” also appear to integrate sensitivity into intercommunal coexistence-sensitive approaches.

### 5.3. *Asia Foundation (AF)*

**Background and Mission:** The Asia Foundation is an American NGO that began operating in South/Pacific Asia as a partner to American intelligence agencies during the American-Vietnam War. Its aim was to facilitate the US military and intelligence community’s access to civil society; to educate; to conduct student exchange programs; and to mobilize and recruit. The Foundation has been a conduit between American policy

makers from the intelligence and foreign policy community and educational and philanthropic interests that convergent in greater-Asia. To date, the Foundation has a presence in 18 countries throughout Asia. In 2005, it has distributed more than \$65 million dollars in aid and grants. It is “committed to the development of a peaceful, prosperous, just, and open Asia-Pacific region.

**Activities:** The Foundation supports programs to improve governance, law, economic development and reform, women’s rights, and international relations. Some of the ways that it pursues these aims are to provide substantial grants to organizations in the field and to practitioners for conducting research; to provide books, software and other educational materials; to conduct extensive exchange programs between practitioners, activists, and intellectuals; to provide support in the form of technical assistance; to develop training and educational programs at the grass-roots level; and to promulgate AF publications for a wide variety of audiences.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** AF’s [Governance Law and Civil Society](#) arm conducts programs in legal reform, elections, human rights, conflict management, countering corruption, and local governance. While the Foundation conducts a number of programs that seek to empower civil society and connect it with local and national political bodies, explicit intercommunal work within ethnic groups does not figure anywhere into AF’s local governance or elections work. However, the [Foundations Conflict Management](#) programs in Sri Lanka, Philippines, and Thailand examine the role of clans and ethnic violence in the context of democratization.

#### 5.4. **Open Society Institute ([OSI](#))/Soros Foundation**

**Background and Mission:** OSI is a private grant making program of the Soros Foundation, created in 1993 and funded by the philanthropist, George Soros, to support his foundations facilitating democratic transitions in eastern and central Europe and the former Soviet Union. OSI has since expanded its activities to over 60 countries where democracy is a particular concern, including the United States. OSI has offices in Baltimore, Maryland, Washington, D.C., Budapest, Brussels, London, and Paris. The Institute “aims to shape public policy to promote democratic governance, human rights, and economic, legal, and social reform. On a local level, OSI implements a range of initiatives to support the rule of law, education, public health, and independent media. At the same time, OSI works to build alliances across borders and continents on issues such as combating corruption and rights abuses.”

**Activities:** OSI runs programming through [Initiatives](#) that cover a range of activities to address specific issues that foster open and free societies. OSI has supported over 30 Initiatives throughout the world in areas such as art and culture, media and communications, health, youth, and justice. All Initiatives target macro social and cultural systems and are intended to facilitate the development of transparent and democratic processes by incorporating programming designed to stir public debate and alter public policies within different local constituencies. Although each Initiative has a pre-determined project life cycle, [many](#) spin off into entities no longer affiliated with

OSI. OSI also runs various open forum series, which provide platforms for discussion and exploration of pressing issues in a policy framework.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** OSI's policy statements and its Initiatives both indicate an underlying awareness of cultural fragmentation that often results from authoritarian rule and closed and rigid societies. Its work with local organizations in [Latin America](#) demonstrates commitments to principles of coexistence; however, there is no evidence of explicitly intercommunal programming. Similarly, OSI's [Southeast Asia](#) programming integrates various tools for coalition building and capacity development, although there is no evidence of specifically intercommunal conflict-sensitive work. OSI's Human Rights and Governance [program](#) provides grants to local human rights and governance organizations in Europe and Central Asia. It dispensed [grants in 2004](#) to increase the capacity of local organizations to effectively litigate and advocate for issues; however, coexistence sensitivity did not appear to be a salient concern. OSI's human rights programming in the [Middle East and North Africa](#) do integrate coexistence principles.

## 6. Think Tanks, Research & Advocacy Groups

### 6.1. *American Enterprise Institute (AEI)*

**Mission and Background:** AEI is a think tank that was founded in 1943. "The American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research is a private, nonpartisan, not-for-profit institution dedicated to research and education on issues of government, politics, economics, and social welfare. AEI's purposes are to defend the principles and improve the institutions of American freedom and democratic capitalism--limited government, private enterprise, individual liberty and responsibility, vigilant and effective defense and foreign policies, political accountability, and open debate." AEI hosts around 175 policy makers, academics, and practitioners. Lynne Cheney, Jeanne Kirkpatrick, Richard Perle, and Newt Gingrich are among the distinguished scholars and former and present policy makers who collectively promote a robust US foreign policy at AEI.

**Activities:** AEI sponsors research and conferences and publishes books, monographs, and periodicals. Research is conducted through three primary research divisions: Economic Policy Studies, Social and Political Studies, and Defense and Foreign Policy Studies. It also works through several specialized programs such as the Brady Program on Culture and Freedom, the [AEI-Brookings Joint Center for Regulatory Studies](#), the [National Research Initiative](#) (which sponsors research by university-based scholars), the [AEI Press](#), and [The American Enterprise](#) magazine.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** As an organization deeply vested in the maintenance and promotion of US domestic democracy, AEI's position on international democratization is strongly idealist-interventionist, invoking coercive political and military approaches informed primarily by US foreign policy interest. There is little in AEI's literature that demonstrates support for intercommunal work based on models of coexistence or other approaches to fostering international democracy.

According to statements by senior AEI fellows, the NED plays a critical role in promoting democratic values and institutions in other countries.

