



# Supporting Sustainable Frameworks for Conflict Transformation: Opportunities for the Donor Community

July 2008

Shelly Ross with Jessica Berns and Kristin Williams

## Coexistence International Staff

Jessica Berns, Program Director  
Kristin Williams, Program Coordinator

Cynthia Cohen, Executive Director,  
Slifka Program in Intercommunal Coexistence

## International Advisory Board

Mari Fitzduff, Chair  
Gaya Gamhewage, Vice Chair  
Dekha Ibrahim Abdi  
Mohammed Abu-Nimer  
Thais Corral  
Meenakshi Gopinath  
Roberta Levitow  
Barbara Merson  
Tim Phillips  
Stella Sabiiti  
Alan B. Slifka  
Paul van Tongeren  
Howard Wolpe


As donors face the enormous issues confronting global society today, a primary question is how diverse problems can be effectively addressed. Wide-ranging challenges, such as persistent poverty, increasing health epidemics, global insecurity, environmental disaster, and social disintegration highlighted by high levels of violence,<sup>1</sup> require specific responses; but due to their often integrated nature, they cannot be addressed in isolation. Nor can they be effectively addressed without confronting the inter-group tensions or divergent agendas that surface. Finding common areas of interest—whether they exist between a state and its minorities, between rebel groups and the ruling government, or between local communities and multinational companies—is the key building block in conflict transformation efforts.

While the coexistence field does not have clearly defined parameters that fall neatly within most donors' funding lexicon, the very flexibility of its nature makes coexistence work one of the strongest approaches for addressing the economic, social, cultural, political, and security needs of today's world. Coexistence work cuts across a range of initiatives to include violence prevention and management, post-conflict and conflict transformation work, social cohesion, peacebuilding, reconciliation, and multicultural and pluralism work, with the underlying goal of ensuring that communities and societies can live more equitably and peacefully together.<sup>2</sup> As such, coexistence work supports the mechanisms for finding common ground and focuses on building the structures essential to preventing conflict and achieving lasting impact on the challenges facing the global community.

## Coexistence International

Mailstop 086  
Brandeis University  
Waltham, Massachusetts  
02454-9110

781-736-5017  
781-736-5014 fax  
[www.coexistence.net](http://www.coexistence.net)  
[coexistenceintl@brandeis.edu](mailto:coexistenceintl@brandeis.edu)



Shelly Ross is Project Manager for EastWest Institute's Regional and Transfrontier Co-operation programme in southern Serbia, Kosovo, and Macedonia. Jessica Berns is Program Director and Kristin Williams is Program Coordinator for Coexistence International at Brandeis University.

Efforts to address the causes of conflict often remain focused on short-term results that fail to address entrenched perceptions and grievances,<sup>3</sup> and do not support the long-term planning essential to conflict transformation. Coexistence work addresses these failures in numerous ways:

- 1) Coexistence work addresses relationship- and confidence-building measures critical to long-term sustainability of development and violence prevention efforts.
- 2) Coexistence work allows for the inclusion of critical actors such as local communities and potential "spoilers" (actors who actively seek to obstruct the settlement of conflict), whose exclusion is often a key cause for failure of conflict prevention efforts.
- 3) Coexistence work is grounded in a commitment to working within the local context, providing necessary planning information to help avoid exacerbating problems, promoting the sustainability of efforts through inclusion, and supporting the implementation of activities that draw upon local mechanisms and are appropriate to the needs and capacities of local communities.

The causes of conflict are many, and responses must be both strategic and multi-faceted. "Clearly, no single actor or institution is able to address change at all these levels. A wide variety of actors need to be involved, locally and internationally..."<sup>4</sup> Although significant levels of funding have been allocated to address the multitude of challenges faced by society today, they have not been as effective as hoped. While this paper focuses on the importance of funding coexistence work, a number of observations and recommendations are made with regard to the value of applying a coexistence approach or lens to funding strategies. In addition, the paper emphasizes the importance of supporting the continued mainstreaming of coexistence approaches into the development agenda through the creation of conflict-focused units and the promotion of participatory programming. Increased support for integrated funding, coexistence work, and the application of a "coexistence lens" to funding can help donors improve the efficacy of efforts to transform and prevent conflict and its root causes—in particular, tensions between groups.

## Current Funding Environment

While it is difficult to assess the level of funding for coexistence work, an overview of trends in international giving provides important information regarding funding priorities and the implications of these priorities on prospects for transforming inter-group relations.

