

DON'T GO IT ALONE: America's Interest in International Cooperation

New Directions for Democracy Promotion



*By Lorne W. Craner, International Republican Institute
Kenneth Wollack, National Democratic Institute*



Cover photo: A woman in Afghanistan casts her ballot in the country's historic 2004 presidential election.

The **Better World Campaign** works to strengthen the relationship between the United States and the United Nations through outreach, communications, and advocacy. We encourage U.S. leadership to enhance the UN's ability to carry out its invaluable international work on behalf of peace, progress, freedom, and justice. In these efforts, we engage policy makers, the media, and the American public to increase awareness of and support for the United Nations. To learn more, visit www.betterworldcampaign.org.

The **International Republican Institute (IRI)** is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization committed to advancing freedom and democracy worldwide. For 25 years, IRI has been helping to spread democracy through trainings by volunteer experts from all over the world on political party and candidate development, good governance practices, civil society development, civic education, women's and youth leadership development, electoral reform and election monitoring, and political expression in closed societies. IRI is active in 70 countries with offices in 42 countries. To learn more, visit www.iri.org.

The **National Democratic Institute for International Affairs (NDI)** is a nonprofit organization working to strengthen and expand democracy worldwide. Calling on a global network of volunteer experts, NDI provides practical assistance to civic and political leaders advancing democratic values, practices, and institutions. NDI works with democrats in every region of the world to build political and civic organizations, safeguard elections, and to promote citizen participation, openness and accountability in government. To learn more, visit www.ndi.org.

This paper was commissioned by the Better World Campaign, a sister organization of the United Nations Foundation, as part of a series of papers developed for the 2008 Presidential campaign and incoming administration. These papers offer strategies for enhancing international cooperation to address global challenges and advance U.S. interests. The views represented in the paper are those of the authors.

Executive Summary

New Directions for Democracy Promotion

Despite the confusion and skepticism about U.S. democracy promotion efforts generated largely by the Iraq war and the outcome of elections in the Palestinian Authority, the United States must remain engaged in this important effort.

In recent decades, scores of countries have chosen to become democratic and the majority of people in every region of the world now believe that democracy is the best form of government. While democratic systems may be the standard that nations seek, achieving that standard and sustaining support for democratic governance can be a difficult process.

A critical challenge for new democracies is to deliver better lives to their populations. To be successful and maintain popular support, a democracy cannot be just a set of concepts or processes; it must be connected to economic prosperity and produce visible improvements, which are key factors in preventing alternatives, such as autocratic regimes, from gaining ground.

Democracies also provide the best alternatives for fostering peace across borders by maintaining internal stability and achieving economic and social development. The September 11 attacks increased the focus on failed states and those in conflict as potential breeding grounds for extremists. Democracies, with their focus on accountability, transparency, and pluralism, can help reduce extremism by allowing avenues for dissent, alternation of power, and protections for the rights of minorities.

However, “regime change” is not a goal or objective of democracy promotion. Rather, democracy is about choice-incremental improvements and reforms adopted at a pace set by each body politic. Democracy is also about much more than elections. The health and extent of democracies are judged as much by events and changes between elections when the substantive work of building democratic structures takes place.

Support for democracy has been a priority of U.S. foreign policy since the earliest days of the republic and has been on the agenda of almost every president since World War II. The U.S. government has taken a pluralistic approach to support for democracy promotion, allowing for diverse and complementary programming through the core institutes of the National Endowment for Democracy (NED), executive branch agencies, and contributions to multilateral institutions such as the United Nations.

For both our national interests and our ideals, the United States should remain engaged in democracy promotion. The next U.S. President should rejuvenate this core concept by implementing in his first 100 days a number of recommendations that would recommit the nation to international democratic principles and the promotion of democratic governance abroad, including:

- **Re-energizing U.S. alliances among democratically minded nations inside and outside of the United Nations, including within the UN’s regional groupings;**
- **Committing diplomatic resources to fixing the UN’s new Human Rights Council and/or expanding U.S. financial and political commitments to the UN’s Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights and its field-based operations;**

- Enshrining democracy promotion as one of the key pillars of U.S. foreign policy in the National Security Doctrine;
- Announcing continued or expanded funding for democracy support programs within various agencies of the U.S. government;
- Announcing continued support for and funding of the Millennium Challenge Corporation and the Community of Democracies;
- Announcing continued support for congressionally initiated funding for democracy support programs in Iraq; and
- Ensuring that the value of democracy promotion efforts is understood by American diplomats through extensive programs by the Foreign Service Institute and other mechanisms.