## 6.2. ***Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*** ([CEIP](#))

**Background and Mission:** The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace is a private, nonprofit organization born out of Andrew Carnegie’s desire to end international war. It was one of the first think tanks to conduct international affairs research and today remains strongly internationalist in character. The Endowment is “dedicated to advancing cooperation between nations and promoting active international engagement by the United States. Founded in 1910, its work is nonpartisan and dedicated to achieving practical results.”

**Activities:** The Endowment conducts research; publishes books, articles/op-eds, and policy briefs; convenes forums; and creates new international networks and institutions. Among its recent books on Democratization and Governance are “Funding Virtue: Civil Society Aid and Democracy Promotion,” “Critical Mission: Essays on Democracy Promotion,” and “Aiding Democracy Abroad: The Learning Curve.”

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** Under the leadership and advocacy of Timothy Carothers, the Endowment’s [Democracy and Rule of Law Project](#) promotes a broad and inclusive approach to democratization, with literature espousing the critical importance of civil society and community-based approaches to supporting intercommunal coexistence. The Endowment’s webpage does not endorse policies towards democratization, peacebuilding, or intercommunal/coexistence work; however, its publications advocate for a critical examination of failure of current policies and envisioning of different approaches to democratic transformation.

## 6.3. ***Carter Center***

**Background and Mission:** President Jimmy Carter and his wife founded The Carter Center in 1982. The Carter Center is an independent facility based at Emory University. It seeks to advance human rights and prevent human suffering throughout the world by bringing together interns, young activists, and practitioners with partners on the ground.

**Activities:** The Center runs health, agriculture, and mental health programming that is focused on minimizing preventable diseases and promoting human security throughout sub-Saharan Africa. Its [Democracy Program](#) and [CR Program](#) utilize a human rights approach in seeking to prevent and resolve armed conflict and develop democratic societies worldwide.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** The Center’s democracy programming consists of elections monitoring, initiatives for strengthening civil organizations’ local capacity, and promoting the rule of law. Together with NDI and the UN Election Division (EAD), the Carter Center acted as the Secretariat in promulgating a [Declaration of Principles](#) for international election observation and conduct of international election observers, published in Oct 2005. Civil Society activities consist of programs that “train media in the responsibilities of a free press, facilitates dialogue and reconciliation among

competing national groups, and provides useful working tools to improve the effectiveness of human rights monitors and advocates. Priority is given to supporting the political participation of traditionally marginalized segments of society, such as women, indigenous peoples, refugees, and youth.” Human rights attorneys and advocates as well as judges and other legal professionals facilitate the Center’s HR and Rule of Law work. The Center’s Conflict Resolution program consists of projects to address the underlying causes of conflict, seeking to promote social and political stability through negotiation, mediation, peace implementation, violence prevention, peace building, and reconciliation. Intercommunal and identity based work has been carried out in Ecuador and Guyana.

#### 6.4. **Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS)**

**Background and Mission:** “The Center for Strategic and International Studies provides strategic insights and practical policy solutions to decision makers committed to advancing global security and prosperity. Founded in 1962 by David M. Abshire and Admiral Arleigh Burke, CSIS is a bipartisan, non-profit organization headquartered in Washington, D.C with more than 220 employees. Former U.S. Senator Sam Nunn became chairman of the CSIS Board of Trustees in 1999, and John J. Hamre has led CSIS as its president and chief executive officer since April 2000.”

**Activities:** The Center runs programming in well over a dozen geographic and thematic [areas](#), particularly relevant to the convergence of international political, economic, and military interests. In addition to holding forums and providing venues for conferences and meetings, and promulgating reports and policy materials for the popular and policy audiences throughout the world, the Center hosts international fellows, sponsors its own research, and promotes partnerships with institutions, fellows, and the academic and policy community. The [Post-Conflict Reconstruction project](#) bills itself as “the leading source for authoritative analysis, recommendations, and evaluation of conflict-prone societies and post-conflict reconstruction, [and it] pursues reforms necessary to increase U.S. and international capacity to engage in conflict-prone environments.” In addition to developing a framework for addressing post-conflict issues, it has developed specific action strategies for Sri Lanka, Sudan, Iraq, and Afghanistan. The [PCR Brief](#) is an important bi-weekly newsletter of current issues in post-conflict reconstruction.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** CSIS’s approach to post-conflict work is informed by a [framework](#), jointly developed with the Association of the United States Army (AUSA), and published in 2002. As with the WB CAF, CSIS’s framework includes a wide variety of community building measures to deal with the myriad of issues - not just governance and democratization - in post-conflict and conflict prone counties, rather than focusing on strictly political/military and economic issues. The framework includes inter-ethnic and inter-faith work based on indigenous practices. However, the framework is only document in-theory. In practice, the Reconstruction Project’s [literature](#) on Sri Lanka and Afghanistan explicitly promotes intercommunal work to facilitate national reconstruction. Its literature on Iraq does not.

## 6.5. *Council on Foreign Relations (CFR)*

**Background and Mission:** Begun in 1921, CFR is an independent non-partisan research center which has grown into one of the most influential policy think tanks in Washington. It is “dedicated to producing and disseminating ideas so that individuals and corporate members, as well as policymakers, journalists, students, and interested citizens can better understand the world and the foreign policy choices facing the United States and other governments.”

**Activities:** CFR’s main activities are to convene meetings with world leaders, prominent thinkers, policy makers, and academics; conduct a range of study programs for Council Fellows to produce literature; publish *Foreign Affairs*; and sponsor Task Forces for independent study to influence policy agendas.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** There is very little about intercommunal level coexistence work on CFR’s site. CFR posts several links to documents by academics such as Barnett Rubin and policy makers who advocate for a community based ethnic component to working with/in conflict, but these are few and far-between. Democracy forms a prominent part of CFR’s research and analysis, especially with regard to the Middle East; however, there was little explicit information indicating a policy on specific models or approaches.