Following a period of rapid growth in the 1990s, funding from U.S. foundations for international purposes declined in 2002. The stock market downturn, a recession, and a more difficult climate for giving in the wake of the terrorist attacks of 9/11 and the ensuing "war on terror"—all contributed to this reduction in support. Between 2002 and 2004, as international giving decreased overall, shares of giving increased for global programs of Western European organizations and organizations working in Africa. Sub-Saharan Africa ranked first by share of dollars, receiving nearly one-fifth of total funding. In contrast, the percentage of funding declined for Latin America, Asia, Eastern Europe, and Russia and the Independent States. However, international giving by U.S. foundations rebounded in 2005, reaching a record \$3.8 billion.<sup>5</sup> Specific funding for "international affairs," which includes efforts to promote peace in foreign conflicts, economic development in impoverished nations, and overseas disaster relief, jumped nearly 41% to a record 591.2 million USD.<sup>6</sup>

During this period a number of emerging states and new private donors added their support to international funding. Emerging states of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development contributed up to 12% of official humanitarian financing annually through the Development Assistance Committee,<sup>7</sup> and within both the U.S. and Europe, newer foundations<sup>8</sup>— including community foundations—and private donors have contributed in increasing amounts to international projects.<sup>9</sup> China has also received attention in recent years with its particular focus on funding for Africa. Estimates of China's annual Official Development Assistance (ODA) range from 1.5 to 2 billion USD.<sup>10</sup> The European Union (EC and Member States) has continued to be a major source of assistance, with ODA levels in excess of 83 billion Euro in 2006, of which nearly 10 billion was committed through the European Commission,

with nearly half this amount focusing on the ACP (Africa, Caribbean, Pacific) countries.<sup>11</sup>

While funding appears to be on the rise, it is important to look at the reasons that have contributed to this growth, as they reveal numerous—and in some cases worrying—implications for activities focused on social change and peacebuilding. The increase in international funding levels can largely be attributed to the outpouring of support for disaster assistance, such as the Asian tsunami and the crisis in Darfur; significant increases for global health, largely spurred by the Gates Foundation Grand Challenges in Global Health Initiative and commitments to fight HIV/AIDS; and increasing support to conserve biodiversity, through funding such as the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation’s Andes-Amazon Initiative.<sup>12</sup> Increasingly, major international donors have been allocating their support to disaster relief, to the exclusion of other areas of funding, including coexistence work.<sup>13</sup> The phenomenon of ‘chasing’ conflict—reallocating funding based on emerging threats (e.g. Afghanistan, Iraq) and natural disasters—while not unwarranted, has resulted in the re-directing of aid away from some regions and sectors, and a high concentration of funding around certain regions.<sup>14</sup>

## Key Trends and Implications

The following trends in the international funding environment illustrate the value of coexistence work and approaches. These trends are: an increased focus on security; lack of donor engagement with local strategies; reduced funding opportunities for local actors; and the increased use of coexistence-focused approaches in combating today’s global issues.

### **1. Increased Focus on Security**

Security work encompasses a broad range of activity, including security-sector reform; work on small arms and light weapons; trafficking and border management; demilitarization, demobilization, reintegration and rehabilitation; and the combating of terrorist threats and weapons of mass destruction. While the variety of areas covered necessarily involves a wide range of actors, funding trends reveal an inclination towards military security and anti-terrorism measures, as part of the “war on terror”<sup>15</sup> resulting from 9/11. Increasing amounts of funding are being distributed via Defense Ministries and Departments,<sup>16</sup> and even efforts to better coordinate ODA, as seen in the United Kingdom’s Global Conflict Prevention Pool, are coming under scrutiny from a variety of sectors. While the Global Conflict Prevention Pool was designed to promote joint thinking on conflict issues by the Department for International Development, the Foreign Office, and the Ministry of

Defence, many claim that in the attempt to combine the broad perspectives represented by these agencies, the security agenda has predominated.<sup>17</sup> In the U.S., attempts to coordinate diplomacy, defense, and development are raising similar questions regarding the increased militarization of diplomacy and development and the increased involvement of military personnel in areas such as reconstruction and rehabilitation.<sup>18</sup>

A preoccupation with the international security agenda presents several challenges, both for donors funding work overseas and for organizations operating in areas of work related to coexistence and conflict transformation. Stricter government policies in the U.S., aimed at preventing the diversion of charitable assets to terrorist organizations, may be discouraging funding of overseas initiatives.<sup>19</sup> The upsurge in funding of U.S.-based organizations—to the detriment of locally-based organizations—may have also been a result of stricter regulations, which require security clearance of both staff and family members. This policy indirectly involves NGOs in intelligence gathering, placing their neutrality and their very ability to conduct their work at risk. Such restrictions raise questions not only of independence—an enormous price to pay to ensure financial survival for NGOs, whose very work is predicated on independence—but also of access as well. Such restrictions effectively rule out working with all actors—including potential “spoilers.” Excluding such actors only undermines efforts to resolve conflict. Coexistence work facilitates access to these parties; access that is often extremely difficult (or in many cases forbidden—think of the U.S. government’s line of “we don’t negotiate with terrorists”), despite its necessity.