In Punjab, Pakistan an interviewer asks a woman if she thinks her country is headed in the right direction. The IRI poll was conducted in May 2007.

“The answer to today’s threats ultimately lies in creating an overall environment in which international cooperation can be emphasized, and human development and dignity can be advanced.”



Ellen Johnson Sirleaf holds a campaign rally in Monrovia, Liberia. IRI and NDI monitored the 2005 elections in which Johnson Sirleaf was the first woman elected to lead an African nation.

Defining Democracy

Primarily because of Iraq and the outcome of elections in the Palestinian Authority, there is confusion and skepticism about efforts by the United States to promote democracy abroad. There are those who now argue that advocating democracy is neither a smart nor an effective foreign policy. In this view, the United States should pursue a more “realistic” approach and focus on more narrow national security issues. In reality, however, if this country fails to speak up for and support democracy, we will abandon the foundation upon which America’s national security is built.

Security is a complex achievement. It combines a hard and necessary defense with things that are less quantifiable, but no less important: principles, values, and relationships. All of these play a role in keeping this nation safe.

The answer to today’s threats ultimately lies in creating an overall environment in which international cooperation can be emphasized, in which conflict can be reduced, and in which human development and dignity can be advanced.

While democracy is a universal concept with varied manifestations, its advantages over other forms of government have come to be accepted globally in recent decades. Scores of countries have adopted the system, particularly since 1975, and a majority of people in every region of the world now believes that democracy is the best form of government, according to the “World Values Surveys” and other sources.

At its heart, democracy is legitimate governmental authority that derives from a body of citizens, regardless of gender, race, religion, national, ethnic, or social origin, or political or other opinion. The oldest democracies in the world share much history, but their institutional manifestations of democratic principles are quite different and the scores of countries that have become free show that each democratic system is unique.

What they have in common are the basic concepts of democratic governance. These include the ability to participate directly in government and public affairs and to choose, through genuine elections, representatives to occupy elective office and exercise the powers of government. They also include the ability to benefit from structures of accountability (including the legislature/parliament and the rule of law), the ability to exercise freedom of association and expression, and otherwise enjoy respect for human rights and equality of treatment. As more democracies have developed, it has become apparent that democracies are more likely to set free economic policies that lead to development and are less likely to resort to violence internally or with each other.

The concept of democracy has been embraced in numerous international conventions. By 1948, following the traumas and lessons learned from World War II, the United Nations General Assembly unanimously adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It defined “life, liberty, and security of person” in an effort largely led by the United States. The Universal Declaration, like other human rights instruments, addresses the relationship between sovereignty and the people of a country. Article 21 states:

“The challenge, particularly in a new democracy, is to build support for democratic governance that prevents alternatives from gaining ground.”



NDI women's political participation training in Afghanistan in 2006.

“Everyone has the right to take part in the government of his [or her] country, directly or through freely chosen representatives...The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government; this will shall be expressed in periodic and genuine elections, which shall be by universal and equal suffrage...”

The Universal Declaration and numerous treaties that the United States has joined posited that protection and promotion of human rights, including the right to democratic governance, was central to maintaining international security and peace.

Connecting Development with Democracy

Over the past 15 years, there has been a sea change in the attitudes of the donor community, international financial institutions, and those supporting democratic development that recognizes the interconnectedness between political and economic reform. Even from the perspective of traditional foreign assistance, the establishment of democratic institutions was the best way to assure sustainable development. Rural dislocation, environmental degradation, and agricultural policies that led to famine all traced to political systems in which the victims had no political voice, in which government institutions felt no obligation to answer to the people, and in which special interest groups felt free to exploit resources without fear of oversight or the need to be accountable. Where guarantees of individual rights within a society did not exist, the inevitable result was exploitation, stratification, disorder, and the inability to compete.

Another element of the sea change is the recognition that to advance development effectively, political institutions and organizations—legislatures and political parties—must be engaged, as well as executive branches, the courts, and civil society. A civil society without effective political institutions and organizations quickly creates a political vacuum. It sows opportunities for demagogues who promise to cut or weaken intermediary institutions such as parliaments, which are the foundation of representative government, setting the stage for a so-called “people’s democracy.” In addition, it leaves out institutions that are central to building the accountability needed to break patterns of waste and corruption that subvert development.

