

*Advancing Democracy Abroad:*  
*A Proposal to Create the Democracy Canada Institute*

**THOMAS S. AXWORTHY AND LESLIE CAMPBELL**

Paper presented to

The Institute for Research on Public Policy  
**IRPP**

*Canada's Role in International Assistance to Democratic Development*

September 10-11, 2004  
Minto Place Suite Hotel  
Ottawa, Ontario

This document is a preliminary draft.  
**PLEASE DO NOT QUOTE OR REPRODUCE IN WHOLE  
OR IN PART WITHOUT PERMISSION FROM THE AUTHOR.**

## ***Introduction***

Man is capable of justice, hence democracy is possible; but man is inclined to injustice, therefore democracy is necessary.

*Reinhold Niebuhr*

Our daily newspapers tell the tale: hardly a day goes by without a story about failed states, like Afghanistan or Haiti, trying to build the minimal structures of a functioning society, or well-developed former authoritarian states like Iraq or Russia trying to build new civil societies of pluralism and liberty, or already strong civil societies like Taiwan or Hong Kong striving to make the jump to a sustainable democracy. State-building, civil society-building and democracy-building are three of the most important topics in the world today, and this paper is dedicated to the question of whether Canada can make a contribution to international democratic capacity building and, if so, how such a contribution would be structured.

Answering such questions is far more than an academic exercise. The federal government has announced an international policy review, and the priority afforded to democratic and governance capacity building - as opposed to poverty reduction, peace and security and the myriad of other foreign policy objectives - will be one of the big issues that a new White Paper must address. The Martin government, too, in the 2004 Speech from the Throne, announced the creation of a Canada Corps, an initiative that seeks to harness the energy and experience of Canadian experts, volunteers, and young professionals for the delivery of international assistance in areas of governance and institution building. On May 14, 2004, the Prime Minister further announced that two co-chairs, Julie Payette and Gordon Smith, would be marshaled to come up with a three to five-year agenda for the Canada Corps.

This paper argues that the proposed objectives of the Canada Corps – giving Canadian volunteers an outlet and using Canadian expertise to assist international governance – are worthy and deserving of government support. But the volunteer aspect of the initiative – the Canada Corps – should be structured to encourage youth volunteers and participation in organizations like Katimivak and Canada World Youth. The focus of the Canada Corps should be to give volunteer-deficient young people a meaningful community experience in the transition from school to work. A healthy Canada is a Canada that volunteers. But while doing communities some good, the purpose of such an organization would be on the educative, self-transforming experience of the participants themselves. The other mandate mentioned in the initial description of the Canada Corps – transferring knowledge and skills in governance – is a professional, highly complex process. Public administration is a discipline with no easy answers.

Assisting international governance calls for a different kind of organization, and we would suggest that the government establish an independent Democracy Canada Institute, funded and reporting to Parliament, which would support existing Canadian organizations in the field and work closely with Canadian political parties to use some of their expertise in democratic development abroad. In 1970, Canada created the International Development Research Centre to assist development; in 1988, the government created the International Centre for Human Rights and Democracy Development to promote the rule of law; in 2004-05, the government should create a new

institution to fund, coordinate and prioritize Canadian efforts to nurture sustainable democracies abroad.<sup>1</sup>

In arguing this case, four questions must be addressed:

- Why is democratic development important?
- Does Canada have particular expertise or skills sets to add to the issue?
- What is being done internationally and what can be learned comparatively?
- If Canada is to make a contribution, how should it be structured?

### ***Democratic Development***

Running as a presidential candidate in 2000, George W. Bush was extremely wary of the concept of “nation-building.” But, as President, Bush has launched the most intense and ideological promotion of democracy since Woodrow Wilson. In his famous speech of November 2003, on the promotion of freedom and democracy in the Middle East, Bush proclaimed:

Are the peoples of the Middle East somehow beyond the reach of liberty? Are millions of men and women and children condemned by history or culture to live in despotism? Are they alone never to know freedom, and never even to have a choice in the matter? I, for one, do not believe it. I believe every person has the ability and the right to be free...Therefore, the United States has adopted a new policy, a forward strategy of freedom in the Middle East.

Bush’s commitment is breathtaking, especially since the record of building sustainable democracies is so mixed. But it does demonstrate how highly our superpower neighbour views the priority of democracy-building. Yet, it is the start of wisdom to begin a venture with a realistic appraisal of its chances for success. This paper argues for an enhanced Canadian effort to aid democratic development abroad, but the capabilities and realities of the real world won’t be pushed aside. The track record on building democratic systems that can be sustained after the donor or the imperial power leaves is not good. As Francis Fukuyama reminds us in *State-Building*, the “experience of the 1990’s in Somalia, Haiti, Cambodia, Bosnia, Kosovo and East Timor should be very chastening.”<sup>2</sup> The mission is vital but not easy and this must be readily acknowledged before Canada considers the creation of a new institution.

Historian Jacques Barzun, in his article *Is Democratic Theory for Export*, is skeptical that such knowledge can be transferred. Barzun’s democratic theorem can be stated in a single sentence: “For a free mankind, it is best that the people should be sovereign, and this popular sovereignty implies political and social equality.”<sup>3</sup> *Vox populi, vox dei* has always meant that rulers should not withstand the people’s will. But to force leaders to account for their actions, the people need liberty and training in how to use it. This was the essential point of Edmund Burke. People change only gradually and it is the norms of culture or society that determine behaviour most of the time, not the sanctions of the state. In his *Reflections on the French Revolution*, Burke famously wrote, “To love the little platoon we belong to in society is the first principle (the germ as it were) of public affections,” and by loving our families, our neighbourhoods, our churches, etc., gradually we build civic competence. Generations build on generations so that society is “a partnership not only

between those who are living but between those who are dead, and those who are to be born.”<sup>4</sup> Since it is local tradition that determines what de Tocqueville called “the habits of the heart,” Barzun is skeptical about international attempts to transfer knowledge in the absence of a domestic demand for them. Institutions depend on habits long ingrained and the habits of the heart cannot easily be transported to another. Barzun concludes: “The parts of the machine are not detachable.”<sup>5</sup>

But if Burke and conservatives like him are right, and it is the “little platoons” and, more broadly, culture that determine the “habits of the heart,” and thus the success of institutions, Burke’s great contemporary Immanuel Kant makes an equally strong case for reform. In his essay *Perpetual Peace*, written five years after Burke’s *Reflections on the French Revolution*, Kant made the point that institutional change can change a culture, and thus the norms that determine how things run. Republics, he theorized, are different from Monarchies and less likely to go to war, because citizens will know that it is they who will suffer. Reform can bring about different habits of the heart. Change the incentive system and you change behaviour. Burke and Barzun warn us that democracy cannot be exported holus-bolus; rather, people have to come gradually to the idea. But Kant enlightens by showing that cultures are not in stasis, they evolve, and structural changes in institutions from an absolute monarch to a civic republic can lead to more civil behaviour.

If Burke cautions us not to rush, Kant says don’t give up hope. Both lessons are amply on display today. States like Taiwan, Chile and South Korea have made substantial progress in becoming full-fledged democracies within a generation. Taiwan’s progress is instructive. Taiwan after 1945 was authoritarian but had a Mandarin culture that went back 5000 years. China invented the Mandarin system of bureaucracy and has a tradition of a strong state. Confucius’ parable about the woman fleeing anarchy and civil war, even if she had to face tigers on the road, makes the point that security and order are the preconditions of governance. For twenty years after Chiang Kai-shek fled the Mainland he ruled Taiwan as a dictator, but gradually elements of a civil society developed. Religion thrived, capitalism took hold and the middle class expanded. Wealth grew. Taiwan began to experiment with expanded participation in local government. Taiwan became liberal, though not democratic. Finally in the mid 1980s, the son of Chiang Kai-shek, Chiang Ching-kuo, faced with growing political unrest, decided that democracy instead of oppression would be his legacy. Local governments became free, constitutional assemblies were created, the legislature became competitive and finally the president became chosen by direct election. This transformation from strong state to civil society to a democratic state came about because of gradual but continuous change, asked for from below but steadily allowed from above. Today, Taiwan has become the first entirely free part of China in 5000 years. It is a model on how democracies can be built.

### ***The Democratization Debate***

Since the 1970s, democracy has been on the march.<sup>6</sup> Thomas Carothers notes that in the last quarter of the twentieth century, trends in several nations resulted in a move “away from dictatorial rule toward more liberal and often more democratic governance.”<sup>7</sup> Carothers argues that Western observers have seen these trends as part of a larger process, “a global democratic trend that thanks to Samuel Huntington has widely come to be known as the ‘third wave’ of democracy.”<sup>8</sup>

Between 1974 and 1990, the world saw the transition of approximately thirty nations from “non-democratic to democratic political systems,” which, according to Samuel Huntington, constitutes a “wave of democratization.”<sup>9</sup> Huntington went on to define the wave as “a group of transitions from non-democratic to democratic regimes that occur within a specified period of time and that significantly outnumber transitions in the opposite direction during that period of time.”<sup>10</sup>

Support for Huntington’s claim can be found in Freedom House’s *Freedom in the World* survey, which quantitatively measures the degree to which nations are free and democratic.<sup>11</sup> Results of this survey show that the number of “sovereign states” has increased substantially over the past forty years, going from 150 in 1972 to 192 in 2002. In addition, the survey points to the “dramatic progress in the expansion of freedom and democratic governance.” In 1972, the survey suggested that there were 43 ‘free’ countries, while 38 were only ‘partly free’ and 47 were ‘not free.’ However, over the last quarter century, the number of states considered free has doubled while the proportion of states considered not free has shrunk. Today, the survey states that currently 89 nations are rated ‘free,’ 56 ‘partly free’ and 47 ‘not free.’<sup>12</sup>

The most dramatic cases of democratization have occurred in three major regions: the Asia-Pacific region, Central and Eastern Europe, and Latin America. Democratization has been particularly weak in the Muslim world where 27 states with majority-Muslim populations are considered ‘not free.’ It is important to note, however, that the survey finds no direct causal link between belief in Islam and resistance to democracy.<sup>13</sup> It is also important to note that dividing countries into these simple categories based on their respective degrees of freedom may oversimplify the complexities of democratization.<sup>14</sup>

Although there has been an overall trend towards increased democratization in the world, there have also been setbacks. Between 1974 and 1991, 22 countries that moved into the ‘free’ category have since lost their ‘free’ status.<sup>15</sup> Larry Diamond points out that some prominent third wave democracies have been regressing and that the proportion of electoral democracies seems to be reaching equilibrium. This has led Diamond to conclude that the third wave may be entering a period of “stasis... in which gains for democracy are more or less offset by losses.”<sup>16</sup>

Diamond recommends supporting and bolstering the existing third wave democracies that he characterizes as “shallow, illiberal, or only tentatively liberal.” Bolstering these democracies would result in “the deepening and enlargement of the ranks of stable, liberal democracies,” and “would then generate a much more favourable global environment for renewed democratic expansion, with the cultural capital and institutional models to help launch a fourth wave.”<sup>17</sup>

Diamond is guardedly optimistic about the possibility of a fourth wave of democracy occurring. He points out, for example, that of the 53 nations considered by Freedom House to be ‘not free,’ “the prospects for democratization appear bleak for some time to come.”<sup>18</sup> However, optimism is evident in Diamond’s analysis when he claims, “we cannot confidently predict where and when a combination of unforeseen events, regime divisions, and popular protest might open a game of democratic transition.”<sup>19</sup>

Additionally, it seems that Diamond sees something of an inevitable trajectory of democratic transition. He claims that “universal norms of democracy and human rights will become embedded in international dialogue and action” and that the “universality” of liberal democracy will eventually

be affirmed in the world. Diamond projects a future in which a number of states currently considered 'not free' will undergo transitions to democracy and "generate a fourth wave of global democratization."<sup>20</sup>

The idea that waves of democratization are followed by reverse waves reflects an application of Hegel's conception of a dialectic of history to the theory of democratic transition.<sup>21</sup> Although Huntington acknowledges that history is not "unidirectional," it seems clear that the third wave paradigm assumes that democracy will be spread throughout the world by fits and starts. This spread of democracy ultimately results in a scenario where, over time, if world leaders push the democracy agenda forward,<sup>22</sup> the number of fits will be reduced and the number of starts will be increased.

Thomas Carothers observes that the transition paradigm's analytic framework has been widely received by the U.S. foreign policy and democracy promoting communities.<sup>23</sup> During the third wave, active democracy promotion initiatives by government and non-governmental organizations increased significantly.<sup>24</sup> The successes of democracy promotion efforts over the period of the third wave helped to solidify this paradigm as a key to informing democratization policy. Gretchen Casper and Michelle Taylor argue that after an apparent transition to democracy occurs, both national actors and parties involved in international democracy promotion share in the euphoria of the birth of new democracy.<sup>25</sup>

To illustrate the complexity of democratization, Geraint Parry and Michael Moran point out that democratization is not a "once and for all event" and that "even the long-established democracies have continued to experience substantial political change, and this political change bears in highly complex ways on the question of democratization."<sup>26</sup>

But there are differing degrees to the consolidation of democracy within a nation. It is possible for a country to be procedurally democratic while lacking deeply integrated and institutionalized democratic consolidation.<sup>27</sup> Carothers claims that several third wave democracies exist in a 'gray zone.' Many of these countries have failed to solidify a well-functioning form of democracy and fail to fit within the framework of the third wave transition paradigm.<sup>28</sup>

Carothers suggests that democracy assistance practitioners are sometimes naïve, but many democracy promoters understand the flaws inherent in the process of democratization, including a tendency to view democratization efforts in a simplistically coherent way. Moreover, democracy promoters see the goal of increasing democracy abroad as a noble, cause-oriented activity. Thus, democracy promoters will apply a degree of optimism and enthusiasm to their efforts that may be misconstrued as simplistic analysis by outside observers, when in actual fact, a great deal of hard-minded analysis is used to inform policy. In the end, despite all of the inherent dilemmas of democracy assistance, it remains the right thing to do, both as a matter of policy and as a matter of priority for international aid.<sup>29</sup> The promotion of democracy abroad is not, however, simply a wholly 'noble' activity and underlying most efforts in the international arena are a host of corollary objectives and influences.

The analysis of foreign policy has become increasingly complex in a post-Cold War era. As Andrew Moravcsik argues, "The relationship between states and the surrounding domestic and transnational society in which they are embedded critically shapes state behavior by influencing the

social purposes underlying state preferences.”<sup>30</sup> The national interest, therefore, must increasingly incorporate broader international concerns.

Globalization has likewise had a profound impact on democracy in the world.<sup>31</sup> The necessity of cooperation in international relations derives from a changing world order – where, because of globalization, power is no longer situated neatly within state borders. New information and communication technologies have caused power to be diffused to non-governmental individuals and groups. As a result, nations must incorporate elements of ‘soft power’ (economic, cultural, and social power) into their foreign policy objectives, rather than relying on traditional ‘hard power’ (military power, sanctions) to promote their objectives abroad.<sup>32</sup>

Democracy promotion, then, becomes increasingly important as ‘soft power’ agendas become more prominent in the foreign policies of developed nations. As we attempt to promote democracy abroad, it seems clear that we must also increase our understanding of the nations we wish to assist. We must also re-examine the policies and strategies we use to achieve the goal of strengthening democracy throughout the world. If the process of democratization is not as coherent as was once thought, then we must increase our efforts to understand how democratization initiatives work – from country to country and from project to project.

Democracy promotion, therefore, is one of the most active areas in development. Democratic capacity building is now one of the pillars of the World Bank’s overall efforts. Burke warns us that it will be hard. Kant cheers us by saying it can be done. But does Canada have anything special to contribute?