## 6.6. *Freedom House*

**Mission and Background:** Freedom House is an independent non-governmental advocacy and research foundation started by Wendell Wilkie and Eleanor Roosevelt in 1941. It seeks to “support the expansion of freedom around the world” through its publications, relationships with the United Nations and senior US policy makers, and advocacy of front-line practitioners on the ground.

**Activities:** Freedom House publishes a series of oft-cited annual [periodicals](#) and surveys on the status of countries’ political systems. Its ratings are calculated based on each country’s level of democratization and human rights. Its categories are “free, partly free, not free” in the areas of political rights and civil liberties. Freedom House’s ratings are now a primary source of information in the academic and policy community. Advocacy includes global [initiatives](#) to uncover and give voice to impediments to freedom, efforts to ensure that democracy and human rights figure prominently in the domestic and policy agendas of the US and other countries, and regional initiatives to increase awareness and promote democratic practices at locations and countries undergoing processes of political change.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** Freedom House conducts 5 programs for promoting democratic governance: The African Institute for Democracy and Rule-of-Law, Citizen Participation in Elections in Ukraine, Regional Networking Project (RNP), Serbia: Democratic Transition and Reintegration, and Serbia: Responsibility for the Future. The Serbia Program employs grass roots approaches to promote reconciliation and ethnic and communal harmony. Neither of the other programs approaches the promotion of democracy from a coexistence lense and there is no mention of

intercommunal work or specific/different approaches to democratization. Rather, Freedom House's work is largely aimed at top/middle tier groups and individuals as well as specialized organizations such as civic groups, judges, and activists. The approaches appear structural and administrative in nature.

### 6.7. **Foundation for the Defense of Democracies (FDD)**

**Background and Mission:** FDD is non-partisan not-for-profit think tank founded by a group of US philanthropists and policymakers following 9/11. FDD was a leading advocate for Operation Iraqi Freedom and is distinguished for its close ties to the Bush Administration as well as for the neo-conservative views of several of its more prominent senior officers, including Jeane Kirkpatrick, Newt Gingrich, and James Woolsey. According to its website, FDD is “the only nonpartisan policy institute dedicated exclusively to promoting pluralism, defending democratic values, and fighting the ideologies that drive terrorism.” FDD’s basic assumption is that “America and its democratic allies are worth defending, and that the terrorists who killed 3,000 innocent people on September 11, 2001 will kill more innocent people the next time – if we don't stop them.”

**Activities:** FDD conducts research and advocacy on a range of [topics](#) relating to international terrorism, the Muslim world – including specialized geographic focus – the media, UN failures, and democratization. FDD [also](#) conducts outreach, strategic media campaigns – particularly regarding Iran and Iraq, – investigative reporting, and [democracy](#) and fellowship programs to become anti-terror/pro-democracy advocates.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** FDD makes no explicit commitments to coexistence or conflict-sensitive programming on its website. It advocates for proactive military engagement and media and intellectual campaigns to influence hearts and minds. Grassroots perspectives designed to address fundamental social and communal grievance is not part of FDD’s agenda.

The prevention of international terrorism is inextricably tied to the promotion of democratic policies. FDD democracy educational [materials](#) for Iraq do advocate forcefully for gender sensitivity and present democracy prospects in post-Hussein Iraq. FDD advocates for a single model of liberal Western democracy.

### 6.8. **International Crisis Group (ICG)**

**Background and Mission:** “The International Crisis Group is an independent, non-profit, non-governmental organisation, with over 110 staff members on five continents, working through field-based analysis and high-level advocacy to prevent and resolve deadly conflict.” ICG is often referred to as a civilian intelligence organization that provides political analysis of a quality recently unavailable to the public. ICG’s authority within the beltway in Washington on topics relating to contemporary conflict situations has elevated its role from a think tank to a powerful advocate for political change. ICG’s analysts are stationed in over 50 crisis-affected countries in the world, working in the field within close proximity to political and social movements.

**Activities:** ICG publishes briefing [reports](#), crisis papers, and an annual report called [Crisis Watch](#). In addition, ICG maintains a [Database and Reporting page](#) that posts maps, conflict histories, early warning indicators, and advocacy tools, all designed to facilitate ICG's role as a resource for practical recommendations for key international policymakers.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** ICG's focus on [Democratization](#) is divided into 4 general categories: [elections](#), [governance](#), institution building, and judicial reform. ICG's frontline analysis provides a fresh and concise counterpoint to the Washington consensus on divisive issues such as US policy vis-à-vis Islam, international terrorism, and democratization. Such analysis is invariably far more nuanced in complexity than what's usually available for the Western policy-elite, yet it remains coherent in its policy recommendations. ICG's analysis and policy materials demonstrate heightened conflict sensitivity. It frequently calls for increased attention to ethnic and religious triggers as components of comprehensive approaches to conflict. ICG does not endorse any one model for democracy.

## 6.9. [Social Science Research Council \(SSRC\)](#)

**Background and Mission:** SSRC was founded in New York in 1923. Its mandate is based on the conviction that interdisciplinary social science research plays a critical role in helping to understand complex social, political, cultural, and economic processes, and in producing policy-related outcomes to promote justice, prosperity, and democracy. To this end, the Council works to create incentives to connect and mobilize diverse bodies of academics, intellectuals, policy makers, and activists who work to advance social inquiry on pressing contemporary topics facing global society. The council employs over 60 full time staff, and is chaired by the Dean of Columbia University's School for International Studies. It receives funding mainly from private foundation grants – totaling over \$12 million dollars to-date.