The 2002 Human Development Report of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) presented a clarion call about the importance of the link between democracy and development. Democratic participation, it said, is a critical end of human development, not just a means of achieving it. The report took the democracy agenda one step further by declaring that “politics,” not just civics, is as important to successful development as economics. Today, the UNDP is continuing to build bridges between democracy and development, and other UN agencies and international institutions are advancing this approach.

At the same time, democratic development cannot be left off the hook. “Democracy deficits”—shortcomings in delivering genuine democratic processes and institutions and lack of attention to developing democracy as a means to improving the quality of life for all citizens—have made democracy advocates cognizant of the need to embrace development issues.

A challenge before all democracies, old and new, is keeping the people’s faith and trust that this form of governance will keep its compact with the people to realize human dignity and development. There are many threats to this ideal, including corruption, poor government performance, and attempts by autocratic

governments to suppress internal democratic forces by persecuting dissidents, curbing free media, controlling civil society institutions, and dampening economic development initiatives.

Making democracy work to deliver better lives for the population is a sustained and critical challenge. Taking steps beyond initial breakthroughs, such as promoting economic betterment and ending corruption, are central to maintaining popular support. The challenge, particularly in a new democracy, is to build support for democratic governance that prevents alternatives from gaining ground—whether they are autocratic regimes, populist covers for authoritarianism, or extremist ideologies that promote intolerance and violence.

Creating Stability and Security

Every major peace agreement negotiated in the last two decades has included, as a principal goal, elections and the possibility of democratic governance. Developing democratic processes in the course of building sustainable peace is central to achieving stability and security—both domestically in those countries and internationally. The return on this investment is astronomical. The value of lives saved in places as diverse as East Timor, Democratic Republic of Congo, Liberia, Nepal, El Salvador, and Kosovo, to list only a few, goes far beyond the expenditures that help to build inclusive political processes that cause belligerents to put down arms and engage in peaceful competition for governmental power. The value in realized and potential economic development and the economic implications derived from international peace and stability also have to be considered in the equation.

Democracies provide the best alternatives for fostering peace across borders by maintaining internal stability and achieving economic and social development. Conversely, autocracy, corruption, and lack of accountability exacerbate powerlessness, poverty, and intolerance and breed instability, increasing the potential for conflict and extremism, while hindering efforts to address famine, disease, and other matters essential for human development.

“Democracies provide the best alternatives for fostering peace across borders by maintaining internal stability and achieving economic and social development.”

Extremists exist in any society, but to become a systematic force they must exploit discontent among those who feel powerless and excluded from the political process. Extremists seek to use this disaffection to justify the use of violence. Autocrats, in turn, often use the existence of extremist violence to justify their reign and anti-democratic tactics. Vital elements in breaking this symbiotic relationship include supporting effective political reform, promoting tolerance, and furthering development. Supporting effective democratic reform in states where leaders are elected but block genuine democratic development is therefore essential, because it is the “right thing to do” and because realism—which embraces the tough work necessary to advance strategic interests—demands it.

The September 11, 2001 attacks increased the focus on failed states and states in conflict as potential breeding grounds and hosts for violent extremists. September 11 also put a spotlight on many regimes in the Middle East and Asia where authoritarian or semi-authoritarian regimes use repression to limit dissent and political freedom. In some majority Muslim societies in the Middle East and Asia, political repression discouraged moderates—professionals, women, business people, secular political party leaders, and moderate religious figures—from involvement in political life. Religious extremists (or at least those purporting to be religious), on the other hand, simply went underground or used mosques, religious schools, and other institutions to organize and gain strength.

In many cases, authoritarian regimes seemed to encourage some radicalization within their borders as a permanent justification for emergency law, one-party rule, and limited societal freedom. A limited international consensus emerged that democracy—with its attendant focus on accountability, transparency, and pluralism—would, over the long term, help to reduce extremism by allowing constructive avenues for dissent, alternation of power, and protections for the rights of minorities. There is also evidence that democratic systems have caused Islamist movements to become more pragmatic by offering incentives for power sharing and political inclusion.



Women at a campaign rally for the Lesotho Congress for Democracy in advance of the 2007 parliamentary elections.