### ***Canada’s Niche in International Democratic Development***

Canadians are modest about the achievements of our democracy. Janet Ajzenstat, in her cheeky and stimulating *The Once and Future Canadian Democracy*, reviews our recent history of the Meech Lake debate, the Charlottetown Accord and other assorted failures and concludes: “Well, we’ve had the funerals, where’s the wedding? If you know friends, get me an invitation.”<sup>33</sup> But Ajzenstat also makes the point that Canadians have contributed far more to the realm of political ideas than is generally recognized (certainly by ourselves). In 1806, for example, Pierre Bédard in the journal *Le Canadien* described the new idea of responsible government, at a time when it had only been operating in Great Britain for a few decades: “the Ministry must necessarily have a majority in the House of Commons. When it loses the influence that has been given to it...it is relieved.” Bédard was thrown in jail for his pains but the idea stuck, and in 1836 Robert Baldwin elaborated the concept (to greater acclaim) in his well-known letter to the Colonial secretary. When Lord Durham came to Canada to write his famous report, there was already a substantial “made in Canada” theory of responsible government. Canada innovated again in 1867, with a North American version of Parliamentary “mixed government” in which a Monarch, Senate and House of Commons were wedded to a federal state. In 1887, the Liberal party took a gamble on tolerance by making a member of the French-Canadian minority its leader, at a time of rising religious and ethnic discord. Canada was also one of the leaders in peacefully transferring the British Empire into the Commonwealth. A party dedicated to breaking up the country - the Parti Québécois - has been allowed to contest elections and propose referenda and that party, in turn, under its leader René Lévesque, brought in groundbreaking legislation on election financing. The Charter of Rights in 1982 added language rights to the traditional list of legal and political rights

and, in so doing, made the Charter into a standard of civic rights for minorities rather than ethnic territorial nationalism. We have had the occasional funeral but, all in all, we have much to celebrate in our record of governance.

So, it is fair to say that a country experienced in parliamentary democracy in a federal state, with a multicultural society and a social democratic ethos, might have things to say of interest to some parts of the world.

With this governance tradition, Canada has also made the promotion and development of democracy a key priority in its international initiatives over the past decade, although never with the rhetorical flavour of President Bush. Prior to the announcement of the 2004 international policy review, Canada's last foreign policy review took place in the mid-1990s, with hearings of the Special Joint Parliamentary Committee held in 1994. In 1995 the Canadian government tabled its official statement on Canadian foreign policy, *Canada in the World*, in which it set forth three broad objectives for the country's international relations:

- the promotion of prosperity and employment;
- the projection of Canadian security within a stable global framework; and
- the projection of Canadian values and culture in the world, including respect for democracy.

In principle, *Canada in the World* provided Ottawa with a clear framework in which to guide its international activities.<sup>34</sup> Federal departments could then utilize these guiding principles when engaging in activities related to the promotion of democracy beyond Canadian borders, to ensure that they are consistent with the country's larger foreign policy objectives. The policies, programs and projects of various departments and public organizations can also be developed and evaluated on the basis of these three foreign policy objectives.

In Canada, CIDA has taken the lead in promoting democracy and governance capacity building; the organization has pledged support to international development by focusing its Official Development Assistance and activities on six areas of main concern:

- basic human needs;
- women in development;
- infrastructure services;
- human rights, democracy and good governance;
- private sector development; and
- the environment.

Beyond CIDA funding, there are several non-governmental organizations (NGOs) active in Canada, which possess specialized democracy-promotion skills. Groups such as the Institute on Governance and the Federation of Canadian Municipalities have an international reputation and associated expertise that have made a substantial contribution to the promotion of democracy.<sup>35</sup> While these organizations contribute to securing *democratic values* abroad, they have been unable to fulfill this goal in a comprehensive manner, as democratic development is not their core mandate.<sup>36</sup> Moreover, a sense of collaboration and leadership between groups is visibly absent.

The need for policy coherence between NGOs can be seen by an examination of the multiplicity of objectives that are undertaken by democracy promotion organizations - these groups can be duplicating efforts or at times, seem to be working at cross-purposes. The policies and mandates of several such institutions operating across the country are outlined in Appendix I.

To highlight this lack of cohesion is in no way to minimize the valuable and considerable contributions of Canadian departments and NGOs. Rather, it is to suggest that a Canadian-based institution leveraging the international reputation of the Government of Canada could make a considerable contribution to the promotion of democracy abroad; such an Institute could provide the means for addressing policy coherence among the disparate actors in the democracy field. Key to this goal is the need to ensure that the use of scarce resources in democracy programs is not undermined by the adoption of other policies with conflicting objectives. The mechanisms to ensure that the practices of governments' policies and NGOs are complementary are not in place in Canada today. As such, a Canadian-based institution with its experience in a federal, ethnically diverse, multilateral and bilingual country could make a serious contribution to the promotion of democracy abroad.

### ***A Multiplicity of Directions***

The international promotion of democracy is therefore already an important tenet of Canadian foreign policy. Canada is widely recognized for supporting democracy abroad as evidenced by its willingness to provide electoral assistance to fledgling democracies, support grassroots democracy through civil society organizations and denounce regimes engaged in egregious abuses of democracy. The activities of Ottawa fall into three broad categories: (1) professional and technical assistance missions; (2) aid to NGOs involved in democracy promotion/support for international protocols and institutions addressing governance; and (3) the promotion of democratic values.

Through the activities of various domestic organizations and the specialized knowledge of citizens, Canada has been near the forefront of the international community in providing support for democracy abroad. Many Canadians may be surprised to learn that Elections Canada lends its expertise to several projects abroad. The organization undertakes a host of international activities in response to requests from FAC and CIDA, as well as various international organizations and individual countries. These projects include advising on constitutional and election law provisions, conducting pre-election evaluations and providing professional support. Elections Canada has also sought to partner with its peers internationally, and, in 1996, Elections Canada and Instituto Federal Electoral (the Mexican election agency) signed a five-year agreement for information exchange.<sup>37</sup>

Presently, officials at Elections Canada are working on the Elections and Registration in Afghanistan Project, which is designed to support the preparation of national elections in this transitioning state. Under phase one of the initiative, Elections Canada has provided specialists in systems of representation, voter registration, civic education and political party law.<sup>38</sup> Typically, recipient nations have welcomed Canadian electoral assistance, due in part to our country's lack of identification as a former colonial power or as a superpower, as well as our bilingual character and mixed-law traditions; the Canadian mosaic with its tolerance for multiculturalism is an appealing model for many similarly diverse nations.

Aware of the influence of civil society groups in promoting democratic change and advancement, Canada has supported numerous domestic organizations in these efforts. It has made an attempt to back support local initiatives and ideas on how to strengthen democracy, while also ensuring that expertise is available to support change. In 1988, Ottawa assisted in the establishment of the International Centre for Human Rights and Democracy Development, which works to strengthen democratic institutions and enhance access of civil society organizations to policy debate and decision-making.<sup>39</sup> As well, there are a series of other smaller associations that partake in a wide range of democracy promotion activities, including election monitoring, voter education, strengthening policy capacity and other forms of legislation and training of foreign officials, to name a select few.

The Canadian Institute of Public Administration has – over the past decade – undertaken a variety of projects in partnership with other Canadian organizations with financial support from CIDA. Its international programming has focused on government reform, strategic and financial planning, decentralization, poverty reduction and climate change. Moreover, Canada has provided financing to global organizations, such as the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA), which brings together both governments and NGOs to improve and consolidate electoral processes.

Canada has also been a vigorous advocate of international protocols and mechanisms to support democracy promotion. At the Organization of American States (OAS), Ottawa played the lead role in the establishment of the Unit for the Promotion of Democracy, which provides guidance and assistance to member states in strengthening their democratic institutions and processes.<sup>40</sup> Through the OAS, Canada also championed the establishment of a Special Fund for Strengthening Democracy, which is designed to assist member states faced with threats to their democratic processes. And recently, the Commonwealth heads of government accepted a Canadian initiative to put their democratic principles into action by creating the Commonwealth Ministerial Action Group (CMAG). The mandate of the CMAG is to recommend collective Commonwealth responses to serious violations of democracy and constitutional rule.<sup>41</sup>

A scan of Canadian institutions involved in democracy promotion abroad has led to two key conclusions. First, it is clear that there are many important actors presently active in the field of democracy promotion, that oft have little understanding of their peers and colleagues in the field. Secondly, policy coherence requires a driver of coherence.<sup>42</sup> The Democracy Canada Institute would gather and refine information on Canadian experiences and practices for democratic development while enabling relationships and partnerships with the family of democracy promotion groups already in existence in Canada and abroad. This new institution would leverage the valuable expertise of present actors, which could provide for significant coordination and collaboration between organizations.

So, the ability of Canada and Canadians to contribute to a worldwide movement for more democracy and better governance is already proven. Canadians hold senior positions in the democracy offices of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and the Organization of American States (OAS). NDI employs 29 Canadians in senior capacities in its overseas offices. Canadians employed at the World Bank and the UNDP play a lead role in governance and rule of law programs. Canadians help set policy at the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA) in Stockholm and the International Foundation for

Election Systems (IFES) in Washington, and Canadians have held leadership positions within the international headquarters of the main political party internationals. Canadian parliamentarians, ministers, MLAs and others have participated in study missions and exchange fora and have provided advice to their elected counterparts around the world. Canadian universities supply expertise to a diverse set of governance projects within Foreign Affairs Canada (FAC) and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) both have a portfolio of successful democracy and governance programs around the world.

To summarize, Canadian experiences and models are in demand around the world for a number of reasons:

- Canadians are well received abroad and Canadian motives, particularly in the sensitive area of political development, are seldom challenged. A Canadian organization would find great receptivity around the world in the field of democracy and governance;
- Canada's multilingual, multicultural, tolerant milieu tends to produce people who exhibit sensitivity to foreign cultures and sensibilities and who thrive in difficult foreign settings;
- Canada's political parties have highly developed grassroots organizing models that are relevant in many developing countries. Unlike the large, publicly funded European parties or the private money-reliant American parties, Canadian political parties are decentralized, volunteer driven, have modest budgets with both private and public funding and operate under strict political spending limits. Canada's political parties are valued and important members of the main international groupings of political parties like Liberal International, the Socialist International and the Centrist Parties International. As such, Canada's parties and party leaders are already part of an international network of political activists;
- Canada's parliamentary system and the experiences of current and former Canadian parliamentarians are relevant around the world. Most emerging democracies have parliamentary systems, and the Canadian model is more applicable to nascent parliaments than the unique, expensive and unwieldy American system. Quebec's National Assembly can provide positive examples in countries where the political system resembles the French model. Canadian provincial legislatures are similar in scale and budget to the legislatures in many developing nations and can be a source of legislative expertise and best practices;
- Canada's federation is a model of decentralization, power sharing and respect for minority rights. The flexible nature of Canada's constitution has allowed a constructive and pragmatic devolution of power to the provinces - maintaining Canada's unity and integrity through many trying times;
- Canada is world renowned for administering fair, efficient elections and for maintaining accurate voter registries;
- Canada has a relatively high rate of unionization and has advanced labour legislation at the national and provincial level;
- The Canadian business community has a positive international reputation and is well placed to offer advice on ethical business practices around the world;
- Canada has both a successful public broadcaster and a dynamic private media sector. The quality of training provided to Canadian journalists, particularly through the public broadcaster, and the generally high standards of Canadian political journalism can be used as a basis for training journalists around the world.

More often than not, Canadians contribute to other organizations and other countries' aid and foreign policy objectives – the large coterie of Canadians working for the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs (NDI) and IFES, for example, while highly valued by their respective organizations, contribute primarily to U.S. foreign policy priorities in the democracy field and only tangentially to Canadian interests. Two of the more important Canadian organizations in the democracy and governance arena, the International Center for Human Rights and Democratic Development (Rights and Democracy) and the Forum of Federations both downplay their Canadian genesis and are governed by international boards of directors which dilute their Canadian character.

This dilution of Canadian-ness in Canadian democracy assistance efforts reflects the practice of the past decade or so, but does not necessarily reflect the intent of Canadian political decision-makers. The early internal government discussions around the origins of the first Canadian democracy assistance vehicle, the International Centre for Human Rights and Democratic Development (Rights and Democracy), suggested that policy makers were seeking to create an organization similar to the National Endowment for Democracy (NED), but also made clear that the organization should be Canadian in nature and in its governance. In a memo circulated within the government in 1985 it was suggested that Canada develop a democracy foundation and suggested that the model that would be best received would be “that of a nationally-based political foundation, representative of a social, business, political, union or other organization in the donor country [Canada].” (Anonymous “confidential memo,” March 16, 1985) The memo went on to cite the German political party foundations and the NED as the international models Canada should explore.

A 1987 memo written to the Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Joe Clark, suggested that Canada should look to the successes of the Scandinavians in the democracy field (the Olof Palme Foundation of the Swedish Social Democratic Party being one example), and to the model of the German party foundations, but was clear that a Canadian foundation should “...be Canadian, not internationalist insofar as its voting members are concerned. If a group is to be useful for the integrity and guidance of the institute, it should be clear that program decisions are made by Canadians.” (Robin Sears, June 11, 1987) The memo went on to argue that a new Canadian institute should be based in Ottawa with no connection to either government departments or other NGOs.

The memo was written in support of then Minister Joe Clark's proposal for a democratic development institute. Clark's proposal, although modified and delayed several times, informed the legislation that established the International Center for Human Rights and Democratic Development in 1988. During the planning phase for the Centre, a Canadian parliamentary task force traveled to Washington to meet with NED officials to consult on potential structures, but Rights and Democracy never did evolve into a democracy foundation. Now is the time to make that early idea a reality.

## ***Lessons Learned from International Experience***

The challenges of democracy building are being addressed through two complementary international processes. Although still in early stages, traditional international “clubs” of nations, often organized along geographical lines or reflecting current or historical trade relationships, are giving way to new alignments - alignments based on shared values rather than shared interests. Examples of this new trend include efforts to start a “democracy caucus” within the United Nations, the governmental and non-governmental forums of the Community of Democracies, the World Movement for Democracy, the newly formed Club of Madrid (a grouping of former heads of state and government), the new democratic activism of the OAS, the increasingly strong democracy focus of the OSCE, the parliamentary forum of the Southern Africa Development Community (SADC) and others.

An adjunct of the beginning of this values-based international realignment has been the growth of non-governmental democracy foundations or institutes. Formed to provide an arms-length relationship between governments and official foreign policy, these foundations have a distinctly political flavour - their political orientation reflecting the political nature of the problems afflicting democratic transition in the developing world. At a July 2004 gathering of international democracy assistance organizations in The Hague, more than forty democracy-oriented organizations convened to discuss international democracy promotion. In a field once the exclusive domain of the German political party foundations or “stiftungen,” and joined 20-years ago by the U.S.-based NED, the number of new players within the international democracy field has surprised even the discipline’s most ardent supporters.

The democracy assistance field, which includes, among other topics, political party development, support for fair and open elections, legislative development and women’s political participation, is dominated by single and multi-party political institutes and foundations. Political party and democracy foundations have a number of strategic and programmatic commonalities – all have strong but indirect ties to the highest political echelons in their home country, and all draw on the experiences of political and democracy practitioners. Each organization leverages its political connections to have more impact on democratic processes in target program countries. All of the organizations discussed in this paper maintain an arms-length distance from government (most are private non-profit organizations) but receive their core funding from public sources.

A Canadian democracy foundation would join the growing group of nations looking for a distinctive entry into the international democracy assistance arena. In a paper presented at The Hague gathering, Uwe Optenhoegel, International Director of the Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, and Roel Von Meijenfeldt, Executive Director of the Netherlands Institute for Multiparty Democracy (IMD), summarized the imperative for increasing European involvement in democracy promotion this way:

The new international context that has emerged after the September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001 attacks on the U.S.A., has resulted into the promotion of democracy becoming a more central strategic objective of the US government. This has added significant momentum to the focus on how democracy can be effectively promoted and through what international modalities. What is the distinct European contribution to this challenge?