**Activities:** The Council establishes research networks, organizing conferences and workshops throughout the world. It also administers various fellowship programs for national and international scholars. The Council has programs in Global Security and Cooperation, Migration, Knowledge Institutions, and the Public Sphere – where work on [democracy](#) is carried out. The Institute dispenses grants to study various aspects of democratization, especially in the Middle East.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** The Council's Public Sphere projects explore the development of "public-ness" in a democratic society, specifically with regard to social networks, the role of education, and information technology. The project has not produced any literature dealing with, nor did I find any references to models of democracy or intercommunal perspectives on conflict

## 6.10. [The Brookings Institution](#)

**Background and Mission:** Brookings was founded as the Institute for Government Research in 1916, the first non-partisan US research institution devoted to providing high

quality research, recommendations, and policy analysis of the full range of public policy issues.

**Activities:** Brookings runs 5 different [programs](#): Economy, Foreign Policy, Governance, and Metropolitan Study. Additionally, it runs a dozen [projects](#) associated with 9 policy [centers](#), which conduct research on a dozen different research [topics](#). Together these different branches of Brookings conduct and publish policy analysis, books, briefs, and papers, and they run several fellows programs and educational initiatives, in addition to conducting symposiums and sponsor conferences.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** Brookings approaches democracy under the topic of [Governance](#), and although its literature here deals primarily with domestic politics, analysis, commentary, and policy briefs do suggest different models and approaches to forms of democratic government. Its literature reflects on the role of federalism and separations of power and presents comparative analysis of electoral rules, judiciaries, legislatures, and executives, among other topics. There is also additional analysis and policy dealing directly with democracy, but differing forms and deeper analysis is not provided.

The Saban Center on Middle East Policy produces literature and conducts conferences to “promote a better understanding of the policy choices facing American decision makers in the Middle East.” The Center has produced literature discussing coexistence in the Israeli/Palestinian and [American/Iranian context](#), as well as a [book](#) - *Beyond Jihad and Crusade* - suggesting ways to understand and move beyond current Arab-Muslim/American social and political stalemates. The book's author, [Muqtada Khan](#), has written widely for Brookings on the theme of coexistence in the contemporary Muslim/American context.

### 6.11. *The RAND Corporation* ([RAND](#))

**Background and Mission:** The Rand Corporation's roots date to the US/Korean war, during which it served as the main research and policy organization for the US military. Today RAND provides research and policy outputs for a variety of domestic and international audiences, particularly in the area of national security, but also on critical social and economic issues such as education, poverty, crime, and the environment. RAND is a non-profit organization, and its methodologies are highly analytic and qualitative in nature; RAND takes pride on its rigorous unbiased approach to the research and production of knowledge. Systems Analysis and Game Theory are among the tools that RAND mathematics and economics teams developed.

**Activities:** RAND's main activity is to conduct rigorous policy-oriented research and analysis with a national security focus in over a dozen [research areas](#).

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** A search for coexistence on RAND's side yields 66 documents; democratization, well over 200. In addition, RAND has conducted quantitative [modeling](#) leading to a proposed model for indicators to identify ethnic conflict and intercommunal violence.

Democratization is the subject of numerous books, articles, and policy materials, many of them offering geo-strategic political or economic analysis, or military/civilian perspectives. RAND would be a good source to follow on the existence of data supporting correlations of lowered violence and political and social instability, with interventions at the intercommunal level.

### 6.12. ***The Washington Institute for Near East Policy*** ([WINAP](#))

**Background and Mission:** A small group of senior US policy makers and statesman started WINAP in 1985 with the purpose of providing a discreet but influential venue for nonpartisan discussion of the US's role in the Middle (Near) East. The Institute originally researched Arab-Israeli issues, but branched out to broader topics following the collapse of the Soviet Union. Today the Institute draws on research and scholarship of its scholars to bring a realistic and balanced perspective of US policy in the Middle East, and has become an influential forum in the formulation of Middle East policy within the beltway.

**Activities:** The Institute hosts its own scholars, many of whom have extensive first-hand experience in the Middle East or are foreign nationals from their respective region of study. In addition to promulgating research on countries throughout the Middle East, the Institute researches on 7 other thematic areas, and conducts more in-depth research programs on terrorism, Turkey, military security, and the Middle East peace process. The institute also holds policy forums, conferences, and other special events.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** The Institute has published numerous articles and books and has held conferences around the theme of [coexistence](#). However, the Institute appears to deal only with the Arab-Israeli political and security stalemate; coexistence is promoted as a policy end, but there is little discussion of the means to achieve it on the ground. One exception is a [book](#) published in the Institute in 1999 and written by Moshe Ma'oz: *Middle East Minorities Between Integration and Conflict*. The book explores political space and belonging from the perspective if ethnicity and community.

## 7. **Non-Governmental Political Party & Democratization Organizations**

### 7.1. ***Clinton Foundation/Global Initiative***

**Background and Mission:** The Global Initiative is a non-partisan project of the William J. Clinton Foundation. Its mission is to assemble a select group of problem solvers and great thinkers from the business community, academia, NGOs and the policy community, and provide a venue from which to “increase the benefits and reduce the burdens of global interdependence; to make a world of more partners and fewer enemies; and to give more people the tools they need to build a better future.:

**Activities:** The Initiative asks each of its members to make firm commitments to pursue a project in its specific field of expertise and in line with the Global Initiatives areas of interest: Poverty, Religion Conflict and Reconciliation; Business and Climate Change; and Governance, Enterprise and Investment.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** The Global Initiative does not stipulate any specific approaches to promote democratization or coexistence. However, there are several projects conducted in the area of Poverty, Religion, Conflict, and Conflict Resolution which do have implications for different models of democracy and coexistence work. These models include using [media](#) to promote inter-community and inter-ethnic reconciliation between Arab and Western television audiences, [inter-religious engagement](#) with the religious community in Iran and between Iran and the West, and creating trans-border, trans-religious, and trans-ethnic [links](#) between entrepreneurial youth throughout the Balkans.