Security is a critical component of addressing conflict, and in many cases of helping to maintain peace, but it is only one component of the package required to address the multitude of factors causing tension and outbreaks of violence. There is a tremendous amount of important work being done in the sector. Still, an overemphasis on the military aspects of security, combined with a lack of support for others engaged in the sector (civil society for example) can result not only in the failure to engage all parties of a given conflict, but also can actually isolate communities who can become targeted as ‘collaborators.’ A further complication of such an approach lies in the fact that the closer cooperation required between diplomatic, defense, and development actors can become mired in confusion, as “these actors do not share a common language or culture.”<sup>20</sup> And finally, such an approach fails to draw upon the breadth and depth of knowledge and experience available through the work undertaken by other actors.

Integrated funding of coexistence work could help encourage dialogue among the various actors involved in security issues.

It would also help ensure that the conditions of local communities are better understood by defense and diplomatic actors, who often lack the access to, and in many cases, the confidence of these communities. Funding for coexistence work is also critical for those organizations and individuals willing to take the risk to engage with spoilers, which has proven necessary in numerous instances of seemingly intractable conflict.

## **2. Lack of Coordination with Local Strategies**

Increased politicization of aid decreases the likelihood that local actors will have control over strategies to address conflict, development, and even disaster planning, and this significantly reduces both the appropriateness and long-term sustainability of initiatives. Donors all too often arrive with predetermined plans that limit the involvement of local actors in strategy development and decision-making. As a result, outside interests and plans take precedence, and local civilian populations are marginalized as one of many 'stakeholders,'<sup>21</sup> despite rhetoric adopted by the international community that emphasizes local ownership and the importance of 'indigenous mechanisms.' Externally driven efforts to promote democratization as the panacea to all problems are one example.<sup>22</sup> Although the causal link between a lack of accountable and transparent democratic regimes and a range of destabilizing dynamics has been reinforced by examples across the globe,<sup>23</sup> we have also seen numerous cases in which democracy can intensify identity-based conflicts and in which democratic processes have been used to consolidate and retain power.<sup>24</sup> This was the case in Sri Lanka, where majoritarianism led to violent conflict between the Sinhala and Tamil factions.

A study by Coexistence International noted that, overwhelmingly, policymakers stress their "unequivocal commitment to participatory and inclusive approaches in policy development...."<sup>25</sup> However, despite improvements in this area, policy and funding decisions often remain at headquarters' level, and decisions taken without due regard to their impact at the local level and without attention to transferring power to local players remain an all too common occurrence. The role of recipients in funding is an important topic for further discussion among funders. Those receiving funding need to be seen as partners in the process—not as mere recipients. A simple grantor-grantee relationship fails to capitalize on the critical lessons to be shared and on opportunities for improved programming, and subsequently, improved impact.

The problem is not so much with concepts, but with approaches that allow minimal space for discussion and thinking that may run counter to the current solutions promoted by powerful players in the international community. Further, many of the solutions favored today require

elements (e.g. civil society) that are often nascent or non-existent, or worse, do exist but in a form not easily incorporated into the strategies of the international community, i.e. religious associations or networks supported by former combatants. Consequently, the donor community and international organizations often end up creating structures rather than assisting in their natural development or working within existing structures. This ultimately creates additional problems further down the line, such as a weakened civil society, community mistrust of both civil society and the international community, and exclusion of important groups (such as religious groups or veterans associations) who are often seen as too 'biased' to engage with, even if they have a proven track record at community mobilization against violence. Societies in transition need to explore their own meanings of concepts such as democracy or reconciliation, as strategies developed outside of the context of the conflict and with prescribed stages only serve to fuel tension in already fragile climates.

Additionally, funding allocation and timeframes can sometimes become tied to political timetables and commitments, and the result is, more often than not, attempts at quick-fix solutions that do not address more sensitive processes, such as reconciliation, and that fail to plan for the long term. A survey of donors and civil society representatives in Kosovo revealed that an aversion toward addressing the underlying causes of conflict, combined with an emphasis on the immediate re-establishment of security, although important, resulted in a lack of long-term planning to rebuild severed relations and re-establish trust among communities.<sup>26</sup> The consequence, according to these representatives—donors and NGOs alike—was a 'frozen' conflict, where the "disputes are alive and well."<sup>27</sup>

While national ownership of strategies is critical, there is a danger that these strategies do not often reflect the reality of needs at the local level, particularly communities at the periphery. Further, the relationships between civil society players and national governmental actors are often characterized by mistrust due to nepotism, corruption, and patterns of political opposition. Very often, donors focus on the importance of national-level strategies, without addressing local government and civil society. There is a further danger for civil society organizations not based in capital cities in that they are not as frequently consulted as their counterparts who are more easily accessible.

Funders of coexistence work can assist in countering top-down approaches by working directly with local communities to assess causes of tension, needs, and capacities (for peace as well as violence). More and more, as donors increasingly play a central role in policy and strategy discussion,<sup>28</sup> it becomes imperative to bridge the divide between those implementing work on the ground and those making funding

and policy decisions. In comparison with governmental and intergovernmental donors, foundations and corporate donors are often less subject to political and media pressures and have a proven track record of providing support for non-traditional activities and operations in largely forgotten regions.<sup>29</sup> This level of independence and openness to innovation allows such donors a significant degree of flexibility for supporting improved strategies for coexistence and conflict transformation.