The European Union (EU) is in a process of transforming itself through enlargement, the writing of the first EU constitution and the enhancement of its Common Foreign and Security policy, for example by the creation of the position of a EU foreign minister.

These developments make it appear appropriate and timely to engage in deliberations about a more elaborated European profile in the global context of democracy promotion.<sup>43</sup>

More entrants, European or otherwise, will be welcomed into the democracy assistance field because the promotion of democracy does not lend itself to unilateralism. Kenneth Wollack, President of the Washington-based NDI, one of the largest NGOs engaged in democracy assistance, put it this way in his 2004 testimony before the U.S. Congress:

Cooperative approaches convey a deeper truth to nations attempting a transition to democracy: that they are not ceding something to the United States when they develop democratic institutions; rather, they are joining a community of nations. That other nations have traversed the same course. That while autocracies are inherently isolated and fearful of the outside world, democracies can count on natural allies and an active support structure. And that other nations are concerned and are watching - something that would-be autocrats, who flourish outside the glare of the international spotlight, will bear in mind.<sup>44</sup>

NDI, its counterpart, the International Republican Institute (IRI), and other U.S. democracy organizations have grown exponentially in the last decade - NDI's revenues in 1994 totaled \$14.9 million USD, while 2004 revenues may reach \$60 million USD. U.S. government support for democracy programs comes from a variety of sources and through various mechanisms. In the early 1980s, democracy programs were funded and implemented primarily through the NED. The NED and its core institutes - NDI, IRI, the American Center for International Labor Solidarity (ACILS) and the Center for International Private Enterprise (CIPE). Since the 1980's, overseas development assistance (ODA) support from the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) allowed for a significant increase in U.S. democracy promotion activities, as did the U.S. Department of State's application of Economic Support Funds (ESF) for democracy assistance. In more recent years, increased resources within the U.S. Department of State's Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor (DRL), and Middle East Partnership Initiative (MEPI) housed with the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs (NEA) have allowed American organizations to vastly expand their democracy assistance work. Total yearly U.S. democracy funding, through the NED, USAID and the Department of State, exceeds \$1 billion USD.

A more complete survey of institutions devoted to promoting democratic values is outlined in Appendix II. They can be simplified into three main categories and two sub-categories - political party institutes like the German party model, international or multilateral organizations like the Stockholm-based International Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA) and national umbrella institutions like the NED. One sub-category includes smaller, more research-oriented organizations, affiliated with universities, the best example being the Australian Centre for Democratic Institutions. The second sub-category includes nationally-based organizations with a multilateral character, for example organizations with an international board of directors or with international subsidiaries. Examples of this category include the International Foundation for Elections Systems (IFES), which, while Washington-based, has an international board of directors

and a European subsidiary. Another example of this type of organization is the Ottawa-based International Forum of Federations.

The individual party institute model has never been seriously contemplated in Canada. The (Lortie) Royal Commission on Electoral Reform and Party Financing (1991) did put forward a recommendation for the establishment of publicly funded party foundations, but their mandate was to be limited to domestic policy development and political education. Canada's parties, while active within their respective international groupings - the New Democratic Party within the Socialist International, and the Liberal Party within the Liberal International - have not embraced the concept of developing individual international foundations.

The government of Canada is a participant in most of the multilateral democracy assistance vehicles, including the OSCE, OAS and IDEA, but Canada's multilateral democracy assistance endeavors seldom reflect unique Canadian experiences and values. Canada has many fine democracy assistance programs, governmental and non-governmental, but a consensus has emerged that there is a lack of coordination and policy coherence that makes the sum of Canada's international democracy efforts less than the total of its parts.

With single party institutes being unattractive in the Canadian context and multilateral institutions lacking Canadian-specific style and content, the nationally-based umbrella democracy foundations may be the most appropriate models for a new Canadian foundation. The organizations that best fit the model of the internationalization of democracy assistance and exemplify the cooperative model of working both with international partners and through indigenous organizations, include the NED, the IMD and the Westminster Foundation for Democracy (WFD). The National Democratic Institute for International Affairs (NDI) will also be included in this comparison. Even though NDI is loosely affiliated with the U.S. Democratic Party, its non-partisan approach, scope and scale of work and world-wide reputation make it resemble an umbrella democracy assistance organization more than a party institute.

One important overarching lesson learned – repeated in different forms by the executives of the organizations below – is that democracy assistance must be process oriented and that political outcomes cannot be orchestrated or influenced from abroad. The best democracy assistance organizations are open about their work, respond to requests from interlocutors in the recipient country, and never attempt to impose an outside agenda. The organizations described in this paper work with both government and opposition political tendencies and support indigenous efforts for reform.

Carl Gershman, President of the NED, believes that a successful democracy foundation should pursue political independence, seek domestic consensus and maintain ideological and programmatic balance. The NED jealously guards its and non-governmental status political independence and has observed a strict policy of treating its core institutes equally. NED programs constitute a balanced mix of efforts to strengthen political processes, support democratic labour movements and promote private enterprise.

Gershman also points to indigenous demands for democracy and freedom as the imperative behind the NED's work. "Democracy assistance is about connecting and helping what already exists, not creating something new or foreign," says Gershman. "There is an authentic democracy

movement around the world that arises from common belief and shared values,” Gershman continues. “The NED respects the integrity, dignity and autonomy of those it helps.”

Reiterating the lesson that democracy institutes should be arms-length from foreign policy, Gershman notes that, “foreign policy is often about self interest. A country like Canada can be ennobled by joining in a common effort that goes beyond the country’s direct interests. It may be a highfalutin idea, but democracy is also a practical cause.”

A second lesson of international experience in democracy assistance is that while domestic political party participation in democracy assistance activities is crucial, democracy foundations work best when party input into the day-to-day work of the foundation is minimized. In the American model, the party foundations have a loose affiliation with the parent party and no direct coordination. The NED staff and board serve as a policy sounding board and provide program and financial accountability. The Dutch IMD has full time party coordinators on staff but professional program staff manage activities. The WFD has historically provided funding directly to parties to support their own bilateral activities, but that model is in the process of changing.

Senior executives within the WFD call the organization, “conceptually brilliant, but flawed in execution and practice.” The WFD, along with discretionary grants and some self-initiated programs, provides funding to British political parties to implement programs with partner parties and organizations. The WFD has gained a positive international reputation, but struggles with program coherence and strategy. The model of supporting the activities of British political parties is similar to the NED’s support of the two American political party institutes, but, unlike the NED, the WFD lacks the ability to play a strong role in program strategy, design and oversight. The WFD is moving toward a model of engaging political parties in programs implemented by the WFD itself, rather than funding programs carried out by individual parties that may have little relevance to an overall policy direction set by the WFD board and staff.

A third lesson drawn from the last decade of democracy assistance is that the problems of state-building and the promotion of good governance are complex and must be addressed by experienced practitioners. In the first decade or so of NDI’s work, the institute was often described as a “political peace corps.” Relying on enthusiastic young people to organize seminars and events and develop briefing materials, NDI programs would draw on the expertise of temporary pro bono ‘trainers’ - political practitioners that would spend a short period in country. While this program model worked well and is still in limited operation, the growing sophistication of democracy assistance efforts mean NDI’s field staff are usually political and legislative experts in their own right, many having retired from successful political careers or having extended leave or sabbatical to pursue international work. The typical profile of a senior NDI country director is a person with a graduate degree, twelve or more years of directly relevant expertise and senior level political experience. NDI employs several former party leaders, more than a dozen former ministers and members of parliament and dozens of former senior party staff members

A fourth lesson concerns domestic political consensus and participation in a democracy institute. Carl Gershman notes that the NED was the creation of four partners – Democrats, Republicans, business and labour. Created during the Reagan administration, and supported by Presidents Bush, Clinton and George W. Bush, the NED has always enjoyed broad political support. The senior executives of the IMD believe that the strength of the organization lies in the engagement of

all mainstream Dutch political parties in program design. Foreign policy and development assistance, they say, is best accomplished in an atmosphere of domestic political consensus.

A final overarching lesson concerns cooperation and collaboration. Democracy itself is a process that attempts to reconcile competing demands, and democracy assistance works best in an atmosphere of pluralism and complementary effort. Democracy foundations have recently instituted regular meetings for experience sharing and the evolution of values-oriented international groupings like the Community of Democracies and World Movement for Democracy will help forge common approaches to problems of democratic governance.

### ***Conclusion: A Modest Proposal for the Democracy Canada Institute***

In the words of Prime Minister Paul Martin, in an announcement regarding the creation of a Canada Corps in May of this year, “Canada has long been recognized as a leading voice in the world for democracy, pluralism, human rights and the rule of law. Groups and individuals from across the country are already sharing their expertise in these areas with the world...” While, as discussed, this is undoubtedly true, our analysis of existing efforts would suggest that Canadian expertise has not yet been harnessed to its full potential – a shortcoming that could, we believe, be lessened through the creation of a non-partisan, independent, Democracy Canada Institute.

A considerable amount of research and reflection would, of course, be required before any new initiative is undertaken; but as an initial contribution, our analysis has determined that the framework for such an Institute should include the following:

- The Institute should report to Parliament and the members of its Board should enjoy consensus support by Parliament. Various mechanisms can be explored but the objective is to have an organization supported by all parties;
- The Institute should not necessarily replace the existing democratic governance projects of CIDA and DFAIT, which have their own foreign policy logic, but the Institute would be mandated by Parliament to develop a coherent democratic governance strategy that would be worthy of the support of Parliament, be implemented by existing actors in the field and engage the active involvement of current and former Members of Parliament. Should the Institute model prove to be a success, however, it could assume responsibility for existing programming;
- The Institute would fund projects suggested by the existing rich NGO community, and government agencies like Elections Canada, although it could recruit expertise where it does not currently exist. The Institute would also entertain partnerships between Canadian NGOs and agencies and local partners in the target countries. The Institute would reorganize, assist, recruit, co-enable and facilitate existing Canadian expertise, listed in Appendix I and work with the international institutions listed in Appendix II;
- Canadian political parties have expertise that can be useful abroad especially through organizations like Liberal International, Socialist International or Christian Democrats International. The Democracy Canada Institute would work with all parties to

encourage them to contribute internationally. A multi-party approach is preferable, but if the parties chose to create independent party foundations, Democracy Canada could work with these vehicles;

- Part of the important work of the Institute would be to recruit former Members of Parliament, party activists and officials with expertise in the mechanics of elections, civil society or government structure, willing to give their time to work or consult abroad;
- Based on an assessment of existing organizations, both within Canada and abroad, it is anticipated that the Institute would require an annual appropriation of approximately \$50 million. These funds would be utilized for both the administrative maintenance of the organization and the strategic funding for international grants and programs.

The above represents an initial outline of our preliminary conceptualizations of the structure and substance of a Canadian Democratic Institute. A supplementary conference, attended by interested stakeholders in the international democracy promotion community will be held later this fall, to provide feedback and give further substance to these initial framing ideas.

Therefore we recommend a Democracy Canada Institute, which should be established as a non-profit, non-governmental organization, would be endowed with significant yearly funding for its own programs and would provide grants to partner institutes and organizations. The Democracy Canada Institute could assume responsibility for many existing Canadian democracy initiatives including parliamentary strengthening and political development programs, thus reducing the amount of “new” funding required for its creation, and the new entity would work collaboratively with established democracy and governance organizations abroad. Democracy Canada would reinforce the established governance, democracy, human rights and media development community in Canada by providing a more coherent policy structure, a higher Canadian profile abroad and, in some cases, an increased and more predictable source of grant funding.

Fyodor Dostoyevsky, in the *Brothers Karamazov*, featured a Grand Inquisitor berating the Lord returned to earth for promising to make mankind free when human beings are manifestly incapable of doing so: “Nothing has ever been more insupportable for a man of human society, than freedom,” the Inquisitor sneers. To repress freedom then, he is asked: “Is everything permitted?” “Yes” is the terrible reply. Regretfully, we continue to know something about repression in the early years of this new century: terrorists use children as shields in Russia, thousands die in the Darfur region as private armies are let loose, soldiers and aid workers die in Afghanistan, trying to bring order far away from home; the list of atrocities and deprivations could go on and on. The Grand Inquisitor would not be surprised.

We may only make progress internationally in inches, when yards and kilometres are needed, but working to make the Grand Inquisitor a relic of history is still an ethical imperative. The rule of law is “the wise restraint that makes man free,” and Canadians have more success than most in restraining our impulses and creating a society of discussion, tolerance and pluralism. If we know something about wise governance that the world needs, it is our duty to pass our insights to others. It should be the mission of Canadians, as a free people, to join with other free peoples, to say to

the Grand Inquisitor, “No, not everything is permitted” and to provide a counter-example of how to live. The Democracy Canada Institute can play a modest role in this noble cause.

## Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> The authors would like to thank Carol Hales, David Donovan and Denis Silva for their assistance in research and writing. They assisted in completing a scan of Canadian and international organizations active in the field and helped organize a series of interviews in Ottawa and Washington. This paper presents a framework for assessing the priority and our tentative conclusions about a Democracy Canada Institute. The next phase of the project will be a more fully rounded description of the structure and functions of a Democracy Canada Institute. This paper will be presented to an international workshop in Washington in November. We want to thank the Walter and Duncan Gordon Foundation for their support of the project.

<sup>2</sup> Francis Fukuyama, *State-Building* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2004) 103.

<sup>3</sup> Jacques Barzun, *A Jacques Barzun Reader*, ed. Michael Murray (New York : Harper Collins, 2002) 475.

<sup>4</sup> Edmund Burke, *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (London: Everyman's Library, 1971) 93.

<sup>5</sup> Barzun 488.

<sup>6</sup> For a detailed review of the broader international context of democracy promotion, see: George Perlin, "International Assistance to Democratic Development: A Review," *IRPP Working Paper Series* no. 2003-2004 (2003). See also: Thomas Carothers, *Aiding Democracy Abroad: The Learning Curve*. (Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1999); Thomas Carothers and Marina Ottaway, eds. *Funding Virtue: Civil Society Aid and Democracy Promotion* (Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2000); Larry Diamond, *Developing Democracy: Toward Consolidation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999).

<sup>7</sup> Thomas Carothers, "The End of the Transition Paradigm," *Journal of Democracy* 13.1 (2002): 5.

<sup>8</sup> Carothers. *Journal of Democracy*.

<sup>9</sup> Samuel P. Huntington, *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1991) xiii.

<sup>10</sup> Huntington 15.

<sup>11</sup> Freedom House is a "non-partisan and broad based" NGO founded in 1941 to promote democratic values abroad. Freedom House believes that "American leadership in international affairs is essential to the cause of human rights and freedom." Among Freedom House's publications is the *Freedom in the World* survey. This annual survey measures various indicators of freedom in different countries to develop an overall score indicating the level of freedom of a given nation. For more information, visit [www.freedomhouse.org](http://www.freedomhouse.org).

<sup>12</sup> Adrian Karatnycky, "The 30<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Freedom House Survey: Liberty's Advances in a Troubled World," *Journal of Democracy* 14.1 (2003): 100.

<sup>13</sup> Karatnycky.

<sup>14</sup> For a detailed discussion of the problems with empirical theories of democracy, see: Quentin Skinner, "The Empirical Theorists of Democracy and Their Critics: A Plague on Both Their Houses," *Political Theory* 1.3 (1973).

<sup>15</sup> Diamond 25.

<sup>16</sup> Diamond 60-61.

<sup>17</sup> Diamond 63.

<sup>18</sup> Diamond 261.