## 7.2. *Club of Madrid*

**Background and Mission:** The Club of Madrid was founded in October 2001 – in the shadow of 9/11 - when 35 former and current heads of state and 100 academics assembled in Madrid, Spain, to discuss political transition and consolidation. As noted on the Club’s website, “The Club of Madrid is an independent organization dedicated to strengthening democracy around the world by drawing on the unique experience and resources of its Members - democratic former heads of state and government.” The exceptional merit of the Club’s members allows the Club to advocate as a catalyst for change in the international policy arena.

**Activities:** “In partnership with other organizations and governments that share its democracy-promotion goals, the Club of Madrid provides peer to peer counsel, strategic support and technical advice to leaders and institutions working towards democratic transition and consolidation.”

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** The Club has a competitive advantage in the international community amongst institutions and regimes that articulate normative instruments and standards. Thus, its policy statements are directed at the macro policy level. The Club’s [Madrid Summit Working Paper Series](#) contains three volumes that look at democracy and international security. The psychology of violence and religious and cultural factors are central explanatory themes in the series. Articulated as a response to international terrorism, one of the Club’s key principles from [Towards a Democratic Response](#) reads: “Since one of the causes of terrorism is fundamentally different conceptions of history, justice, and the contemporary world, international organizations in the culture sphere should take new initiatives for promoting cultural rights and mutual respect among diverse communities consistent with the protection of fundamental human rights.”

The Club warns against military use in democratization, and makes an explicit recommendation to pursue democratization exclusively within a long term and custom tailored framework based on unique and different regions and local actors.

## 7.3. *Council for a Community of Democracies (CCD)*

**Background and Mission:** the CCD was founded in Warsaw, Poland, during the 2000 Community of Democracies Conference. It is part of an international network of NGOs organized around a board of advisors and a group of experts. CCD receives funding from

the Bumper Development Foundation, Henry Luce Foundation, Russell Family Foundation, and the US Government. CCD's founding is rooted in a realization of the extent and severity of crimes against humanity committed during the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and in support of an emerging global movement for democracy. It advocates cooperation among nations and a deep respect for institutional multilateralism informed by principles of nonviolence to combat global terrorism. CCD's mission is to "seek a community of nations working together to strengthen democracy across a wide spectrum of cultural and religious traditions and transparency of government processes, sound electoral systems, respect for human rights and the rule of law, active civic education, prevention of official corruption and related core values basic to democratic governance. Our aim is to foster awareness of the importance of democracy both as a central organizing principle of official government foreign policy and as the basis of international alliances of non-governmental organizations devoted to the strengthening of democracy."

**Activities:** CCD's activities are to strengthen collaboration among governments and democracy advocates in building an effective worldwide community of democratic nations based on the initiative of the June 2000 Warsaw Community of Democracies Conference. Goal of the initiative included the following: To help implement resolutions promulgated at the 2002 Community of Democracies meeting in Seoul, Korea; to assist national and international non-governmental organizations formulate a strategic vision for the future of the Community of Democracies and to support that vision by their participation in the 2005 meeting to be held in Santiago, Chile; to share among governments and non-governmental organizations their pro-democracy programs and resources; and to promote collaboration among democratically elected parliaments and among delegations to the United Nations -- including the organization of a UN democracy caucus --- and collaboration among other international organizations in support of democratic practices. The most important operational aspects of CCD's work are its [bi-annual conferences](#), which are attended by foreign ministers of over 100 countries, academics, and representatives of NGOs. CCD also maintains a Community of Democracies [library](#), with basic documents and materials on third wave democracies, democracy promotion and education, regional organizations, and geographic regions.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** Policy statements from CCD's activities affirm support for conflict-sensitive approaches and acknowledgement for the need for coexistence sensitivity in democracy programming. Notable excerpts from the [final version](#) of the Santiago ministerial conference, held in 2005, were convictions that "democracy cannot be sustained without strict adherence to the principle of non-discrimination, including protection for persons belonging to national or ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities and indigenous peoples, and persistent efforts to eliminate extreme poverty, underdevelopment, marginalization, economic disparities, and social exclusion.

"We reaffirm our commitment to uphold the values of tolerance and compromise that underpin effective democratic systems and to promote respect for pluralism, so as to enable societies to retain their multicultural characters."

CCD does not endorse a single democratic model.

#### 7.4. **Democracy Coalition Project ([DCP](#))**

**Background and Mission:** “The Democracy Coalition Project is a nongovernmental organization that conducts research and advocacy relating to democracy promotion policies at the national, regional and global levels. Begun in June 2001 as an initiative of the Open Society Institute, the Democracy Coalition Project relies on an international network of civil society organizations, scholars, foreign policy experts and politicians committed to democracy promotion as an essential element of international peace and human development.”

**Activities:** The DCP coordinates and participates in a range of activities, including a long-term project analyzing democratic responses to non-democratic crises of leaderships. It also coordinates discussions on policy issues surrounding democracy promotion and panel presentations at international forums on the democratization of international institutions. It also has published a [seminal publication](#) on the promotion and protection of democracy in the world. The DCP’s ability to effectively advocate its agenda stems in part from the stature of its director - Morton Halperin – and the influence of a distinguished advisory board.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** The DCP’s approach to democratization is oriented to the policy and academic community, especially with regard to top-tier solutions: it advocates for increased networks among international and national organizations, more thorough legal and administrative mechanisms, a constitutional model of democratic governance, and redoubling of political will. Towards this end, the United Nations Democracy Caucus – a primary activity of the DCP – dedicates itself to ‘the promotion and fulfillment of the principles of democracy and human rights embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Warsaw Declaration of the Community of Democracies . . . the Campaign seeks establishment of a permanent United Nations Democracy Caucus as a group of democratic nations committed to strengthening the United Nations’ ability to promote democracy and human rights.’ A focus on coexistence does not appear to be part of DCP’s work.