### **3. Reduced Funding Opportunities for Local Actors**

In recent years, international funding has been allocated to a smaller number of implementing agencies and to an increasing number of private contractors and consulting firms.<sup>30</sup> Additionally, an increasing proportion of funding is being allocated to large projects run by governments in the developing world.<sup>31</sup> It has been estimated that by 2020 as few as 20 multinational NGOs may account for up to 80% of all non-government resource allocation.<sup>32</sup> The emergence of 'mega private funds'<sup>33</sup> such as the Soros Foundation and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation,<sup>34</sup> coupled with the massive pledges of more established funders such as the Carnegie Corporation and the Ford Foundation, have also contributed to this trend, as there is a tendency among these large funders to seek equally large partnerships of international non-governmental organizations (INGOs) and for-profit institutions. Research on funding trends reveals that large gifts tend to attract additional funding from other donors, thus reducing available funding for other causes.

The axiom "money attracts money" is fitting in this context. Larger, longer-established organizations will have an advantage with the many donors who are seeking to streamline their grantmaking processes by funding fewer organizations. Despite the availability of funding mechanisms specifically targeting smaller and newly established organizations, larger INGOs are likely to continue their growth to the detriment of smaller, less experienced, and more isolated actors. In the increasingly competitive fundraising market, strategic alliances to implement integrated projects and access to donors become extremely important,<sup>35</sup> and are another area where those organizations with established contacts, resources to present a more professional identity, and the ability to travel and network will have the advantage. It is a common complaint among local NGOs that they simply "...don't have the resources to compete with big international NGOs and private firms."<sup>36</sup> Further, as one NGO representative noted about a recent European Commission conference focusing on funding opportunities in Southeastern Europe, "...The entire afternoon was focused on presentations of private consulting firms selling their services, not about how local organizations can access funding to implement their own projects...."<sup>37</sup>

The problems with this trend are multiple, but some key issues include: the implementation of projects by organizations that do not necessarily possess on-the-ground knowledge and access to local communities; attempts to ensure financial survival that pull organizations away from their original mandates (and potentially away from areas in which their skills are strongest); the disappearance of smaller 'niche organizations' as funding pools decrease; failure to empower local actors who are needed to sustain communities; and stagnation in local civil society sectors as they fail to compete with external organizations. Funding in this way maintains the major inequities that characterize division in resources in the world, ultimately exacerbating underlying sources of conflict.

Funding of coexistence work will facilitate the involvement of local communities' contribution to national strategies, but this must be complemented with more stringent monitoring and evaluation on the part of the donor community. A donor's commitment does not end with the distribution of grants; it is incumbent upon donors to follow through with monitoring of how their money is applied and to evaluate the results and potential impact. At the same time, however, donors must be more flexible in their approach to monitoring and evaluation, and understand the value of process in conflict transformation. In terms of accountability, transparency is also required on the side of the donor community. Donors need to review the impact of their strategies and improve their level of coordination to ensure that diverse local actors are not marginalized when it comes to funding. Donors providing "mega funds" need to ensure that they are promoting conflict-sensitive development, as such massive amounts of money can dramatically alter the conflict landscape (both positively and negatively); and they need to complement such funding with coexistence work that focuses on improving social inclusion.

### **4. Mainstreaming of Coexistence Lens**

The links between social inclusion, stability, and the attainment of broader development goals are widely recognized, resulting in the positive mainstreaming of coexistence work in a number of institutions. A few examples of such efforts include the United Nations Development Programme's Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery, the Organization of American States' Special Program for the Promotion of Dialogue and Conflict Resolution Unit, the World Bank's Conflict Prevention and Reconstruction Unit, and the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe's Conflict Prevention Centre. Many government donor agencies have also recognized the importance of improving conflict-response mechanisms and better integrating development and conflict work as well. The Canadian government works through the Canadian Peacebuilding Coordinating Committee; the United Kingdom has developed its Conflict Prevention Pools and the Conflict and Humanitarian Affairs Department; the United States Agency for International Development has established the

Office of Conflict Management and Mitigation and the Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization; and Nordic governments have long been proactive in supporting conflict prevention and peacebuilding activities. While these examples are but a few, and not without their challenges, it is clear that more and more donors are improving their knowledge for operating in unstable environments.