- 
- <sup>19</sup> Diamond 263.
- <sup>20</sup> Diamond 278.
- <sup>21</sup> Huntington 21.
- <sup>22</sup> Huntington 316.
- <sup>23</sup> Carothers 6.
- <sup>24</sup> Perlin.
- <sup>25</sup> Gretchen Casper and Michelle M. Taylor, "Discussing Democracy," *Negotiating Democracy: Transitions from Authoritarian Rule*. (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1996)
- <sup>26</sup> Geraint Parry and Michael Moran, "Introduction: problems of democracy and democratization," *Democracy and democratization* (London: Routledge).
- <sup>27</sup> Jaun J. Linz and Alfred Stepan, *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation: Southern Europe, South America, and Post-Communist Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press: 1997)
- <sup>28</sup> Carothers 10. In addition, for a detailed account of the stagnation of Latin American democratic progress and how this fits into the 'gray zone' of democratic development, see: Carlos Santiso, "Promoting Democratic Governance and Preventing the Recurrence of Conflict: The Role of the United Nations Development Programme in Post-Conflict Peace-Building," *Journal of Latin American Studies* 34 (2002): 570. For a similar account of the lack of uniform direction in democratization efforts in Asia, see: Daniel C. Lynch, "International 'Decentering' and Democratization: The Case of Thailand," *International Studies Quarterly* 48 (2004).
- <sup>29</sup> Analysis from Kenneth Wollack in a speech to the Journal of Democracy Symposium in 2002 on the book, *Democracy Promotion: The End of the Transition Paradigm?* by Thomas Carothers, Vice President for Studies, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington, DC.
- <sup>30</sup> Andrew Moravcsik, "Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics," *International Organization* 51.4 (1997): 516.
- <sup>31</sup> For a discussion of globalization and democracy, see: Zaki Laïdi, "Democracy in Real Time," *Journal of Democracy* 13.3 (2002); and: Marc F. Plattner, "Globalization and Self-Government," *Journal of Democracy* 13.3 (2002).
- <sup>32</sup> Joseph S. Nye Jr., *The Paradox of American Power: Why the World's Only Superpower Can't Go it Alone* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002).
- <sup>33</sup> Janet Ajzenstat, *The Once and Future Democracy* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2003) 147.
- <sup>34</sup> For example, see Andrew F. Cooper, *Canadian Foreign Policy: Old Habits and New Directions* (Scarborough: Prentice-Hall, 1997).
- <sup>35</sup> Leslie Campbell, *Democracy Canada: Turning Canadian Democratic Values and Experiences into International Action* (Hemisphere Focus, 13 January 2004) 2-3.
- <sup>36</sup> Campbell.
- <sup>37</sup> See: Elections Canada, 2004, <http://www.elections.ca/content.asp?section=gen&document=ec90770&dir=bkg&lang=e&textonly=f> also
- <sup>38</sup> Elections Canada
- <sup>39</sup> Interview, Ottawa, 8 July 2004.
- <sup>40</sup> See: Organization of American States, 2004, <http://www.oas.org/main/english/>
- <sup>41</sup> See: Foreign Affairs Canada, 2003, [http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/foreign\\_policy/commonwealth/imoc307-en.asp](http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/foreign_policy/commonwealth/imoc307-en.asp)

---

<sup>42</sup> Ann Weston and Daniel-Pierre-Antoine, *Poverty and Policy Coherence: A Case Study of Canada's Relations with Developing Countries* (North-South Institute, February 2003) 57.

<sup>43</sup> Uwe Optenhoegel and Roel von Meijenfeldt, *A European Profile in Democracy Promotion* (A paper presented to the European working conference, "Enhancing the European Profile in Democracy Assistance," the Netherlands, July 4-6, 2004).

<sup>44</sup> Statement by Kenneth Wollack, President, National Democratic Institute for International Affairs, before the Committee on International Relations Subcommittee on International Terrorism, Nonproliferation and Human Rights, U.S. House of Representatives, July 7, 2004.

### ***Appendix I: Canadian Expertise and Experience***

The following appendix presents an overview of the many Canadian institutions currently working to advance democratic values and establish democratic systems of government in developing countries around the world. Although Canada does not possess an all-encompassing, single organization, such as the National Democratic Institute in the United States or the Centre for Democratic Institutions in Australia, Canada does maintain a series of smaller associations devoted to the international promotion of democracy. These institutions partake in a wide and distinct variety of activities including election monitoring, voter education, strengthening policy capacity, enforcing electoral plus other forms of legislation and training foreign officials, to name a select few.

The first section investigates those quasi-government and non-government organizations that seek both to advance democracy in developing regions and failed states across the globe and improves Canada's own democratic principles through national operations. The second half of the appendix concentrates on the two institutions managed by the federal government, Foreign Affairs Canada and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), that also work in the field of democratic advancement and development. For each organization devoted to the promotion of

---

democracy both in Canada and overseas, their mandate, programs, research interests and geographic areas of concentration will be thoroughly examined.

### **Part I: Government Organizations**

#### **Foreign Affairs Canada:**

Foreign Affairs Canada (FAC) supports Canadians abroad, works toward a more peaceful and secure world and promotes Canadian culture and values internationally. A department of the federal government, FAC recognizes that what happens beyond Canadian borders is having a greater impact on Canadian lives than ever before. This therefore makes engagement with the world increasingly important to Canada's well-being today and into the future. Through agencies such as CIDA, FAC supports official development assistance aimed at reducing poverty in other countries and contributing to a more equitable sharing of the world's prosperity.

FAC, through its Strategic Policy Branch, is strengthening its capacity to undertake research on important international policy issues. The Canadian Centre for Foreign Policy Development, which is housed within the Strategic Policy Branch, helps engage Canadians in international policy issues through the John Holmes Fund. Support from this fund has helped many individuals and organizations contribute to international policy discussions and generate reports on a wide range of issues such as democratic development, poverty reduction and environmental sustainability.

Source: Foreign Affairs Canada, 2004, <http://www.fac-aec.gc.ca/menu-en.asp>

#### **Canadian International Development Agency:**

The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), an institution operated by the federal government, supports sustainable growth in developing countries in order to reduce poverty and to contribute to a more secure, equitable and prosperous world. The organization's central objective is to work with developing countries and states in transition in order for them to develop the tools to eventually meet their own needs. Working with partners in the private, public and nonprofit sectors both domestically and internationally, CIDA supports foreign aid projects in more than one hundred of the poorest countries in the world. Currently, the institution supports six specific program branches: (1) Africa and the Middle East, (2) Americas, (3) Asia, (4) Canadian Partnership, (5) Central and Eastern Europe, and (6) Multilateral.

Canada's official development program operated by CIDA concentrates resources on a multitude of priority areas such as basic human needs, gender equality, infrastructure services, private sector development, the environment and human rights, democracy and good governance.

Source: Canadian International Development Agency, 2004, <http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/index.htm>

---

## **Part II: Quasi-government/Non-government Organizations**

### ***Institute on Governance:***

The Institute on Governance (IOG), founded in 1990, is a non-profit organization with a mandate to promote effective governance. It works with a variety of partners including government agencies, international organizations, non-governmental institutions and the private sector. Efforts and activities overseas generally concentrate on the developing world and have thus taken IOG to Africa, the Caribbean, Eastern Europe, the Middle East, South-east Asia and Southern Asia. Programs run by IOG are almost entirely self-financing either through contracts or participant fees; however the Institute does receive support through secondments of senior professional staff from different levels of government.

The Institute concentrates its democracy-promotion work around six specific knowledge areas: (1) aboriginal governance, (2) accountability and performance management, (3) board governance, (4) building policy capacity, (5) technology and governance and (6) youth and governance.

Source: Institute on Governance, 2004, <http://www.iog.ca>

### ***Parliamentary Centre:***

The Parliamentary Centre is an independent, non-profit organization with a mission to strengthen legislatures both in Canada and around the world. Its guiding principle is that legislatures should play a vital role in ensuring that government is accountable, open and participatory; where legislatures fail, government is likely to be unaccountable and unresponsive to citizens. The Centre has a close working relationship with Parliament, including Members of Parliament and Senators, to assist in the operation of its Canadian and overseas programs. The Parliamentary Centre assists legislatures through assessment missions, capacity development programs, interparliamentary networking, research and publications. The staff and associates have expertise in a variety of areas including parliamentary committees, research and information systems, the budget process, parliamentary organization and administration and the role of Parliament in public policy-making, notably anti-corruption, poverty reduction and gender equality.

The Canada Program of the Parliamentary Centre serves the Parliament of Canada, its members and some of their interparliamentary activities, and supports them in playing more effective roles in Parliament and as policy entrepreneurs and parliamentary diplomats. The activities of this program include: (1) the Parliamentary Forum, (2) the Parliamentary, Business and Labour Trust, (3) the Centre for Legislative Exchange, (4) the Interparliamentary Forum of the Americas (FIPA), and (5) the Global Organization of Parliamentarians against Corruption (GOPAC).

Not only does the Parliamentary Centre operate programs to improve democracy in Canada, but it also works overseas with legislatures in Africa, Asia, Eastern Europe and the Middle East to strengthen systems of good governance and sustainable development. The international programs cover a variety of issues, but common to all are the Centre's core values of accountability, transparency and participation. The internationally-based programs focus on committees (given their linkages to all three values), research and information, member and

---

staff training and extra-parliamentary institutions such as human rights commissions and offices of ombudsmen. Increasingly, the Centre's programs also deal with governance outcomes, such as poverty reduction and anti-corruption, and Parliament's role in affecting those outcomes.

Source: Parliamentary Centre, 2004, [http://www.parlcent.ca/index\\_e.php](http://www.parlcent.ca/index_e.php)

***Elections Canada:***

Elections Canada is an independent, non-partisan agency that reports directly to the Canadian Parliament. Its principle concern is to fulfill its responsibility to ensure that citizens of Canada are able to exercise their choices in elections and referendums through open and impartial processes. The central mission of the institution is to demonstrate excellence and leadership in electoral matters by providing the means of facilitating fair and honest elections. The obligations of Elections Canada are numerous and include enforcing electoral legislation, registering political and third parties that engage in election advertising, training election officers and monitoring election spending.

Not only does Elections Canada play an active role in the Canadian electoral system, but it also operates extensively on the world stage by offering its experience to new democracies and international organizations dedicated to the promotion of democratic electoral processes. The institution supports democratic development around the world by working with provincial and territorial partners on several global initiatives. Furthermore, it provides technical and professional services in response to requests from the federal government through the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) and Foreign Affairs Canada.

Since 1990, Elections Canada has organized more than three hundred international democratic development missions in ninety-four countries. Its missions abroad do not seek to promote Canada's electoral system or Canadian procedures; rather, it identifies the choices available to each host country taking into account its specific challenges and opportunities, and helps select and implement the option best suited to the country's laws, customs and environment. The international programs undertaken by Elections Canada include advising on constitutional and election law provisions, conducting pre-election evaluations to assess the electoral environment and identify potential problems, providing professional support and technical assistance in preparing election documents and training officials. Currently, officials of the institution are currently working in Afghanistan on the Elections and Registration in Afghanistan (ERA) project, which is being funded by CIDA.

Source: Elections Canada, 2004, <http://www.elections.ca/home.asp?textonly=false>

***Forum of Federations:***

The Forum of Federations is a non-profit, international organization based in Ottawa and engages in a wide range of programs designed to help develop best practices in countries with federal systems of government around the world. It works with countries and organizations from around the world, with established federal countries and newly-emerging federations. In addition, the Forum works with countries that are exploring the possibilities of a federal political system.

---

The Forum has quite an international scope. One of its aims is to provide policy and program assistance to governments in emerging federations. This is achieved by building partnerships with governments, NGOs and the private sector around the world to enhance its role in federal governance and conflict resolution. In enhancing federal governance, the Forum works intensively in a select group of countries to enable development of federalism. At the moment, these countries include: India, Nigeria, Mexico and Brazil. In areas of the world where federalism could be part of a solution to conflicts, the Forum offers its expertise and services. These areas include: Sri Lanka, the Philippines and Sudan.

Source: Forum of Federations, 2004, <http://www.forumfed.org/default.asp?lang=en>

**Canadian Institute of Public Administration:**

Founded in 1947, the Canadian Institute of Public Administration (IPAC) is an association comprised of public servants, academics and others interested in the field of public administration. It is a membership-based organization that creates effective knowledge-based networks and leads public administration research across the country. Since the early 1990s, it has also been a significant player in exporting successful Canadian public sector expertise and scholarship around the world. The Institute's mission is dedicated to excellence in public service. It pursues this objective by encouraging the highest standards of professional public practice and service, enhancing comprehension of the public sector and advocating the highest values and ideals of public service. Additionally, IPAC is involved in expanding and exchanging knowledge about public administration, contributing to the resolution of key issues within the field and promoting the education and professional development of public administrators in Canada.

The Institute's international program was established in 1992 to respond to the desire of the organization's members to share their expertise and experience with their public sector colleagues in developing countries, to enhance the experience of Canadian public servants and to increase awareness and understanding of development issues within Canada. IPACs vision at the international level is to be the best Canadian source of senior-level public sector knowledge and qualification in support of sustainable development, good governance and effective public policy. Since 1992, the Institute has undertaken a variety of projects in partnership with other Canadian and international organizations with financial support from CIDA, the World Bank and partner states. International programming focuses on government reform, strategic and financial planning, decentralization, poverty reduction and climate change.

Source: Canadian Institute of Public Administration, 2004, <http://www.ipaciapc.ca/>

**Federation of Canadian Municipalities/International Centre for Municipal Development:**

The Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) has been the national voice of municipal government since 1902. FCM is dedicated to improving the quality of life in all communities by promoting strong, effective and accountable municipal government. The Federation helps to ensure that municipal governments maintain a strong advocacy role in lobbying the federal government to include municipal concerns in policy development and national decision-

---

making. Through its national organization, the FCM ensures that the federal government understands the full impact of its decisions on municipal governments and taxpayers.

In 1987, Canadian municipalities across the country gave FCM a wider mandate by permitting the organization to act as their international representative through the International Centre for Municipal Development (ICMD). ICMD is the only legitimate representative of Canadian municipalities internationally and the main course of Canadian municipal practitioners and resources for international work. The Centre's mission is to develop and empower municipal governments worldwide to improve the quality of life and the sustainability of local communities, and envisions a future in which there is equity, security and sustainability with local governments playing a strong role in global affairs.

In order to achieve its ambitious mission, ICMD organizes and operates a number of programs falling within five central divisions: (1) Knowledge Development, (2) Municipal Capacity Development, (3) Enabling Institutions Capacity Development, (4) Policy and Regulatory Frameworks Development, and (5) Multilateral Organizations Policy and Program Support. The work of the Centre reflects its commitment to democratic principles, good governance and human rights through local action, sustainability, mutual interdependence, partnership, diversity, justice, innovation and inclusion.

Through its international programs, the Centre has involved over one hundred Canadian municipalities internationally including forty partnerships linking Canadian municipalities with local governments in over twenty countries in Africa, South-east Asia and Latin America. Canadian municipalities contribute to democratic and sustainable development by emphasizing processes that bring municipal governments and communities together. The central objective remains to strengthen the capacity of overseas municipal governments to respond to basic issues in the lives of their citizens, specifically by helping them determine, design and implement efficient solutions to their service delivery needs.

Sources: Federation of Canadian Municipalities, 2004, <http://www.fcm.ca/>; International Centre for Municipal Development, 2004, <http://www.icmd-cidm.ca/>

### ***Canada World Youth:***

Canada World Youth (CWY) designs and delivers international educational programs for youth aged 17 to 29 with a focus on volunteer work and community development in a cross-cultural setting. The organization envisions a world of active and engaged global citizens who share responsibility for the well-being of all people and the planet. Its mission is to increase the ability of people, especially youth, to participate in the development of just, harmonious and sustainable societies. Since 1971, more than 21,000 youth across the country have participated in CWY programs.