#### 7.5. **Friedrich Ebert Stiftung ([FES](#))**

**Background and Mission:** FES was founded in 1925 as a social democrat foundation in the legacy of Germany’s first democratically elected president, Friedrich Ebert. Today it is a private non-profit that aims to “further political and social education of individuals from all walks of life in the spirit of democracy and pluralism, facilitate access to university education and research for gifted young people by providing scholarships, and [by] contributing to international understanding and cooperation.”

**Activities:** FES maintains offices in 33 countries in Western Europe, Central and Southeast Europe, the CIS-countries, the USA, and Japan. Its activities in international development and cooperation include promoting peace and understanding between people and inside the partner countries, supporting the democratization of the State and society, strengthening the civil society, improving general political, economic and social conditions, reinforcing free trade unions, developing independent media structures, facilitating regional and worldwide cooperation between states and different interest

groups, and gaining recognition for human rights.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** IFES's English documentation is far from comprehensive, and it is difficult to determine specific programming from the online information available. An International Policy [Analysis Unit](#) posts policy materials and other resources. From a [report](#) on international democracy promotion, IFES indicates a preference for decentralization strategies and long-term technical assistance programs. Coexistence programming does not constitute an explicit priority in its democracy programming.

## 7.6. ***Rights and [Development](#)***

**Background and Mission:** RD started out as the International Centre for Human Rights and Democratic Development. It is a non-profit Canadian agency established by the Canadian parliament in 1988 to "encourage and support the universal values of human rights and the promotion of democratic institutions and practices around the world." RD's relationship with the Canadian Government is analogous to NED's relationship with the US government; the government is its main source of funding, and the agency is a virtual clearinghouse for officially authorized democratization programming and funds throughout the world.

**Activities:** RD works with international agencies and local NGOs domestically and throughout the world. RD focuses on 4 themes: democratic development, women's rights, globalization and human rights, and the rights of indigenous people. It has 4 Special Initiatives: Urgent Action/Important Opportunities, which responds to human rights crises and seizes important opportunities as they arise; international human rights advocacy, to enhance the work of human rights advocates in Canada and internationally in the effective use of regional and international human rights mechanisms of the United Nations and regional human rights systems; human rights and security, which monitors the impact of "anti-terrorist" legislation and other security measures on civil liberties and human rights in Canada and abroad; and human rights and democratic awareness in Canada, which initiates and supports the activities of Canadian individuals and groups relating to human rights and democratic development around the world.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** Canada is a strong proponent of the integration of human security and human rights into development practices and these priorities are clear in RD's democracy programming. Coexistence practices, framed in the language of human rights and civil society are clearly laid out in RD's democratic development strategic objectives. These practices are clear in RD's [activities](#) in the Congo and in Burma. Far less clear is a preference with regard to specific democratic models or strategies for democratization.

## 7.7. ***International Federation of Elections Systems ([IFES](#))***

**Background and Mission:** IFES is a US-based international non-profit with 17 years of experience in transitioning regions such as Central Asia and Eastern Europe. IFES is a flagship democratization organizing which supports the building of democratic societies through extensive assistance in election administration, civil society, rule of law, and

human rights. According to their biannual report 2004-2005, IFES prides itself on versatility, flexibility, and expertise, all allowing it to “support and facilitate democratic participation at any given place and incorporate any idea or practice that can help it reach that goal.” IFES has worked in over 100 countries and maintains active field presence in 22 countries throughout the world. IFES’s 2003 total revenue was over \$37 million dollars.

**Activities:** IFES employs a range of tools to help engineer and shape democratic political and social systems. Civil society programs cultivate the conditions for successful democratic reform by increasing citizens’ ability to mobilize and advocate for their needs. Civic training to CSOs, teacher training, curriculum development, and special educational programs expose a broad range of citizens to political life and the principles of representative government. Elections Services include comprehensive assistance to governments, political parties, and civil society organizations in election planning and administration, electoral law development, and voter education. Elections Services involve pre-election technical assessments, onsite technical assistance programs, poll-worker training, and equipment procurements. Voter registration and education programs establish guidelines for carrying out elections, and the latter activities revolve around coalition building, public-private partnerships, civil society monitoring, engagement, and public and civic education. The [Center for Transition and Post-Conflict Governance](#) is the first center to integrate political stability and technical assistance linked to democracy programming. The Center’s activities include: electoral dispute resolution; out-of-Country Registration and Voting Programs; election security planning; disarmament, demobilization, reintegration (DDR) and political process, political finance and corruption; conflictive or post-conflict electoral processes; post-conflict media development; and systems of representation and delimitation.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** IFES programming appears to seek intercommunal coexistence through the provision of technical support and the establishment of administrative procedures and institutions. There is little indication that conflict resolution practices form a part of its elections work. None of IFES’s civil education projects or political awareness-raising workshops with civil society work on an explicitly cross-ethnic or intercommunal level or specifically address marginalized groups. Conducting elections is a main component of IFES’s programming; it’s no surprise that elections form the most important backdrop for democratization.