However, gaps remain. This is where the concept of 'conflict-sensitive development' can play a useful role. The international community has increasingly recognized the potential of development work, however well intended, to fuel conflict. A number of donor institutions have recognized the need to improve their knowledge about working in conflict situations and have adopted more conflict-sensitive approaches to their work. Further positive trends have been seen in the support of locally administered reintegration programs and, in some cases, truth and justice commissions. An increased awareness of the value of improving relations between conflicting parties and cooperation among local, national, and international partners has led to a higher level of support among both local and international communities for Track II diplomacy and dialogue efforts. The use of arts in peacebuilding, such as the Transforming Arms into Ploughshares Project, an innovative project designed to promote peacebuilding and reconciliation while concurrently reducing the stockpile of small arms in Mozambique has been another effort at integration. (The project encourages the creation of sculpture and art pieces out of some weapons, and the destruction of others in exchange for tools.) Projects that draw people into reconciliation processes at their own pace and allow them to engage in such processes in less confrontational or more culturally resonant ways tend to be especially effective; some examples include numerous Peace Parks promoting sustainable development while engaging communities in strategies to promote reconciliation and peaceful coexistence; monuments around the globe; and drumming circles throughout parts of Africa to support reconciliation.

Such efforts not only support local methods of communication and addressing social problems, but also often prove effective at breaking down barriers by enabling people to engage emotionally. These breakthroughs are important, particularly because, as scholars and practitioners are increasingly recognizing, "...rational processes alone cannot transform relationships of enmity or indifference...."<sup>38</sup> The transformation of relationships is the foundation of coexistence work and the foundation for the transformation of conflict. Without significant and sustained support for these activities, plans for security and the attainment of broader development goals are subject to collapse, as the underlying causes of conflict remain unaddressed.

## Recommendations

### ***Donor Community in general:***

- Recognize the fact that societal-level change requires long-term commitment and coordinate with other donors to ensure that long-term funding is provided; at the same time, better coordinate overall funding allocations to ensure that certain sectors are not dangerously underfunded.
- Incorporate and expand the use of conflict-impact assessments into funding strategies to better understand the impact of funding on the conflict environment.
- Distribute larger grants through networks to be more effective at facilitating social change and to operate at many levels and with a range of actors.<sup>39</sup> Funding in this manner can also support the distribution of smaller grants to local organizations, thus contributing to civil society development and engagement with community actors at the local level.
- Support dialogue, coordinated planning, and expertise exchange among the development, defense, and diplomatic communities.
- Increase awareness of the benefits of preventive activities and take an active role in dissemination of this information to the broader public. For example, despite cost-benefit analyses that have shown disaster prevention to be cost efficient and important in reducing serious human suffering and economic loss, understanding of this among either the general public or the donor community is lacking.<sup>40</sup>
- Fund opportunities for academics and other actors to work with field staff and practitioners to "...close the gap between theory and practice...."<sup>41</sup>
- Meet with practitioners to improve understanding of the intricate social processes that contribute to conflict transformation and social change, and re-evaluate time scales and criteria for funding success.
- Use leverage at the policy level to provide platforms for civil society. This should be complemented by training in making presentations to policymakers, as well as educating NGOs about the importance of familiarizing themselves with the intricacies of the system they intend to influence.<sup>42</sup>
- Provide community outreach and advocacy at the policy level (both national and international) to fill the gaps that currently exist between decision-makers and local communities.
- Take advantage of opportunities for coexistence work within funding for the health and educational sectors: plan dialogue sessions at local vaccination points, incorporate leadership training and conflict resolution skills into school curricula, etc.

- Consider various approaches for increased donor transparency and accountability, such as the Financial Tracking System instituted by the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA).<sup>43</sup> These could also serve as important indicators for identifying gaps in funding.
- Re-assess roles in the donor-grantee relationship, as well as in the global issues being addressed. Recognize that while grantees involved in conflict-related and disaster-management work are often asked to take risks, donors are often unwilling to do the same.
- Review aspects of current policies that may inhibit the transformation of conflict. For example, cross-border work is particularly needed in certain regions where there has been a spillover of conflict, but is often difficult to fund under country-based approaches, where funding can only be applied within countries, not across borders—a drawback of a number of government-funding programs.
- Recognize role as partners in the transformation of conflict. This means engaging more actively in the conflicts and going to the field—not just to the capitals, but to the villages and border towns where problems are often most acutely felt.

### **Private Donors (Foundations, Trusts, Community Foundations, Corporations):**

- Bring together diverse practitioners and donors to discuss the implications of the politicization of funding and to develop strategies to influence policy.
- Facilitate dialogue on and exploration of more sensitive issues with all stakeholders, including government donors who might otherwise avoid these subjects.
- Support coexistence activities that engage all actors—including potential “spoilers.” This is particularly important, as the exclusion of those parties most interested in pursuing violence will result in a return to violence if their grievances are not addressed. Government donors may not be willing to support such initiatives and as a result civil society may, in an effort to retain independence and the trust of communities, avoid government funding.
- Ensure that dialogue efforts are structured in such a way as to achieve maximum impact on situations of conflict.
- Provide support for local exercises that explore concepts such as democracy and justice, and that enable local representatives to raise questions about donor approaches within the context of their particular social and historical setting.<sup>44</sup>
- Encourage initiatives aimed at creating mechanisms for local/regional resource mobilization to support financial sustainability and a degree of independence for local organizations.