The institution's organizational goals are three-fold in nature: (1) to foster the acquisition of the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values necessary for active community involvement, (2) to create a network of people of different backgrounds and cultures united by mutual respect and understanding, and (3) to establish partnerships with countries, organizations, communities, groups and individuals that will serve as a basis for effective action.

---

Canada World Youth organizes and operates three different programs. The first is the customized initiatives that include the HIV/AIDS program, Africa-Canada Economic-Leadership, NetCorps Canada International and North American Community Service Program, to name a select few. The second CWY program area is the foreign internships which place Canadian youth in international organizations across the globe. The third and final is the academic and community partnerships. Since 1971, Canada World Youth has operated such programs in North America, South America, the Caribbean, Asia, Africa, Central and Eastern Europe and Oceania.

The organization's philosophy revolves around the concept of learning by doing. Its non-formal educational model involves core elements such as the team approach, the counterpart relationship, host families and community and partner organizations. Examples of projects include helping to build a health centre for a village, working as a reporter at a community newspaper, participating in reforestation projects, teaching English or French, building a computer database for a social services organization and taking part in a polio prevention campaign.

Source: Canada World Youth, 2004, <http://www.cwy-jcm.org/>

***Canadian Association of Former Parliamentarians:***

Founded in 1987 the Canadian Association of Former Parliamentarians (CAFP) is a non-profit organization based in Ottawa and is composed of former parliamentarians who served in either the elected House of Commons or the appointed Senate. One of the objectives is to put the knowledge and expertise of its members at the service of parliamentary democracy abroad. Given the honourable employment of members of the CAFP, there is a considerable amount of expertise that is available in a number of areas, such as budget processes, parliamentary committees and parliamentary organizations.

Source: Canadian Association of Former Parliamentarians, 2004, <http://www.parl.gc.ca/ex-parl/who-e.htm>

***CANADEM:***

Initiated in 1997 and operational in 1998, CANADEM is a national roster of Canadians skilled in human rights, peacebuilding, democratization, administrative-logistics, security, reconstruction and other field experience. It is an independent, free-standing organization that serves as a civilian standby mechanism for the United Nations and other international agencies. CANADEM's fundamental premise is that, like military peacekeeping, the civilian components of UN field operations can benefit immeasurably from national level civilian standby arrangements which facilitate the rapid deployment of properly screened personnel.

As part of the Youth Employment Strategy, CANADEM sponsors a number of Junior Professional Consultants (JPC) to work with various agencies of the UN and other international organizations around the world. The program is funded through the Young Professionals International Program financed by Foreign Affairs Canada and the International Youth Internship Program financed by the Canadian International Development Agency. The internship assignments promote human rights, gender equality, the building and consolidation

---

of democratic institutions, environmental sustainability, health education and the creation of societies that are more peaceful, open and economically strong. The JPCs work in diverse and multicultural environments, and provide assistance to humanitarian efforts that address the needs of low-income people, refugees and displaced persons living in post-conflict zones and transition economies.

Source: CANADEM, 2004, <http://www.canadem.ca/home/>

***National Judicial Institute:***

Founded in 1988, the National Judicial Institute (NJI) is an independent, non-profit organization that serves the Canadian judiciary by planning, coordinating and delivering judicial education dealing with the law, the craft of judging and social context. NJI is dedicated to the development and delivery of educational programs for all federal, provincial and territorial judges. Its programs stimulate continuing professional and personal growth and reflect Canada's cultural, racial and linguistic diversity, in addition to the changing demands of the judiciary in a rapidly-evolving society. The programs of the Institute focus on the three major components of judicial education: (1) substantive law, (2) skills training, and (3) social context issues.

The International Cooperation Group (ICG) manages international activities for the NJI. Its goal is to develop professional relationships among judges and judicial educators in Canada and in other countries. The ICG's central responsibilities are to guide international development projects focused on judicial reform and coordinate the participation of Canada's judges, judicial educators and courts in international projects. The organization takes a partnership approach to its international work. It cooperates with a growing network of Canadian and overseas partners operating in the field of legal judicial reform to bring a range of expertise to bear on development projects and to build international networks among professionals.

The activities of the ICG are numerous and include: drafting protocols for international interventions of Canadian judges, managing international judicial reform projects, coordinating the reception in Canada of study tours from overseas and promoting the development of an international network of judicial educators and members of the judiciary. In so doing, ICG works with judicial educators, the judiciary, governments, regional and international groups, organizations working in international legal reform, donors of international development projects and civil society. Established in February 2003, the ICG is currently working in the Philippines on a project which aims to set up over a dozen model courts within five years. The ICG is also coordinating NJI's participation this coming fall and winter in judicial education projects executed by groups in South Africa and Latin America.

Source: National Judicial Institute, 2004, <http://www.nji.ca>

***International Centre for Human Rights and Democratic Development:***

The International Centre for Human Rights and Democratic Development (ICHRDD) is a non-partisan organization that maintains an arm's length from government and possesses an international mandate. Created by Canada's Parliament in 1988 to encourage and support the

---

universal values of human rights and the promotion of democratic institutions and practices around the world, the ICHRDD works with individuals, organizations and governments in Canada and abroad to promote the human and democratic rights defined by the UN.

In spite of a wide-ranging mandate, the Centre focuses on four themes: (1) democratic development, (2) women's human rights, (3) globalization and human rights, and (4) the rights of indigenous peoples. Its central goal is to inform public opinion and call for policy changes with respect to the promotion and defence of human rights and democratic development. The Centre also aims to strengthen the capacity of civil society organizations to achieve their human rights objectives and to contribute to the building of democratic processes and institutions. Its program strategy positions the Centre to act as a bridge between Canada and the world, a bridge between Canadian non-governmental organizations and such institutions around the world and a bridge between civil society associations and government both in Canada and abroad. In conducting its many initiatives, the ICHRDD enjoys partnerships with human rights, indigenous people and women's rights groups, as well as democratic movements and governments around the world with whom it cooperates to promote human rights and democracy.

Source: International Centre for Human Rights and Democratic Development, 2004, <http://www.ichrdd.ca/frame2.iphtml?langue=0>

***International Development Research Centre:***

Created in 1970 by the Parliament of Canada, the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) is a Canadian public corporation that works in close collaboration with researchers from the developing world in their search for the means to build healthier, more equitable and more prosperous societies. The Centre's mandate is to initiate, encourage, support and conduct research into the problems of the developing regions of the world and into the methods for applying and adapting scientific, technological and other knowledge to the economic and social advancement of those regions. In so doing, IDRC helps developing countries use science and knowledge to find practical, long-term solutions to the social, economic and environmental problems they encounter.

The goals of IDRC are three-fold: (1) to strengthen and help mobilize the indigenous research capacity of developing countries, (2) to foster and support the production, dissemination and application of research results leading to policies and technologies that enhance the lives of people in developing countries, and (3) to build selectively on the past investments and explore new opportunities within its program framework.

The Centre's international work focuses on three developing regions. First, IDRC has worked in close collaboration with Africans since 1971. Over the past thirty years, the organization has supported over twenty-five hundred research projects directed and managed by African researchers and institutions. Second, the Centre conducts extensive work in eighteen Asian countries and has supported nearly two thousand initiatives throughout the continent. Third, IDRC officials have worked closely in Latin America since 1971, in a territory that spans from Mexico to the southern tip of Argentina and Chile. Finally, the Centre focuses activities on ten countries in Northern Africa and the Middle East by supporting five hundred and fifty research projects throughout the region.

---

Source: International Development Research Centre, 2004, [http://web.idrc.ca/en/ev-1-201-1-DO\\_TOPIC.html](http://web.idrc.ca/en/ev-1-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html)

---

## ***Appendix II: An International Survey***

The following report presents an international survey of several current institutions working to promote democratic values and establish democratic systems and structures in developing countries around the world. The appendix is divided into two sections. The first section provides a detailed cross section of democracy promotion organizations, discussing the lessons learned from these prominent organizations. This section covers the umbrella organization of the National Endowment for Democracy (NED), an NED core institution, the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs (NDI), as well as the multi-party national Westminster Foundation for Democracy (WFD), and the Dutch Institute for Multi-party Democracy.

The second section provides a sketch of several of the other organizations at play in democracy promotion. The second section is divided into three subsections. The first subsection highlights those internationally focused national organizations that seek to advance democracy in regions outside of their own borders. The second subsection surveys global and multilateral democracy promoting organizations. The third subsection is more nationally concentrated, as these organizations focus on improving democratic systems within their own states.

Both sets represent the variety and diversity that characterizes today's democracy-promoting institutions, as organizations from both developed and developing nations are discussed. For each organization devoted to the practice of democratic development, their mandate, mission statement, programs, research interests, governing structures, funding mechanisms, and geographic areas of concentration are examined.

### ***Section A: Lessons Learned from Democracy Organizations***

#### ***Dutch Institute for Multi-party Democracy (IMD):***

##### ***Overview***

The Dutch Institute for Multi-Party Democracy, established in 2000, is a new player in international democracy assistance and the organization was designed explicitly to avoid the pitfalls of older models of democracy promotion. A multi-party institute, the IMD does not attempt to fund political parties in the Netherlands but engages and incorporates Dutch political party leaders and parliamentarians in its work through structures that include full time "party coordinators" drawn from member parties and an advisory council that includes senior party officials. A board of trustees drawn from eight Dutch parties governs the IMD.

The IMD grew out of an existing organization called the Foundation for a New South Africa. The original Foundation, which also had a multi-party structure, served as a model for the IMD because, the senior staff argue, sensitive questions of international policy are best handled by an organization which seeks multi-party consensus.

##### ***Structure***

Governed by a board drawn from representatives of eight Dutch political parties, the IMD is funded by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs and reports to the Ministry and to Dutch Embassies in program countries. The IMD maintains a regional office in Mozambique but does

---

not establish field offices staffed by Dutch employees, preferring to work through local organizations.

### ***Philosophy and Focus***

The IMD concentrates on strengthening political parties and on helping to create the conditions for a multi-party democratic system. Preferring to work with all democratic parties, the IMD organizes multi-party seminars and events and encourages parties in the developing world to work cooperatively.

### ***Grant-making***

IMD prefers to work through local implementers and issues grants and uses contractual mechanisms.

### ***Target Countries***

The Institute cooperates in countries supported by Dutch development cooperation. It began primarily working in Eastern Europe, but is now exploring opportunities in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. It is currently operating in Bolivia, Ghana, Guatemala, Indonesia, Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Suriname, Tanzania, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

### ***Funding***

IMD funding comes exclusively from the Dutch Ministry for Foreign Affairs, but the IMD has a mandate to seek alternative funds equal to 35 per cent of its total funding after four years.

### ***Lessons Learned***

The senior executives of the IMD believe that the strength of the organization lies in the engagement of all mainstream Dutch political parties in program design. Foreign policy and development assistance, they say, is best accomplished in an atmosphere of domestic political consensus. The IMD also focuses on a relatively small number of target countries, avoiding work in the Middle East, for example, but concentrating more heavily in countries that are traditional recipients of Dutch aid. The IMD is pursuing a policy of growth and is developing a strategy to seek additional funding.

### ***National Endowment for Democracy (NED):***

#### ***Overview***

If the German party *stiftungen* served as a model for all party foundations, so has the NED served as a model for the European and other umbrella democracy foundations that have emerged in the past decade. The NED, funded by a yearly Congressional appropriation (although it also receives and disburses earmarked funds for special projects), supports the work of four core institutes - two party institutes, NDI and IRI, both of which have very loose ties to their namesake parties, and ACILS and CIPE, which have ties to the AFL/CIO and American Chamber of Congress, respectively. The NED, which reserves half of its funding for discretionary grants to developing country organizations, also supports the Forum for Democratic Studies, the Journal of Democracy and the World Movement for Democracy. With its four core institutes spanning the U.S. ideological spectrum, grant-making capacity,

---

academic gravitas and international networks, the NED is the undisputed leader in the democracy assistance world and has defined the field for most of the last two decades.

The NED's governance is multi-sectoral and multi-partisan with senior Democratic, Republican, business and labour leaders seeking and serving on its prestigious board of directors. All four core institutes are separately chartered, non-profit, private organizations that also seek and receive project specific funding. In most cases, project specific funding for the core institutes, often from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) or from other national or multi-lateral funders like the UNDP, now surpasses NED core funding. Each core institute is required to submit proposals for NED funding, which is apportioned to each institute equally - half of the NED's appropriation is reserved for discretionary activity while the other half is split equally among the four core members. The NED collaborates with the core institutes to write a yearly strategy document, which is then reviewed regularly by the board. The strategy paper plays some role in proposal selection and approval. Core institute proposals are reviewed by NED program staff and must be approved at quarterly meetings of the board of directors.

### ***Structure***

The NED has a multi-sectoral board of directors chaired by former Member of Congress, Vin Weber. Business, labour and political parties are represented on the board, which includes senior, sitting, members of the House and Senate. Senior program officers manage seven regional divisions. The NED also includes the research-oriented Forum for Democratic Studies, which publishes the Journal of Democracy. The NED serves as the secretariat for the World Movement for Democracy.

### ***Philosophy***

The NED has been controversial since its inception and is a very public and open organization. All approved NED programs and grants are listed on its website and in its annual report.

### ***Grant-making***

The NED reserves half of its funding for grants to individual organizations and activists. Grant guidelines are available on its website.

### ***Target Countries***

A strategy document is produced each year, which sets target allocations regionally and country by country.

### ***Funding***

Funding for the NED is appropriated by Congress each year but has been steady at about \$40 million USD per year. The NED also receives earmarked funding for special projects and recently received \$5 million for projects in Muslim countries and \$30 million to support political party, civil society, labour and private sector development in Iraq.

---

### **Lessons Learned**

Carl Gershman, President of the NED, believes that a successful democracy foundation should pursue political independence, seek domestic consensus and maintain ideological and programmatic balance.

The NED jealously guards its non-governmental status and political independence and has observed a strict policy of treating its core institutes equally. NED programs constitute a balanced mix of efforts to strengthen political processes, support democratic labour movements, and promote private enterprise.

Gershman also points to indigenous demands for democracy and freedom as the imperative behind the NED's work. "Democracy assistance is about connecting and helping what already exists, not creating something new or foreign," says Gershman.

"There is an authentic democracy movement around the world that arises from common belief and shared values," Gershman continues. "The NED respects the integrity, dignity, and autonomy of those it helps."

Reiterating the lesson that a democracy institute should be arms-length from foreign policy, Gershman notes that "foreign policy is often about self interest. A country like Canada can be ennobled by joining in a common effort that goes beyond the country's direct interests. It may be a highfalutin idea, but democracy promotion is also a practical cause."

#### ***National Democratic Institute for International Affairs (NDI):***

NDI was formed in 1983 as one of the four NED core institutes. Loosely affiliated with the Democratic Party (there is no formal affiliation, although NDI's board is composed, in large part, of prominent Democrats), NDI has grown to be the largest democracy assistance organization of its kind after the German Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (SDP) and Konrad Adenauer Stiftung (Christian Democrat). The two German foundations have yearly revenue exceeding \$100 million Euro each, while NDI's grant revenue for 2004 may exceed \$60 million USD.

Although NDI's early by-laws prohibited the establishment of field offices, the democratic transitions of the late 1980's – in the Philippines and Chile, for example – and the exploding demand for advice in establishing political parties and legislatures in Eastern and Central Europe after the fall of the Berlin Wall, convinced NDI policy-makers that a field presence was necessary for the establishment of relationships and for developing in-depth knowledge of the countries in question. NDI now operates 50 field offices ranging in size from one to 30 or more employees.