## **7.8. *International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance*** ***(IDEA)***

**Background and Mission:** IDEA is a research and practitioner organization based in Stockholm, Sweden. Founded in 1995 as an intergovernmental organization founded with the support of member states, IDEA was based on the suggestions of the Swedish Parliament to provide electoral observation. Today, its purview has expanded to include a full mandate based on the support and promotion of democracy worldwide. IDEA now has over 50 employees in offices in Sweden, Peru, Mexico, South Africa, Ghana, Indonesia, and Armenia.

**Activities:** IDEA's range of activities include: Democracy building and conflict management, which involves developing the process for building consensus, setting priorities, designing political institutions and constitutions, organizing dialogue and decision making, promoting reconciliation and inclusive democracy; strengthening electoral processes, including adapting electoral systems, improving access and turnout, ensuring professional management and independence, building public confidence; developing political parties as actors in democracy, which includes reviewing external regulation and enforcement, public funding, internal management and democracy, relations with civil society and the public; and political equality and participation, especially of underrepresented groups, including women in politics. This last activity involves identifying ways to build commitment and experience with special measures such as quotas. IDEA's work covers 5 themes: exploring the [meaning](#) of democracy; [democracy building](#) and conflict management; electoral processes; political parties; and women in politics.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** IDEA's [policies](#) on democratization and governance are highly sensitive to the use of conflict resolution and coexistence practices, advocating for fully inclusive processes based on social justice and integrative of local experiences. IDEA is perhaps one of the most comprehensive sources for innovative theories on the development and promotion of democracy in a range of different environments. It promotes highly participatory governance founded on the unique needs and abilities of each society. IDEA has also published seminal [resources](#) and materials dealing with democracy promotion.

## 7.9. ***National Democratic Institute for International Affairs (NDI)***

**Background and Mission:** NDI is a private non-profit institute that channels grants and draws on volunteer experts and international professionals to provide practical technical expertise to advance democratic values, practices, and institutions throughout the world. NDI was established by the NED and received funding from the Federal Government and Democracy Century Fund. Chaired by Madeleine Albright, NDI's Board of Directors is staffed by many current and former high-ranking figures from the American political and academic community. NDI's activities openly seeks to promote US geo strategic interests abroad by cultivating and supporting the development of political systems that "operate in a manner consistent with democratic values of transparency, representation, pluralism and accountability."

**Activities:** In addition to sending ambassadors and other notable figures of American democracy such as President Carter to advise on political processes, NDI provides materials and resources to emerging democracies and it's promoters, distributes grants through its numerous field offices, and runs a [forum](#) for the exchange of information and experiences among activists and others working to promote democracy around the world. NDI's activities include work in seven main areas: [Democratization and governance](#); elections and political processes; information and communications technology; political party development; security sector reform; and women's participation. NDI's Democratization and governance work consists of four main areas: Constitutional reform, Legislative Development, Local Government, and Public Integrity.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** Although some of NDI's democratization projects appear to integrate conflict resolution training, there is scant evidence of a systematic approach to, or recognition or a promotion of, the practice of intercommunal coexistence in any of its work. NDI's democratization and governance programming is aimed primarily at the structural level – at emphasizing the range of institutional and political dimensions of democratic governance. NDI does not appear to make an explicit commitment to work with marginalized groups or integrate conflict resolution/management/transformation in its programming.

#### **7.10. *Netherlands Institute for Multiparty Democracy (NIMD)***

**Background and Mission:** The Dutch Government established NIMD in April 2000 to respond to requests from abroad for support and resources for political party development. NIMD's mission is “to support the process of democratization in young democracies by strengthening political parties as the pillars of parliamentary democracy in order to help create a well-functioning, sustainable, pluralistic system of party politics.” NIMD receives funding from the Dutch government. Its priorities, areas of interest, and sources of funding are similar to the Westminster Foundation for Democracy.

**Activities:** NIMD works at the political level, in political party dialogue and development. According to its website, it undertakes activities by building up the party organization (this includes leadership training for senior officials; management training; communication training, especially to improve communication between representatives of the people and their grass-roots support). NIMD promotes political education, aimed at an understanding of the principles, institutions and processes that nurture and maintain multiparty democracies; joint projects focused on promoting interaction between political parties; projects that enhance transparency and accountability in the party structure; and projects that increase the ability of political parties to formulate policies.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** Coexistence sensitivity does not appear to be a part of NIMD's programming concerns. NIMD promotes parliamentary and other multiparty political systems that encourage pluralism and political competition.

#### **7.11. *Partners for Democratic Change (PDC)***

**Background and Mission:** Partners began its activities in East and Central Europe, designing and delivering conflict resolution curricula to local universities and schools. These activities helped cultivate a generation of practitioners and leaders in local communities, civil government, and NGOs. Since 1989, Partners has continued to expand its presence with local communities outside of academia, leading to sustained contact with local NGOs, the establishment of its own network of local organizations in the field and in headquarters in New York and San Francisco, and programming to integrate conflict resolution services - such as mediation centers, ethnic conciliation commissions, and cooperative planning initiatives - into local democracies. Today, Partners seeks to “play a role in strengthening democratic societies.” Its mission is to “build sustainable

local capacity to advance civil society and a culture of change and conflict management worldwide.”