## Conclusion

Addressing the diverse causes of conflict and the development needs across the globe requires cooperation among a variety of actors at multiple levels—local, national, and international—each providing critical knowledge, experience, and understanding. A major threat lies in the continued adherence to results-driven, top-down approaches and an avoidance of long-term strategy development. Despite the overwhelming evidence of the benefits of preventative-planning—in terms of saving money, infrastructure, and, ultimately, lives—approaches in this area remain dangerously under-supported. Development work must address the inter-group relations and divergent agendas that are the driving forces behind conflict and poverty, and this approach, too, is under-funded.

Efforts to reduce poverty and mitigate conflict are subject to failure if donor approaches remain fragmented and short-term in nature. Coexistence work is premised on the need to engage people directly and provide them the space and support to find common ground upon which they can build a base for their future. Supporting the creation of such bases will help to ensure that strategies developed to tackle the problems facing us are far more likely to meet with lasting success. The question remains, will donors, who currently control the lion’s share of resources, exercise the flexibility, foresight, and courage to meet these challenges?

## Additional Resources On This Topic

### Coexistence International Reports and Publications

- *A Survey of Coexistence Sensitivity in International Democratization and Governance Policies\**
- Coexistence Fundraising Directory\*
- *Coexistence Sensitivity in International Democratization and Governance Policies: Lessons Learned\**
- *Complementary Approaches to Coexistence Work series\**

### Other Papers and Publications

- Asian Development Bank. “Frameworks, Tools and Instruments for Preventing, Detecting and Managing Conflict of Interest,” (2008).
- Bush, Kenneth. “A Measure of Peace: Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment (PCIA) of Development Projects in Conflict Zones,” (International Development Research Centre, 1998).
- Conflict-Sensitive Approaches to Development, Humanitarian Assistance and Peacebuilding: A Resource Pack. See: [www.conflictsensitivity.org/node/98](http://www.conflictsensitivity.org/node/98).
- Simpson, Erin. “Is Coherence a Trojan Horse for the Politicization of Aid? Policy Coherence in Fragile States.”

(Canadian Council for International Co-operation, 2005).

- Stoddard, Abby; Harmer, Adele; Haver, Katherine. "Providing aid in insecure environments: trends in policy and operations," (Humanitarian Policy Group, 2006).

### Organizations & Web Sites

- Alliance for Peacebuilding: [www.allianceforpeacebuilding.org/](http://www.allianceforpeacebuilding.org/)
- Canadian Peacebuilding Coordinating Committee: [www.peacebuild.ca/](http://www.peacebuild.ca/)
- Conflict Sensitivity: [www.conflictsensitivity.org](http://www.conflictsensitivity.org)
- Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Network on Conflict, Peace and Development Co-operation: [www.oecd.org/dac/conflict](http://www.oecd.org/dac/conflict)
- European Foundation Centre: [www.efc.be/](http://www.efc.be/)
- Foundation Center: [foundationcenter.org/](http://foundationcenter.org/)
- Initiative for Peacebuilding: [www.initiativeforpeacebuilding.eu/](http://www.initiativeforpeacebuilding.eu/)
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, - Fragile States Group: [www.oecd.org/dac/fragilestates](http://www.oecd.org/dac/fragilestates)
- Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe - Conflict Prevention Centre: [www.osce.org/cpc/](http://www.osce.org/cpc/)
- Partnership for Peace: [www.nato.int/issues/pfp/index.html](http://www.nato.int/issues/pfp/index.html)
- Peace and Security Funders Group: [www.peaceandsecurity.org/](http://www.peaceandsecurity.org/)
- Recasting Reconciliation through Culture and the Arts - A Virtual Collection: [www.brandeis.edu/programs/Slifka/vrc/recasting/index.htm](http://www.brandeis.edu/programs/Slifka/vrc/recasting/index.htm)
- United Nations Peacebuilding Commission: [www.un.org/peace/peacebuilding/](http://www.un.org/peace/peacebuilding/)

\* Document available at [www.coexistence.net](http://www.coexistence.net)

### Endnotes

- 1 Greensmith, John. "Trends in fundraising and giving by International NGOs," Presented at the 21st International Fundraising Congress (October 2001). [www.globalpolicy.org/ngos/fund/2002/0901ingo.htm](http://www.globalpolicy.org/ngos/fund/2002/0901ingo.htm).
- 2 These are the values that Coexistence International attributes to positive coexistence.
- 3 Lederach, John Paul. *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies* (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace, 1997).
- 4 International Alert, "Local Business, Local Peace: The Peacebuilding Potential of the Domestic Private Sector." [www.international-alert.org/our\\_work/themes/business\\_2a.php](http://www.international-alert.org/our_work/themes/business_2a.php).
- 5 Renz, Loren and Atienza, Josie. "A Snapshot of U.S. Foundation Trends," (Foundation Center, October 2006). [http://foundationcenter.org/gainknowledge/research/pdf/intl\\_update\\_2006.pdf](http://foundationcenter.org/gainknowledge/research/pdf/intl_update_2006.pdf).
- 6 Walker, Peter and Pepper, Kevin. "Follow the Money:

A Review and Analysis of the State of Humanitarian Funding," (Feinstein International Center Briefing Paper, 2007). [www.reliefweb.int/rw/lib.nsf/db900SID/AMMF-75MGSC?OpenDocument](http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/lib.nsf/db900SID/AMMF-75MGSC?OpenDocument).