NDI internationalized its work almost from inception. NDI developed ties with the Liberal International and subsequently with the Socialist and Christian Democrat Internationals. NDI is the only organization in the world with official standing in all three of the main party internationals. Drawing on contacts from member parties, NDI built a volunteer network of political and legislative practitioners and hired field staff with experience from a variety of political systems. At any given time, 60 per cent or more of NDI's field-based staff are non-American, with many being third country nationals.

---

In the first decade or so of NDI's work, the institute was often described as a "political peace corps." Relying on enthusiastic young people to organize seminars and events and develop briefing materials, NDI programs would draw on the expertise of temporary pro bono 'trainers' - political practitioners that would spend a short period in country. While this program model worked well and is still in limited operation, the growing sophistication of democracy assistance efforts mean NDI's field staff are usually political and legislative experts in their own right, many having retired from successful political careers or having extended leave or sabbatical to pursue international work. The typical profile of a senior NDI country director is a person with a graduate degree, 12 or more years of directly relevant expertise and senior level political experience. NDI employs several former party leaders, more than a dozen former ministers and members of parliament and dozens of former senior party staff members.

While once seen as specializing in international election observation (often in partnership with the Carter Foundation), NDI has six "functional" specialties: political party development; governance; citizen participation; election processes; women's political participation; and information and communications programming. Each functional team has a director or senior advisor and a small staff. The functional teams maintain 'trainer' files, facilitate institutional learning and memory, develop training publications and manuals and assist in employee training and orientation. While the functional teams also run stand-alone programs, most NDI programs fall under a regional umbrella of seven teams, each headed by a regional director. The regional teams maintain field offices, develop and manage grant funding and are semi-autonomous in both hiring and program design.

NDI has actively sought partnerships in both the bilateral and multilateral arenas, and, while the majority of the Institute's funding originates from the U.S. government, an increasingly significant source of grants includes the UNDP, the British Department of Foreign and International Development (DFID), the Dutch Foreign Ministry, The Danish Development Agency (DANIDA), the World Bank and other international donors. NDI also works collaboratively with a number of other organizations including the U.N., the OAS and the OSCE. NDI has a long relationship with Canadian political parties and organizations having utilized more than 300 Canadians as pro bono international experts, employing more than 25 Canadians in its offices abroad and having carried out several joint projects and study missions with CIDA and Foreign Affairs.

### **Structure**

NDI is a private, non-profit organization with a board of Directors chaired by former secretary of State, Madeleine Albright.

### **Grant-making**

As a rule, NDI is not a grant-making organization although the institute does issue sub-grants to local partners and occasionally to other NGOs when deemed necessary for the success of a project.

---

### ***Target Countries***

NDI has no formal target countries and will consider any program or request for assistance that will contribute to democratization. NDI's diverse program countries include China, Northern Ireland, Malawi, Afghanistan and Yemen, among many others.

### ***Funding***

NDI's revenue for 2004 may exceed \$60 million USD with grants coming from a variety of bilateral and multilateral donors and international organizations.

### ***Lessons Learned***

Internationalizing its staff, maintaining a multi-partisan (NDI works with a wide spectrum of political parties) program stance and avoiding perceptions of outcome-driven program strategies are the keys to NDI's success. NDI pursues international cooperation and works closely with multilateral organizations including the OSCE, OAS, and UNDP, but also maintains its American political connections, hosting, for example, 700 international visitors to the Democratic National Convention every four years.

While NDI has diversified its grant funding, now receiving about 10 per cent of its funding from non-U.S. federal sources, private fundraising has proven difficult, as potential private donors sometimes wrongly perceive the organization as a partisan entity. NDI raises about \$1 million USD per year from private sources.

### ***The Westminster Foundation for Democracy (WFD):***

#### ***Overview***

Senior executives within the London-based WFD, call the organization, "conceptually brilliant, but flawed in execution and practice." The WFD, along with discretionary grants and some self-initiated programs, provides funding to British political parties to implement programs with partner parties and organizations. The WFD has gained a positive international reputation, but struggles with program coherence and strategy. The model of supporting the activities of British political parties is similar to the NED's support of the two American political party institutes, but, unlike the NED, the WFD lacks the ability to play a strong role in program strategy, design, and oversight. The WFD is moving toward a model of engaging political parties in programs implemented by the WFD itself, rather than funding programs carried out by individual parties that may have little relevance to an overall policy direction set by the WFD board and staff.

#### ***Structure***

The governance structure of the WFD includes the three main political parties in Britain as each is represented on the Board of Governance, a position they are appointed to by the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs. There is also a representative from the smaller political parties and non-party figures drawn from business, the trade unions, the academic world, and the NGO sector.

---

### ***Philosophy and Focus***

The WFD funds a wide range of organizations and projects that aim to build pluralist democratic institutions abroad, such as political parties, Parliaments or other representative institutions, legal reform, human rights groups, independent media, women's organizations and projects, and trade unions.

### ***Target Countries***

WFD's priority areas include Central and Eastern Europe, the Commonwealth of Independent States, and Anglophone Africa. The WFD does not fund projects that benefit residents of the United Kingdom or its dependent territories or other mature democracies and developed countries.

### ***Funding***

Core funding for the WFD comes receives a Government grant of £4 million per year and is accountable to the Foreign and Commonwealth Office. Additional program funding comes from DFID, UNDP, EU, the private sector and other sources. With these contributions, the total annual income for 2003 was £4,777,393.

### ***Lessons Learned***

According to senior executives at the WFD, "Foreign and Commonwealth Office and Government patronage is a great asset, recognizing that, of course it also circumscribes our independence. Representation of the parties on the WFD Board is also an asset; and from the British Government's point of view one of the purposes of having an arms length agency is to support work which it could not do directly - though of course the rationale for WFD is more than this."

"Then there is structure: the key to any successful organizational model is to define roles and accountabilities clearly. There was some ambiguity in the way WFD was set up [relationship to political parties] and we are now addressing this. Relevant advice would be to make the most of Canadian government and party involvement but avoid ambiguity in definitions of roles and responsibilities."

## ***Section B: Overview of Democracy Organizations***

### ***Internationally Focused National Institutions and Party Foundations***

#### ***Australia: Centre for Democratic Institutions:***

The Centre for Democratic Institutions (CDI) responds to the needs of developing countries in the field of good governance and democratic institutions, and maintains a geographic focus in the Asia-Pacific region. Based in the Research School of Social Sciences at the Australian National University, the Centre receives its core funding from the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID). The CDI operates and researches in the fields of parliamentary and judicial processes, civil society, the media, political parties, human rights, and government accountability.

CDI's approach is to work with present and future leaders and decision-makers from developing countries; promote mutual learning dynamics; encourage networking between its

---

focus groups and their Australian counterparts; and work cooperatively with other institutions in the field. The Centre adopts a non-partisan approach, and encourages gender equality in its programs and favours cost-sharing arrangements with project co-sponsors.

The work of the CDI includes strengthening Parliaments, judicial training, NGO leadership courses, support for ombudsmen and their staff, augmenting democratic political parties, offering media courses for journalists and editors, providing accountability courses for political officials, support for the implementation of Human Rights Treaties, and technical assistance in the field of good governance and civil society. The Centre also organizes and hosts conferences and seminars on issues relating to democracy, and officers of CDI present papers and lectures, facilitate workshops, and chair meetings at a range of forums for examining democracy. Furthermore, researchers at the Centre act as consultants to other democracy-promoting organizations.

<http://www.cdi.anu.edu.au/>

***Austria: Renner Institut:***

The Renner Institute is the political academy of the Austrian Social Democratic movement. In this capacity, it aims at:

- Involving experts from various fields of development studies to inform the policies of the Austrian Social Democratic Party
- Generating a forum for political discussion to promote social democratic policy positions
- Training representatives of the Austrian Social Democratic Party so that they are optimally prepared for their present and future tasks
- Fostering the organizational development of the Austrian Social Democratic Party in order to open up and modernize party structures

The Renner Institute is involved in the field of political education at the international level. The Renner institute cooperates with other European party foundations to support emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe. Moreover, the Renner-Institute organizes workshops and individual consultations for functionaries, parliamentary representatives and employees of the Austrian Social Democratic Party in order to encourage political education domestically.

<http://www.renner-institut.at/fremdspr/frengl.htm>

***Austria: Politische Akademie der ÖVP:***

The Austrian People's Party Foundation defines itself as a Christian-based political academy think tank concerned with modern political issues. The foundation supplies expertise for both domestic and international political initiatives to anticipate issues at the cutting-edge of political discourse. The People's Party Foundation seeks to further public discourse on political issues by holding conferences, creating publications and through the media.

Internationally, the People's Party Foundation seeks to advance Christian-democratic policies.

---

The foundation is concerned with political education and uses this method to promote the stabilizations of Europe. It favours the expansion of the European Union to assist in this end. The People's Party Foundation holds forums for experts to inform party policy and to encourage political discussion more widely.

<http://www.modernpolitics.at>\*

**France: Fondation Jean-Jaurès:**

The Jean-Jaurès Foundation is an institution associated with Democratic Socialism in France. Grounded in the principles of freedom and humanism, the foundation strives to support the development of a pluralist and humanistic culture in France as well as internationally. The Jean-Jaurès Foundation wishes to spread the ideals and principles valued during the French Revolution throughout the world.

The Jean-Jaurès Foundation supports research in the social sciences and humanities. In addition, it seeks partnerships with organizations around the world to provide advice in areas of economic, civic, and cultural policy grounded in the values of socialism.

Broadly, the Jean-Jaurès Foundation supports the international labour movement and international socialism. It seeks to create political debate to contribute to the betterment of political discourse around the world, and through action, seeks to enhance the quality of pluralistic democracy in the world.

<http://www.jean-jaures.org/> \*

**France: Fondation Robert Schuman :**

The Robert Schuman Foundation honours the former foreign affairs minister of France and leader of the European Union movement throughout the 1950s. The mission of the Robert Schuman Foundation has the following goals:

- The promotion of European ideals
- Supporting all who work for democracy in Europe and in the rest of the world
- Contributing, in every way possible, to the European debate and to the evolution of the EU
- Establishing ties and cooperating with all institutions that pursue these same goals
- Promoting the study of European thought, by establishing scholarships, developing research programs, and supporting publications which pertain to European construction, its past and its future

The foundation seeks to spread Robert Schuman's message, emphasize political learning, and to promote the European Union. The Robert Schuman foundation hosts policy debates to contribute to new ideas that enhance the European dimension of public life. Through scholarships for international doctorate students, the foundation supports the future economic, cultural, and political leaders of Europe. The Robert Schuman Foundation encourages scholarship holders to work in their own countries to promote and develop European common values – such as peace, stability, and prosperity.

---

The foundation acts to enhance democratic development in Europe to ensure the integrity of the European Union is upheld in the future. The Robert Schuman Foundation organizes research programs and policy seminars focused on the subject of the European Union to enhance political education regarding the EU.

The Robert Schuman foundation is engaged in democracy assistance to promote the EU in developing European democracies. The foundation has several offices throughout Europe, in every EU member state, as well as all of its candidate countries.

<http://www.robert-schuman.org/gb/>

**Germany: Friedrich Ebert Stiftung:**

The Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (FES) was founded in 1925 as a political legacy of Germany's first democratically elected president, Friedrich Ebert. Ebert, a Social Democrat had proposed the establishment of a foundation to serve the following aims:

- Furthering political and social education of individuals from all walks of life in the spirit of democracy and pluralism
- Facilitating access to university education and research for gifted young people by providing scholarships
- Contributing to international understanding and cooperation

The Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, which was banned by the Nazis in 1933 and re-established in 1947, holds to this mission statement today. As a private cultural non-profit institution, it is committed to the ideas and basic values of social democracy. The FES is represented in seventy countries in Africa, Asia, the Middle East, and Latin America. Seventy German staff are posted in these countries at present and, with the assistance of numerous local staff, are generally engaged in socio-political development projects, specifically dealing with economic and social matters.

The FES spends approximately half of its annual budget on international activities. The FES develops partnerships with other political organizations, with the private sector, trade union organizations, academics, communications sector organizations, and cultural institutions.

The FES assists developing countries by:

- Promoting peace and understanding between peoples within partner countries
- Supporting the democratization of the state and strengthening civil society
- Improving general political, economic and social conditions
- Reinforcing free trade unions
- Developing an independent media structure
- Facilitating regional and worldwide cooperation between states and different interest groups
- Gaining recognition for human rights

---

In addition, the FES maintains offices in 33 countries of Western Europe, Central and South-East Europe, the CIS countries, the USA and Japan. It fosters dialogue between democratic institutions with the aim furthering policy development as well as enhancing democracy promotion efforts throughout the world. It cooperates in this process with partners from various societal groups and organizations, such as trade unions, political parties, educational and research institutions, and city and local governments.

In the reform states in Eastern Europe, the FES is involved in supporting the process of democratization, the transition to a market economy and the establishment of a civil society, in particular in the fields of labour, social, environmental, and media policies. It also supports these countries in the process of accession to the EU.

Furthermore, the FES contributes to both the internal German and international debates with its journal "International Politics and Society" (available in English) and series of publications in German such as "Eurokolleg" and "Politikinformation Osteuropa." The section "International Policy Analysis" deals with questions related to foreign policy, European integration, and international economic and social politics.

### **Political Education**

It is the aim of political education by the Friedrich-Ebert- Stiftung to assist the citizens of the Federal Republic of Germany in responding to the changes in politics and society to enable them to take part in a critical and proactive manner. The corresponding activities focus on creating a well-balanced relationship between East and West Germany. Conferences take place throughout Germany to assist in this regard. The wide range of subjects and questions include fundamental issues concerning democracy, international relations and day-to-day politics.

<http://www.fes.de/fesenglish.pdf>

### ***Germany: Friedrich Naumann Stiftung:***

As a foundation for liberal policy, the Friedrich-Naumann-Foundation (FNST) is committed to freedom of opinion and action, both nationally and internationally. The FNST advocates the spread of liberalism to achieve this goal. The FNST has partner organizations in over eighty countries working to increase political awareness and advocate liberalism, both at home and abroad.

To achieve this, the principal tool used by the FNST is civic education. Through the exchange of liberal ideas on a global level, the FNST seeks to promote international political dialogue. The FNST also provides political advice and support to other liberal organizations and political parties abroad. The Liberal Institute is in touch with other think tanks in the liberal milieu. This way, the Institute participates in the worldwide exchange of liberal ideas and solutions.

[http://www.fnst.org/webcom/show\\_article.php/ c-705/i.html](http://www.fnst.org/webcom/show_article.php/ c-705/i.html)

---

**Germany: Hanns Seidel Stiftung:**

*The Hanns Seidel Foundation (HSS) is associated with the Christian Democratic movement in Germany. The mission statement of the Hanns Seidel Foundation is, "In the service of democracy, peace and development." The Hanns Seidel Foundation works within the Bavarian region of Germany as well as abroad.*

The Hanns Seidel Foundation focuses on democratic education and sees this as a principal responsibility for all party foundations. Promoting civic education ensures an open society and allows citizens to participate in the democratic process with a high degree of political knowledge.

The Hanns Seidel Foundation focuses much of its efforts on promoting civic education among young people with the belief that the understanding of democracy must be newly acquired in each generation.

Since its establishment on April 11, 1967, the Hanns Seidel Foundation has been focused on political education "the democratic and civic education of the German people with a Christian basis." The political education efforts of the Hanns Seidel Foundation focus on free choice and autonomy as well as social responsibility and solidarity.

<http://www.hss.de/homepage-e.shtml>

**Germany: Konrad Adenauer Stiftung:**

The Konrad Adenauer Foundation (KAS) is associated with the German Christian Democratic movement. Founded in 1956, the KAS is named after Chancellor Adenauer. The Konrad Adenauer Foundation offers political education, conducts scientific fact-finding research for political projects, grants scholarships to gifted individuals, researches the history of Christian Democracy, and supports European unification, international understanding, and development policy cooperation.