**Activities:** Partners builds the capacity of local institutions, seeking to promote democratic, participatory change and develop locally staffed Centers for Change and Conflict Management. It does this by [developing and strengthening institutions](#), [training, and teaching](#), [resolving conflicts](#), [promoting public policies](#), and [developing curricula](#). Partners is currently in Albania, Argentina, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Georgia, Hungary, Jordan, Kosovo, Lithuania, Mexico, Poland, Romania, and Slovakia.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** Partners displays a high level of sensitivity to coexistence within a democratization agenda in all of its activities. Its training material and methodology is based on a participatory and intercommunal [model](#) that increases stakeholder consensus. This approach informs work with partners and in all of its activities. President Raymond Shonholtz has published [several papers](#) on incorporating different approaches to coexistence within democratic political systems, including theories of community-based dispute resolution and democracy, the use of conflict resolution and conflict management approaches in emerging democracies, and the role of ethnic minorities in new democratic norms and institutions. Partners advocates for community driven and highly participatory governance. As an example, Partners has promoted decentralized and stable democratic governance throughout the [Balkans](#) by providing skills and trainings within an explicitly multi-ethnic and cross-sectoral framework.

## 7.12. *United States Institute of Peace (USIP)*

**Background and Mission:** USIP’s impetus sprung from the US congress in 1981, the culmination of extended consultations and visioning by senior US statesmen. The vision for a prominent national center for the study and promotion of peace was articulated early in American history as a natural counterbalance to many US institutes and academies that sought to perfect the craft of war. USIP was started as an academy in the tradition of West Point. Now, its mission is to “help prevent, manage, and resolve international conflicts by empowering others with knowledge, skills, and resources, as well as by our direct involvement in peacebuilding efforts around the world.” The Institute receives funding from the congressional wing of the US government, and is a comprehensive one-stop-shop for the academic and policy communities.

**Activities:** USIP’s activities are conducted in three main strategic centers: [The Center for Conflict Analysis and Prevention](#), the [Center for Mediation and Conflict Resolution](#), and the [Center for Post Conflict Peace and Stability Operations](#). Four crosscutting themes inform these centers: education programs, professional training programs, grants and fellowship programs, and the Centers of Excellence - comprised of the Rule of Law Program, the Religion and Peacemaking Program, and the Virtual Diplomacy Program.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** USIP promotes explicit coexistence programming throughout many of its activities, including those designed to promote good governance and democracy in different conflict contexts. Examples include its activities

in the [Balkans](#); research done on [Syria](#); work done by the [Religion and Peacemaking Program](#) in Indonesia, Nigeria and [Iraq](#); conflict analysis and prevention programming to promote [intercommunal peace in Iraq](#); and activities through the Center for the study of Islam and Democracy. This programming takes on a variety of forms and works with different groups of stakeholders, but always includes an intercommunal (ethnic or religious) dimension that is directly related to policies for promoting democratic governance.

### **7.13. *Westminster Foundation for Democracy (WMF)***

**Background and Mission:** WFD is an independent political foundation that was founded by the Foreign Commonwealth Office in the UK in 1992 as a response to the 1989 revolutions and democratic transitions in Eastern and Central Europe. WMF's mandate has grown to provide a range of assistance to countries managing the transition to democracy and other post-conflict countries in Central and Eastern Europe and sub-Saharan Africa.

**Activities:** WMF traditionally operated as a grant-maker, but it now conducts a bit of its own programming. Its activities consist of party-to-party work or through supporting the institutional development of parliaments and other political bodies and a range of politically oriented civil society institutions, including NGOs, free media, human rights organizations, and trade unions. Researching, building, and supporting local and national political parties is a central theme in WMF's democracy programming. As such, promoting political pluralism and cultivating heightened political consciousness among various constituencies are other primary areas of interest.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** WMF has supported a coexistence project to foster intercultural understanding through a joint Hebrew-Arab newspaper project and is currently conducting a civil society project in Iraq. However WMF's institutional and structural perspective on building democracy offers little competitive advantage for carrying out intercommunal coexistence work. Its programming indicates that the political part is the main venue through which all forms of communal and ethnic peace should be pursued. Intercommunal work occupies relatively little of WMF's programming. It largely interfaces with institutions and leaders already firmly engaged in systemic political work.

### **7.14. *World Movement for Democracy (WMD)***

**Background and Mission:** The World Movement for Democracy is an NGO comprised of a global network of democrats, including activists, practitioners, academics, policy makers, and funders, who have come together to cooperate in the promotion of democracy, and who ascribe to WMD's [founding statement](#). WMD was founded in 1999 in the New Delhi conference. It is a non-governmental project of the NED, with an aim to "strengthen democracy where it is weak, to reform and invigorate democracy even where it is longstanding, and to bolster pro-democracy groups in countries that have not yet entered into a process of democratic transition." Support for WMD's activities come from the varied and rich expertise of its members and member organization, as well as the range of resources that NED makes available.

**Activities:** WMD seeks to become a comprehensive resource for people, groups, and countries engaged in various phases of democratic transition and consolidation. It strives to act as an ally to parties in the field, lobby for or with partners, link with and facilitate between actors, encourage innovative research and catalyze processes, provide a venue for meetings, and offer a broad range of academic and practitioner resources on democracy. WMD has convened three main events: its inaugural assembly and founding in New Delhi during February, 1999 (400 participants); a Second Assembly in Sao Paolo in November, 2000 (400 participants); and a Third Assembly in South Africa in February, 2004 (600 participants). These events have provided for opportunities to network with one another, articulate new themes and topics in the field, and develop projects and workshops.

**Coexistence Sensitivity/Models for Democracy:** WMD's programming indicates a high level of coexistence sensitivity, with current activities being carried out in [peacebuilding and democracy](#), advocacy for [democratic reform](#), and [strengthening local governance](#). WMD's approach advocates forcefully for the integration of highly participatory, equitable and conflict-sensitive programming in all democratization activities. The [Global Network on Local Governance](#) is a branch of WMD which "seeks to strengthen local democracy by providing informal forums for discussion at regional and global levels, politically empowering disadvantaged groups, and promoting accountable, participative, transparent, and efficient local governments."