- 7 Ibid.
- 8 Defined as foundations established since 1995.
- 9 Renz, Loren and Atienza, Josie. (2006).
- 10 Lancaster, Carol. "The Chinese Aid System," (Center for Global Development, 2007). [www.cgdev.org/files/13953\\_file\\_Chinese\\_aid.pdf](http://www.cgdev.org/files/13953_file_Chinese_aid.pdf).
- 11 EuropeAid Annual Report, 2007. [http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/multimedia/publications/publications/annual-reports/2007\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/multimedia/publications/publications/annual-reports/2007_en.htm).
- 12 Renz, Loren and Atienza, Josie. (2006).
- 13 Craig, Finlay. "The Importance of Localizing Resource Mobilization," (Resource Alliance) [www.resource-alliance.org/resources/articles\\_library/79.asp](http://www.resource-alliance.org/resources/articles_library/79.asp).
- 14 Walker, Peter. and Pepper, Kevin. (2007).
- 15 "Trends in International Cooperation and Volunteering Over 2006 and the last 5 years." A discussion paper for the 2006 Rethinking International Volunteering and Cooperation Development Initiatives Forum. [www.entwicklungsdienst.de/fileadmin/users/Fachmesse/Infos\\_zur\\_PZ/FORUM\\_Report\\_\\_5\\_years\\_2006.pdf](http://www.entwicklungsdienst.de/fileadmin/users/Fachmesse/Infos_zur_PZ/FORUM_Report__5_years_2006.pdf).
- 16 Through the Commander's Emergency Response Program, the percentage of ODA for the U.S. Department of Defense rose from 6% to 22 % between 2002 and 2005, while USAID's share fell from 50% to 39%. Craig, Finlay. "The Importance of Localizing Resource Mobilization," (Resource Alliance.) [www.resource-alliance.org/resources/articles\\_library/79.asp](http://www.resource-alliance.org/resources/articles_library/79.asp).
- 17 Walker, Bridget. "Funding Conflict Transformation: Money, Power and Accountability—A Grant-Seeker's Perspective." (Responding to Conflict) [www.c-r.org/ccts/ccts25/grant\\_seeker.htm](http://www.c-r.org/ccts/ccts25/grant_seeker.htm).
- 18 Schirch, Lisa and Kishbaugh, Aaron. "Leveraging "3D" Security: From Rhetoric to Reality" (Foreign Policy in Focus, 2006). [www.fpif.org/fpiftxt/3711](http://www.fpif.org/fpiftxt/3711).
- 19 Renz, Loren and Atienza, Josie. (2006).
- 20 Cliffe, Sarah. "Donor Coordination and Commitment in Peacebuilding," The World Bank. <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTLICUS/Resources/SCPeacebuilding.pdf>
- 21 Schirch, Lisa and Kishbaugh, Aaron. (2006).