[http://www.kas.de/1641\\_webseite.html](http://www.kas.de/1641_webseite.html)

**Germany: Heinrich Böll Stiftung:**

The Heinrich Böll Foundation (HBS), affiliated with the Green Party and headquartered in Berlin, is an independent political foundation. It was founded in 1997 by uniting three separate regional party foundations.

The Foundation's primary objective is to support political education within Germany and abroad, thus promoting democratic involvement, socio-political activism, and cross-cultural understanding. The Foundation also provides support for arts and culture, science and research, and developmental cooperation. Its activities are guided by the fundamental political values of ecology, democracy, solidarity, and non-violence. The Heinrich Böll Foundation strives to stimulate socio-political reform by acting as a forum for topical political debate.

To realize its objectives, the HBS provides encouragement and support to those groups and individuals who strive to create a more peaceful world, protect the environment, and of

---

promote respect for human rights throughout the world. The Foundation also supports research into the mechanisms of this century's two German dictatorships, thus paving the road for a sustainable democratic future.

The Foundation promotes a vision of a democratic society open to immigrants and places particular importance on attaining gender democracy - promoting a relationship between the sexes characterized by freedom from dependence and dominance. These collective tasks are significant aspects of both the Foundation's internal structure and public activities.

The Foundation's activities strive to promote respect among people of different nationalities, different cultural or sexual identities and differing political opinions. The educational work of the Foundation also aims to counter discrimination against lesbians and gay men.

Internationally, the HBS is involved in upwards of two-hundred projects in sixty countries. Through these international projects, the HBS aims to strengthen ecological and civil activism on a global level and encourage political debate. The Heinrich Böll Foundation's undertakes collaborative socio-political education programs with its project partners abroad on a long-term basis. Additional important instruments of international cooperation include visitor programs, which, as well as basic and advanced training programs for committed activists.

The Heinrich Böll Foundation's Study Programme considers itself a workshop for the future; its activities include providing support to especially talented students and academics, promoting theoretical work of socio-political relevance, and working to overcome the compartmentalization of science into exclusive subjects

[http://www.boell.de/asp/frameset\\_en.html](http://www.boell.de/asp/frameset_en.html)

***Germany: Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung:***

The predecessor of the Rosa Luxemburg Foundation (RLS) was set up in 1990 as a registered non-profit organization called the "Social Analysis and Political Education - registered society." In 1996, at the convention of the Party of Democratic Socialism (PDS), the society was recognized as the national foundation affiliated with the PDS.

In 1998, the Foundation was named after Rosa Luxemburg, an icon of the political Left and considered by the PDS Party to be one of the most important representatives of left-wing socialist, anti-militarist, and internationalist positions in the Social Democratic Party (SPD) of Germany before 1918.

The Foundation is particularly active in adult and youth political education in the Federal Republic of Germany and has developed into a nationwide institution in this field. It has become a major forum for critical thinking and the formulation of political alternatives as well as a partner in several international cooperation initiatives.

Within an association of like-minded institutions, the Rosa Luxemburg Foundation cooperates closely with PDS-related regional foundations and associations in all the German federal states. In addition to promoting political education, it supports social movements and

---

organizations aiming to further social and political participation, solidarity, and peace, both locally and globally.

The Rosa Luxemburg Foundation is concerned with sustainable democratic development, on international cooperation based on equal rights, on ecological sustainability, as well as antifascism and antiracism and offering critiques of capitalism.

<http://www.rosalux.de/engl/home.htm>

***Greece: Institute for Strategic and Development Studies:***

Founded in 1995, the Institute for Strategic and Development Studies (ISTAME) - Andreas Papandreou is centre for contemporary political and scientific research and is associated with democratic socialism. The ISTAME is a nonprofit, non-governmental organization. The ISTAME mission reflects the values of political pluralism, democratic deliberation, economic development, social cohesion, as well as the fulfillment of national goals.

These values inform the policy research from the ISTAME as well as providing a framework for their various initiatives, conferences, round tables, and the publications. The ISTAME forms and participates in networks of international co-operation in Europe, in the Mediterranean and especially in South-Eastern Europe.

It has also established cooperative relationships with the Institutes of the political parties that participate in the European Socialist Party, as well as with the equivalent parties from South-Eastern Europe. The ISTAME has also established co-operations with similar Institutes in the Middle East and Central Asia, as well as with Russia and China.

[http://www.istame-apapandreou.gr/default\\_en.htm](http://www.istame-apapandreou.gr/default_en.htm)

***Greece: Constantinos Karamanlis Institute for Democracy:***

The Constantinos Karamanlis Institute for Democracy (CKID) was established in January 1998. A nonprofit organization, CKID was founded for the purpose of examining and analyzing social, political and economic issues from a liberal perspective.

The objective of the CKID is to contribute to the growth of democracy and to the advancement of civil liberties and private enterprise, while remaining committed to development and social cohesion.

The establishment of the Institute for Democracy was a response to provide political knowledge to allow Greece to adapt to rapid societal change to consolidate Greece's position in the European integration process. The CKID seeks to enhance the role of the private sector in society and seeks to curb inefficiencies within the public sector.

<http://www.idkaramanlis.gr/index-en.html>

***Norway: Norwegian Centre for Democracy Support:***

Norwegian Centre for Democracy Support (NDS) is a politically neutral non-profit organization created for the purpose of supporting new and developing democracies. The primary objective

---

of the Centre is to promote representative multi-party democracies and free elections in the South.

<http://www.senterfordemokratistotte.no/english.asp>

***Portugal: Cooperaçã e Desenvolvimento OIKOS:***

Created in 1988, the OIKOS Cooperation and Development organization is a non-partisan, non-profit, NGO that seeks to assist those in the world's poorest countries. The OIKOS is concerned with the eradication of the poverty through development initiatives grounded in principles of social justice. The OIKOS works to reduce levels of inequality and to promote human rights, particularly in economic and social policy areas. The Portuguese Ministry of Foreign Affairs considers the OIKOS to be a public utility.

<http://www.oikos.pt> \*

***Portugal: Centro de Intervençã Para O Desenvolvimento Amílcar Cabral CIDAC:***

Founded in 1974, CIDAC was created as a centre of for anti-colonial information that mobilized citizens opposed to Portuguese dictatorship and generated anti-colonial sentiment within Portugal. CIDAC is committed to principles of international solidarity, justice in international relations, the recognition of identity, and development. CIDAC works to encourage political education and development in former Portuguese colonies.

CIDAC forms partnerships with other non-governmental organizations throughout Europe to undertake research and to encourage civic education in the region's developing democracies.

<http://www.cidac.pt>\*

***Romania: Euroregional Center for Democracy:***

The Euroregional Center for Democracy (CED) is a non-governmental and non-profit organization that promotes democracy and stability in Central and South-Eastern Europe.

CED is located in the Western Romanian city of Timisoaraa, where a multi-ethnic and multicultural space encourages the dialogue between individuals and institutions that promote democratic values. Euroregional Center for Democracy is a member of Soros Open Network, a network of Romanian independent organizations whose common aim is to promote the open society values. The Open Society Foundation Romania (OSF) – a non-profit NGO focused on developing an open society in Romania – founded CED

<http://www.regionalnet.org/english/about/mission.html>

***Romania: Ovidiu Sincai Social Democratic Institute:***

"Ovidiu Sincai" Social Democratic Institute Foundation is a non-profit organization, which aims at strengthening and developing Romanian and world democracy. The main goal of the Foundation is to support modernization in line with social democratic values.

---

“Ovidiu Sincai” assists political and civil society leaders to promote democratic values and practices, both domestically and internationally. In addition, “Ovidiu Sincai” Social Democratic Institute aims to develop educational programs that will contribute to promotion and learning of democratic values, ideas and practices and at the same time, encourage dialogue, transparency and responsibility.

“Ovidiu Sincai” strives to increase the professionalism of the political class and provides post-secondary scholarships to encourage youth to uphold democratic values.

<http://www.fisd.ro/indexe.php>

***Spain: Fundacion Pablo Iglesias:***

The Pablo Iglesias Foundation (FPI) is a cultural institution grounded in socialist thought. A group of union workers founded the FPI in 1926. The FPI was reinstated after the demise of the Spanish dictatorship with the aid of the international socialist movement. The FPI conducts research relating to the history of the socialist movement in Spain and seeks to inform an international socialist discourse. The FPI involves like-minded international institutions in its research.

[www.fpabloiglesias.es/](http://www.fpabloiglesias.es/) \*

***Spain: Fundacion para el analisis y lose studios socials (FUNDAES):***

FUNDEAS is a foundation concerned with socio-political studies, which was created in 2003 as the result of a merger between five pre-existing Spanish foundations. FUNDEAS focuses on the areas of development, public policy, economic policy, international rights, as well as international constitutional issues. FUNDEAS is ultimately concerned with promoting democratic and civic values within society.

FUNDEAS encourages the Spanish government to undertake more active foreign policy development to enhance openness and create interdependencies with other nations. FUNDEAS develops partnerships with institutions in both Europe and America to assist in this goal, in which ideas and research are shared amongst similar organizations. FUNDEAS is a think tank and wishes to encourage liberal political discourse in response to the changing dynamics of international relations brought on by globalization.

[www.fundaes.es/](http://www.fundaes.es/) \*

***Spain: Club of Madrid:***

The Club of Madrid is an independent organization whose purpose and priority is to contribute to strengthening democracy in the world. It stimulates, promotes and conducts initiatives and activities and participates in projects seeking this objective. The Club of Madrid acts as a consultative body for governments, democrat leaders, and institutions involved in processes of democratic transition.

The personal and practical experience of its members (44 former heads of state and government) in processes of democratic transition and consolidation is the Club of Madrid's

---

unique resource. Along with the experience and cooperation of other high-level political practitioners and governance experts, this resource is a working tool to convert ideas into practical and feasible recommendations and action plans for implementation.

The Club of Madrid was launched following the Conference on Democratic Transition and Consolidation (CDTC), held in Madrid, Spain, in October 2001. At that unprecedented gathering, 35 heads of state and government from Europe, the Americas, Asia, and Africa met with more than 100 of the world's most respected scholars and policy experts to discuss the problems of building democracy from both a theoretical and practical point of view. The CDTC looked at eight core issues, including constitutional design, the legislature, and its relations with the executive, the judiciary, and its relations with the executive, anti-corruption measures, the role of armed forces and security forces, reform of the state bureaucracy, strengthening of political and social pluralism and of political parties, and economic and social conditions. In four days of intensive discussion between the leaders and experts, the two groups were able to identify areas of agreement and disagreement, and formulate practical recommendations for strengthening democracy around the world.

The Club of Madrid seeks to leverage the first-hand experience of its members to assist countries with critical elements of their democratic transition or consolidation. The Club of Madrid is supported institutionally by the Fundación para las Relaciones Internacionales y el Diálogo Exterior (FRIDE) and the Gorbachev Foundation of North America (GFNA), the original sponsors of the 2001 conference.

<http://www.clubmadrid.org>

***Sweden: Olof Palme International Centre:***

The Olof Palme International Center works in the area of international development, encourages public support for international political and security policies, and is associated with the Swedish Social Democratic Party. Former Prime Minister Olof Palme's conviction that common security is created by cooperation and solidarity across borders influences the activities of the centre.

The Swedish Social Democratic Party, the Trade Union Confederation, and the Cooperative Union established the Palme Center in 1992. Today, the Palme Center has 29 member organizations associated with the labour movement. There are 13 members of the centre's board, representing its member organizations. In addition to the founding organizations, they include the Workers' Educational Association, the tenants' movement, and individual trade unions. These organizations represent the interests of many labour groups and organizations at various levels in Swedish society. An individual cannot be a member of the Palme Center, but the member organizations together have more than three million members.

In Sweden, the centre carries out comprehensive information and opinion-forming campaigns on issues concerning international development, security, and international relations. These activities include several seminars and publications.

---

International development co-operation is concentrated on six regions: The Balkans, the Baltic States and Russia, Central America, the Middle East, Southeast Asia and southern Africa. The Palme Center and its member organizations are involved in approximately 250 international development projects a year. These range from civic education and organizational structure, to human rights and reconciliation projects.

The centre has a framework agreement with the Swedish International Development Co-operation Agency (SIDA), which finances the international development projects of the member organizations. Most projects are carried out directly by the member organizations, which together with their local cooperation partners are responsible for project planning, initiation and evaluation with a focus on creating strong local ties. The centre carries out relatively few international development projects on its own, except in the Balkans.

The centre also administers the International Solidarity Fund (the I-Fund), which is the labour movement's fund for international solidarity and development co-operation. All money collected by the I-Fund is used exclusively to support trade union and political development work.

The centre is located in the same building as Social Democratic Party headquarters in central Stockholm. There are currently 22 employees

[http://www.palmecenter.se/article\\_uk.asp?Article\\_Id=1346](http://www.palmecenter.se/article_uk.asp?Article_Id=1346)

***Sweden: Jarl Hjalmarsson Foundation:***

The Jarl Hjalmarsson Foundation was formed in 1994 to promote freedom and democracy in Europe through the means of civic political education and is associated with the Moderate Party. The foundation attempts to enrich democratic values, particularly in Central and Eastern European countries such as Estonia, Poland, Russia, Ukraine, and the former Yugoslavia. The foundation provides additional democratic assistance to regions of Africa, Cuba, Hong Kong, and Turkey.

Through seminars and conferences dealing with various democratic policy areas, the foundation provides political education to assist these nations in building stronger political organizations. The seminars and conferences teach political campaigning skills and provide education relating to topical political issues. The Jarl Hjalmarsson Foundation incorporates a youth dynamic by encouraging participation of student organizations. The Jarl Hjalmarsson Foundation has developed partnerships with the Westminster Foundation, the International Commonwealth Institute and Konrad Adenauer Foundation.

<http://www.moderat.se/index.asp?mainid=5&subid=13&artid=632> \*

***Sweden: Centre Party International Foundation:***

The Centre Party is involved in extensive international cooperation through its International Foundation. The foundation receives substantial support from the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA). The foundation works primarily in Central and Eastern Europe, and acts additionally in a number of African countries, such as South Africa

---

and Burkina Faso. Many projects are undertaken in conjunction with local organisations within the Centre Party.

The party cooperates with a number of other centre and rural parties in the INC (the International Network of Centre Parties). The INC includes parties mainly in different European countries, the emphasis being on Scandinavia, Central, and Eastern Europe.

<http://www.centerpartiet.se/templates/Infosida.asp?id=2268>

***The Netherlands: MATRA – Programme Central and Eastern Europe:***

The Programme for Social Transformation (MATRA), funded by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, was created to support social transformation in Central and Eastern Europe. It focuses on activities that contribute to the development of open, pluralistic, and democratic societies that are securely embedded in the rule of law.

The programme is divided in three main sub-programmes:

- MATRA Small Embassy Projects Programme: Assists small scale democratic initiatives undertaken by individuals and groups in the interests of advancing democratic pluralism.
- MATRA Projects Programme: Awards grants to projects that contribute to the process of social transformation in Central and Eastern Europe.
- MATRA Pre-accession Programmes: Directed towards Central and Eastern Europe countries preparing for membership in the European Union to assist in meeting entrance standards

<http://www.olanda.ro/?page=doc/Matra.asp>

***United Kingdom: Center for Democracy & Development:***

The Centre for Democracy and Development (CDD) is a non-governmental organization that aims to promote the values of democracy, peace and human rights in Africa and especially in the West African sub-region. The Centre for Democracy and Development works through advocacy, training and research in the areas of governance, human rights, peace and security, environment, gender, social and economic development.

The CDD carries out these activities in two broad policy areas: The Governance, Security & Development Programme area and the Human Rights, Gender and Environment Programme.