- 22 In 2005, USAID's Office for Democratization and Governance spent \$10.8 billion on democracy promotion. Rassoul, Shaheen. "Strengthening Coexistence Policy: A Survey of Coexistence Sensitivity in International Democratization & Governance Policies," (Coexistence International, 2006). [www.brandeis.edu/coexistence/linked%20documents/Coex%20and%20Democ%20Survey\\_March%202006.pdf](http://www.brandeis.edu/coexistence/linked%20documents/Coex%20and%20Democ%20Survey_March%202006.pdf)
- 23 Ibid.
- 24 "Coexistence and Democracy-Building—What is the Connection?," Meeting Summary, March 1, 2007, Coexistence International. [www.brandeis.edu/coexistence/linked%20documents/CI\\_UN\\_Democracy\\_\\_\\_Coexis\\_WEB.pdf](http://www.brandeis.edu/coexistence/linked%20documents/CI_UN_Democracy___Coexis_WEB.pdf)
- 25 Jean, Isabella with Fitzduff, Mari and Berns, Jessica. "A Survey of Coexistence Sensitivity in International Democratization and Governance Policies: Part II – Lessons Learned," Coexistence International. [www.brandeis.edu/coexistence/linked%20documents/CI%20Survey%20PART%20may31.pdf](http://www.brandeis.edu/coexistence/linked%20documents/CI%20Survey%20PART%20may31.pdf)
- 26 Goldstein, Joshua. *War and Gender* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
- 27 Interviews conducted during July and August 2006. Ross, Shelly. "Challenges and Priorities for Practitioners in Conflict Prevention: A Case Study of the GPKT Micro-region," (2006). <http://www.gpkt.org/gpkt-policy-briefs.htm>.
- 28 Foundation Facts & Figures Across the EU – Associating Private Wealth for Public Benefit (European Foundation Centre, April 2005). from: [www.efc.be/ftp/public/EU/EURweb/Facts\\_Figs\\_publication.pdf](http://www.efc.be/ftp/public/EU/EURweb/Facts_Figs_publication.pdf)
- 29 Forbes Martin, Susan; Weiss Fagen, Patricia; Poole, Alice; and Karim, Sabrina. "Philanthropic Grant-Making for Disaster Management: Trend Analysis and Recommended Improvements," Institute for the Study of International Migration, Georgetown University (2006). [www.ncg.org/assets/DisasterResponsefromGates.pdf](http://www.ncg.org/assets/DisasterResponsefromGates.pdf).
- 30 There has been an increase in private competition for ODA funds in the U.S. In 2000, the top ten recipients of USAID funds included five NGOs, four corporations and one university. Walker, Peter and Pepper, Kevin.
- 31 Downer, Kristen. "The Beautiful South," The Third Sector. <http://thirdsector.co.uk/Archive/>
- 32 Craig, Finlay.
- 33 Greensmith, John. (2001).
- 34 In 2006, Warren Buffett pledged to donate the bulk of his fortune - approximately 31 billion USD - to the Gates Foundation. Renz, Loren. and Atienza, Josie. "International Grantmaking Update," (October 2006). [www.foundationcenter.org/gainknowledge/research/pdf/intl\\_update\\_2006.pdf](http://www.foundationcenter.org/gainknowledge/research/pdf/intl_update_2006.pdf)
- 35 Greensmith, John. (2001).
- 36 Interviews conducted during August 2006. Ross, Shelly.
- 37 Discussion with NGO representatives, May 2007.
- 38 Yalen, Lesley and Cohen, Cynthia. "Complementary Approaches to Coexistence Work: Focus on Coexistence and the Arts," Coexistence International (2007). [www.brandeis.edu/coexistence/linked%20documents/Coex%20and%20Arts\\_FINAL%20template.pdf](http://www.brandeis.edu/coexistence/linked%20documents/Coex%20and%20Arts_FINAL%20template.pdf); Long, William J. and Peter Brecke. *War and Reconciliation: Reason and Emotion in Conflict Resolution* (Cambridge, MA, MIT Press, 2003).
- 39 Walker, Bridget.
- 40 Forbes Martin, Susan, et al. (2006).
- 41 Rassoul, Shaheen. (2006).
- 42 Fitzduff, Mari and Church, Cheyanne. "Lessons Learned in Conflict-Related Policy Engagement," NGOs at the Table: Strategies for Influencing Policies in Areas of Conflict (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2004).
- 43 Walker, Peter and Pepper, Kevin. (2007).
- 44 Jean, Isabella with Berns, Jessica and Cohen, Cynthia. "Exploring the Possibilities and Limits of Collaboration: Commonalities and Differences in Coexistence and Related Fields," (Coexistence International, 2006). [www.brandeis.edu/coexistence/linked%20documents/BarometerReport%20FINAL%20June%202006.pdf](http://www.brandeis.edu/coexistence/linked%20documents/BarometerReport%20FINAL%20June%202006.pdf)

## About Coexistence International

Based at Brandeis University since 2005, Coexistence International (CI) is an initiative committed to strengthening the resources available to policymakers, practitioners, researchers, advocates, organizations, and networks promoting coexistence at local, national, and international levels. CI advocates a complementary approach to coexistence work through facilitating connections, learning, reflection, and strategic thinking between those in the coexistence field and those in related areas.

### What is Coexistence?

Coexistence describes societies in which diversity is embraced for its positive potential, equality is actively pursued, interdependence between different groups is recognized, and the use of weapons to address conflicts is increasingly obsolete. Coexistence work covers the range of initiatives necessary to ensure that communities and societies can live more equitably and peacefully together.

## Other CI Publications

### Complementary Approaches to Coexistence Work

*What is Coexistence and Why a Complementary Approach?*

*Focus on Coexistence and the Arts*

*Focus on Coexistence and Democracy-building*

*Focus on Coexistence and Natural Resources*

*Focus on Coexistence and Security*

### Country Studies

This series describes the state of coexistence within different countries around the world—including the Czech Republic, Ecuador, Latvia, Mauritius, Myanmar, the Netherlands, Poland, and South Africa—and compares their diversity and coexistence policies.

Publications can be accessed online at:  
[www.coexistence.net/pubs/publications.html](http://www.coexistence.net/pubs/publications.html).



This publication is made possible through a generous gift of the Alan B. Slifka Foundation.

### Coexistence International

Mailstop 086

Brandeis University

Waltham, Massachusetts

02454-9110