<http://www.cdd.org.uk/index.html>

***United Kingdom: Electoral Reform International Services:***

Established in 1992, with the defined aim of offering a comprehensive advisory service for all democracies, Electoral Reform International Services (ERIS) was formed as an independent and non-political institute. ERIS is a division of the Electoral Reform Society of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (ERS), which was founded in 1884, to develop democracy in Britain and abroad.

---

With a team of staff based in London and a regional office in Africa, ERIS works in partnership with national electoral commissions and civil society organisations or on behalf of international donors to provide specialist electoral and democratisation assistance.

Through the combined expertise and experience of its staff and consultants, ERIS has the resources to cover all aspects of electoral work, good governance assistance and institutional development, specifically related to the development of civil society, the rule of law, good governance and elections.

Specialists assigned to projects by ERIS are drawn from resources within the organization and from an extensive database of UK and other European and international experts. The ERIS database of consultants includes election administrators, present and former elected members of local authorities, former parliamentarians, parliamentary staff, full-time organizers from UK political parties, academics, Civil Society specialists, lawyers, statisticians, journalists, logisticians, NGO officers, IT and observation specialists.

<http://www.eris.org.uk/erisHome/index.html>

***United States: International Republican Institute:***

The International Republic Institute (IRI) was established in 1983 as a non-partisan, non-profit organization dedicated to advancing democracy worldwide. It supports the growth of political and economic freedom, good governance, and human rights around the world by educating people, parties and governments on the values and practices of democracy.

The IRI has been active in nearly one hundred countries training citizens in political party building, monitoring elections, teaching communications practices, organizing civil participation, and conducting legal, legislative and electoral reform work. Currently, the Institute is active in over forty countries.

The IRI is federally funded through the National Endowment for Democracy and the US Agency for International Development (USAID). It also receives grants and donations from individuals, corporations, and foundations. It is governed by a Board of Directors.

<http://www.iri.org>

***Global and Multilateral Institutions:***

***Global: International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance:***

The International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA) is an intergovernmental organization with member states across all continents that seeks to support sustainable democracy in new and long-established democratic countries. It draws on comparative experience, analyses democracy trends and assistance, and develops policy options, tools, and guidelines related to political participation, electoral systems, political

---

parties, and post-conflict democracy building. Established in 1995, the Institute aims to assist countries build capacity to develop and strengthen democratic institutions, and provides a forum for dialogue between academics, policy-makers and practitioners around the world. It also synthesizes research and field experience, develops practical tools to help improve democratic processes, and promotes transparency, accountability, and efficiency in election management.

IDEA has twenty-one member states including Australia, Barbados, Belgium, Botswana, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, Finland, Germany, India, Mauritius, Mexico, Namibia, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, South Africa, Sweden and Uruguay. Japan has taken up observer status with the Institute and Switzerland is going to join soon. There are four associate members of IDEA: the International Press Institute, the Parliamentarians for Global Action, the Inter-American Institute for Human Rights, and Transparency International. It also works in partnerships with several international organizations such as the United Nations, the Organization of American States, the African Union, the UN Development Program, the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank.

IDEA's headquarters are located in Stockholm, Sweden, and a Secretary-General who is responsible to a Board manages the Institute. The Board of Directors is appointed by a Council on which are represented IDEA's member states and associated members. It is financed through contributions from its member states and through complementary funding from a variety of other sources.

The Institute is involved in a number of activities including:

- Democracy Building and Conflict Management: 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: adapting electoral systems, improving access and turnout, ensuring professional management and independence and building public confidence
- Developing Political Parties: reviewing external regulation and enforcement, public funding, internal management and democracy, relations with civil society and the public
- Political Equality and Participation: especially of underrepresented groups, including women in politics. The Institute identifies ways to build commitment and experience with special measures such as quotas

<http://www.idea.int>

***Global: World Movement for Democracy:***

The World Movement for Democracy (WMD) is a global network of democrats, including activists, practitioners, academics, policy-makers and funders, who have come together to cooperate in the promotion of democracy. Initiated in February 1999 by the National Endowment for Democracy, the WMD was designed to strengthen democracy where it is weak, to reform and invigorate democracy where it is longstanding, and to bolster pro-

---

democracy groups in countries that have not yet entered into a process of democratic transition.

An international steering community leads the WMD, and NED serves as its Secretariat. Only those networks, groups, or individuals sharing the principles and values contained in the founding statement (attached) may be associated with the WMD.

As a whole, the Movement does not advocate positions on particular political issues. Instead, it offers new ways to give practical help to democrats who are struggling to liberalize authoritarian systems and to consolidate emerging democracies. WMD highlights the potential for utilizing new information technologies, especially the Internet, to break information monopolies imposed by authoritarian regimes, to share ideas and experiences across countries, to increase grassroots democratic support and to build solidarity with those who are most marginalized by the denial of freedom and self-determination.

The WMD is sustained by two means: (1) global and regional communications and exchange among those engaged in democracy promotion, and (2) biennial global assemblies at which WMD participants can take stock of the accomplishments they have achieved and the challenges they confront, thereby building networks of mutual solidarity and support.

<http://www.wmd.org>

***Global: International Institute for Democracy:***

The Parliament Assembly of the Council of Europe, the European Parliament, and a number of national parliaments as an association established the International Institute for Democracy (IID) in September 1987 under French law. Its governing Board consists of representatives of the founding parliamentary organ, and its permanent secretariat is located in Strasbourg, France. IID's main role is to encourage cooperation on a worldwide scale between governmental, non-governmental, and inter-parliamentary organizations, as well as between national parliaments, with a view to promoting and strengthening pluralistic democracies.

The functions of the Institute include:

- Serves as a clearinghouse for the dissemination of information on the current efforts of various organizations and institutions involved in promoting democracy
- Provides assistance to all countries, and especially those undergoing democratization, which would like to be documented on the functioning of a pluralistic democracy
- Promotes research into parliamentary democracy in cooperation with universities and acts as a documentation centre on parliamentary democracy
- Organized workshops on parliamentary practice and procedure for members and staff of Parliaments in newly emerging democracies

<http://www.iidemocracy.coe.int/>

---

### **Domestically Focused Institutions:**

#### **South Africa: Institute for Democracy in South Africa:**

The Institute for Democracy in South Africa (IDASA) is an independent non-profit public interest organization that promotes democracy in South Africa. IDASA's mission is to promote a sustainable democracy by building democratic institutions, educating citizens, and advocating social justice. The primary objective of the Institute is the building of capacity for democracy in civil society and government.

IDASA operates in three general areas of activity:

- Representation of voters and community, and public participation
- Delivery of state services and constitutional obligations, and appropriately articulated and organized citizen demands
- Enforcement of laws, regulations, bylaws, and the constitution, and informed compliance and consent by citizens

IDASA is organized around national programs, objective oriented projects, and associated bodies. The national programs of the Institute are as follows:

- Political Information and Monitoring Service (PIMS): works to support democracy and promote ethical governance in South Africa. From research and reporting, to advocacy and training, PIMS aims to serve and build civic capacity and promote an open and accountable executive with strong, independent Parliaments.
- Public Opinion Service (POS): believes democracy requires elected government officials, political parties, and civil society organizations that are able to represent citizens and meet their needs based on an understanding of citizens' desires and likely actions. The Institute also conducts attitude surveys to build capacity and consolidate democracy.
- South African Migration Project (SAMP): provides the governments of Southern Africa with policy-relevant information regarding cross-border population migration. It promotes public awareness of the role, status, and contribution of foreign immigrants of African origin in South Africa.
- Local Government Centre (LGC): seeks to empower municipalities and their communities for effective and accountable governance and service delivery. The LGC does training and research, and gathers and disseminates information about the legislative and policy changes of the local government.
- All Media Group (AMG): handles IDASA's information dissemination, from publishing books, producing radio programs, and creating training materials.

Established in 1987, IDASA's initial task was to build confidence in a negotiated settlement and between factions within South Africa. With the disbanding of resistance movements and the establishment of opportunities for negotiations, IDASA began to support for a myriad of local initiatives, including supporting strategies to end violence. By late 1992, IDASA began to prepare for national elections as a way to establish a target date for the settlement and as a way to found a truly democratic state. By 1993, it was developing electoral support programs,

---

training party agents, and engaging in wide-scale voter education with a view to entrench commitment to democracy. After the first democratic Parliament in 1994, IDASA set up a monitoring arm to track developments in the establishment of the first Parliament and to help people understand it. IDASA trained and supported municipal councillors and for small civil society organizations. It also encouraged the formation of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission.

IDASA is run by a Board, and receives money from donors including the British Council, the European Union, the Kellogg Foundation, the Finnish and Norwegian Embassies, Oxfam, Queen's University, the United States Agency for International Development, and the World Bank.

<http://www.idasa.org.za/>

***Israel: The Israel Democracy Institute:***

Established to strengthen Israel's democratic institutions and shape its values, the Israel Democracy Institute (IDI) was founded in 1991 as an independent, non-partisan research organization. It provides independent professional advice to politicians and policy makers.

IDI also assists the Knesset and its committees, government ministries, and institutions, local authorities, and political parties by submitting research papers and proposals for changes and reforms in their modes of operation. Furthermore, the Institute fulfills its mission by compiling comparative information on legislative topics and on ways of functioning in various democratic regimes. It aspires to enrich the public discourse and encourage new ways of thinking by initiating discussions regarding issues on the political, social, and economic agendas with the participation of legislators, people in executive positions, and academics.

The Institute is registered as a non-profit organization and is supervised by an Executive Committee composed of public figures from the academic and business worlds. Sources of funding are donations from private persons and foundations, as well as from the sale of publications issued by IDI.

IDI undertakes a number of programs and activities including:

- Religion and State: examining alternative approaches and models with relation to this issue, based on Jewish and Western sources, with the aim of offering new solutions and perceptions. It examines the social and ideological tensions that arise from Israel's constitutional character as a state that is both Jewish and Democratic. The issues to be tackled in the upcoming period include separation of religion and state; separation of the nation and state; and separation of nation and religion
- Reform of Constitutional Process: involved in the drafting of the necessary constitutional amendments resulting from the entry into force of the Basic Law on Human Dignity and Freedom and the Basic Law on Freedom of Occupation. In consultation with the Ministry of Justice, the IDI is involved in a sweeping process of constitutional reform, which

- 
- includes the analysis of hundreds of laws in an attempt to harmonize them with the new Basic Laws
- **Business and Democracy:** aim of this project is to analyze the relationship between the private sector and democracy. Issues examined include business management and its influence on the welfare of various groups (workers, creditors, institutional investors) in Israeli society and on the interests of the public at large. IDI is also looking at issues such as the social response of private organizations and the democratization of wealth, the Companies Law, capitalism, and the welfare state, the classification of Israel's regulatory bodies in an attempt to rationalize and democratize their activities, and the privatization of Israel's companies.
  - **Political Reforms:** working to encourage the realization of essential reforms on a wide range of political issues with the aim of improving Israel's system of government. The focus is on accountability and the manner of its implementation. Proposals include: Combining proportional representation with a system based on constituencies to create a direct link between the voters and the Knesset members at the national level of the electorate; reinforcing the Knesset in its capacity as the legislative arm of the people; and introducing intra-party elections that guarantee the direct election of candidates from party lists to guard against the possibility of corruption during primaries
  - **Army and Society:** brings together the Chief of Staff and other high-ranking IDF officers with leading academics, individuals from the public sector and the media to examine the delicate relationship between the armed forces and the Israeli polity and explore new ways of achieving more sound and effective interaction

<http://www.idi.org.il/>

***Thailand: King Prajadhipok's Institute:***

King Prajadhipok's Institute (KPI) is a national, public, academic institute that aims to develop democracy for the achievement of everlasting peace. Operations include the coverage of research studies; organization of training, meetings, and seminars; dissemination of information on development of democracy and governance; and provision of consultation on effective governance at the local and national level. Established in 1994, the Institute bears the name of King Prajadhipok because of his ideals of peace and democracy, which are consistent with the organization's mission and philosophy.

KPI has many objectives including the following:

- To be established as the central unit coordinating the collaborative activities of creating and developing information pertaining to democracy and to act as the nation's role model for effective administrative governance
- To create a continuous flow of information for dissemination and for further development of democracy, and for the actual creation of effective administrative governance to be established among the various target groups
- To be the centre providing correct, informative printed materials to policy-makers, all concerned parties, and the public about various public policies that are relevant for the nation's development

- 
- To be the source of reference for the monitoring and measuring of the nation's level of democracy and good governance
  - To create a centre of excellence and act as a role model on administrative and management systems for public organizations.

KPI's area of research include political, reform, good governance, public participation and decentralization, civil society, branched of government, and independent organizations. An Institute Council led by a Secretary-General and a Deputy Secretary-General runs KPI. KPI is organized into several departments: College of Politics and Governance, the College of Local Government Development, Research and Development Office, Training Dissemination and Public Relations Office, and the Secretariat. An Executive Board and an Audit Committee are responsible to the Secretary-General.

<http://www.kpi.ac.th/en/peace.asp>

***Ghana: Ghana Centre for Democratic Development:***

The Ghana Centre for Democratic Development (CDD) is an independent, non-partisans, and non-profit organization. It is dedicated to the promotion of society and government based on the rule of law, appropriate checks on the power of the state, and integrity in public administration. Established in 1998, the CDD defines itself as a research-based and policy-oriented think tank. The Centre concentrates its efforts and operations in Ghana in particular and Africa more generally. It seeks to enhance the democratic content of public policy and to advance the cause of constitutionalism, individual liberty, the rule of law, and integrity of public life.

The activities of the Centre include:

- Research on issues relating to democracy, good governance, and liberal economic reform
- The monitoring, analyzing, and documentation of the progress of democratic development in Ghana and Africa
- The promotion of transparency, accountability, and integrity in the exercise of administrative and political discretion, and in the allocation and use of public resources
- The promotion of access to information and data relating to matters of public interest
- The provision of training to and networking with key public and civic institutions of democratic governance
- The defence of operational autonomy and helping strengthen the oversight capabilities of public and private watchdog institutions
- The education of the public about their rights and responsibilities under democratic and constitutional rule
- The promotion of peace building and democratic conflict management in Ghana and the Western Africa sub region

<http://www.cdd-ghana.org/>

***Russia: Demokratia – Centre for the Development of Democracy and Human Rights:***

---

Demokratia is a non-governmental public policy and advocacy group. Its mission is to support the development of democratic institutions and sustainable mechanisms of human rights protection in Russia by addressing public policy issues and facilitating civic participation in policy decisions. The Centre conducts analysis of policy issues, develops recommendation for governmental, non-governmental, and international organizations. It also develops NGO networks and coalitions, and organized public advocacy campaigns, NGO dialogues with public authorities, and other forms of civic participation.

The Centre engages leading experts from Russian and international organizations in its projects. It plays a role of coordination, analysis, and education in the protection of public interests and the organization of advocacy campaigns. A Board of Directors comprised of leaders of Russian NGOS and the Centre's President governs Demokratia. An International Advisory Board guides the work of the Centre.

The activities of Demokratia are numerous and include the following:

- Training seminars for NGOs in the organization of advocacy campaigns, public relations work, and coalition building
- Comparative research in international and Russian experiences in public advocacy campaigns and development of a manual on public campaigning
- Organization of youth volunteer exchanges between Russian and foreign NGOs, and research in mechanisms of involvement of young people in the work of human rights
- Research in effective public relations strategies for NGOs
- Participation in efforts to protect the right to privacy in the Russian Internet
- Development of mechanisms of civic participation in local government and community development, including the establishment of community foundations and neighbourhood councils
- Participation in the public efforts to stop the war in Chechnya and violations of human rights and humanitarian law in the region

<http://www.demokratia.ru/eng/about/>

\* Indicates information that has been translated into English