Redefining Democracy Building

“Regime change” is not a goal or objective of democracy assistance. Incremental improvements and democratic reform—at a pace that each body politic sets—define the mode of operation. When those who hold power abuse it and frustrate the will of the people to such an extent that the people decide to take dramatic action to protect their sovereign rights, a regime may be swept away because of its opposition to democracy. That cannot be orchestrated or imposed by outside forces. Dictatorship is an imposition; democracy is about choice.

There are clear examples where those who held power breached their compact with citizens and used the powers of government to stifle the will of the people as to who should represent them. The Philippines spawned “People Power” in response to such abuse of power, as was more recently the situation in Serbia, Georgia, and Ukraine. In each case, people worked for responsiveness and accountability of government before turning to more dramatic means of changing those in power.

The use of military force has never been predicated principally on democracy policy. Toppling a government must be reserved for exceptional circumstances where those in control of a state are abusing its powers in ways that meet universally recognized grounds for intervention, such as launching international aggression or genocide and other crimes against humanity. This action is best taken multilaterally under sanction of

the United Nations or perhaps a regional body—though should such bodies be paralyzed against required urgent action, intervention can be done without violating international law. The purpose of such intervention is not democracy promotion; it is to stop the violation of the sovereignty of other nations that breaches international peace and security or to stop universally condemned gross and massive violations of human rights. Building governance after such an intervention nonetheless should be based on the right to democratic governance and the compelling practical reasons for the international community to support democracy.

“Empowering citizens to exercise their sovereign rights between and during elections is the hallmark of democracy assistance.”

Finally, democracy building is about much more than elections, which are a prerequisite but insufficient condition for democracy. The health and extent of democracies are judged as much on the basis of events and changes between elections, with democratic reformers and democracy assistance organizations working in the trenches on seemingly mundane matters: building political parties that are internally democratic, open, and responsive to constituencies; helping

parliaments conduct pluralist political debate that includes public input and leads to legislation and executive oversight; assisting civil society organizations that engage in policy advocacy and accountability activities; and supporting journalism, the rule of law, civic education, and citizen participation—including women and minorities—in government and public affairs. Empowering citizens to exercise their sovereign rights between and during elections is the hallmark of democracy assistance.

Making Democracy Central to U.S. Policy

While support for democracy in U.S. foreign policy can be traced to the country’s earliest days, in the modern era we often cite Woodrow Wilson’s vision of foreign policy grounded in principles of promoting just government based on consent of the governed. Certainly, almost every president since WWII—from Democrats Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Harry Truman, John F. Kennedy, Jimmy Carter, and Bill Clinton to Republicans Dwight D. Eisenhower, Gerald Ford, Ronald Reagan, George H. W. Bush, and George W. Bush—has placed support for democracy as a central element of U.S. foreign policy. They have done so because of the compelling national interests cited above, as well as ideals.

From the Atlantic Charter to the Marshall Plan, the Berlin Airlift, and the 1961 Foreign Assistance Act, promoting democratic development has a long tradition in U.S. policy. President Carter placed a great emphasis on human rights, and President Reagan’s Westminster speech took that policy further, leading to the creation of a specific U.S. democracy promotion institution, the NED, and four core independent nonprofit institutes loosely associated with the two main U.S. political parties, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO). The four institutes are the National Democratic Institute (NDI), the International Republican Institute (IRI), the Center for International Private Enterprise (CIPE), and the Solidarity Center. President George H. W. Bush expanded support for democratic development by adding it to the portfolio of the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). President Clinton made support for democratic development one of three central pillars of U.S. foreign policy. And President George W. Bush added emphasis, including extending democracy promotion to the Middle East.

U.S. government support for democracy programs comes from a variety of sources. In the early 1980s, these programs were funded primarily through the NED and its core institutes, which give concrete expression to America's democratic values while serving our country's national interest by promoting political environments that are inhospitable to political extremism.

Since the 1980s, support from USAID has allowed for a significant increase in democracy promotion activities, as has the Department of State's application of Economic Support Funds for these purposes. Greatly increased resources within the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor (DRL) and the creation of the Middle East Partnership Initiative (MEPI) during the George W. Bush Administration have allowed even greater opportunities for much-needed innovative democracy assistance in countries and geographic areas that are not traditional USAID recipients.

The United States also invests in democracy building through its contributions to and programs in multilateral institutions, not least of which is the United Nations. U.S. dues to the United Nations support the general extension of the rule of law and provide direct electoral assistance to many of the world's citizens, often through the Electoral Assistance Bureau. As of 2007, about half of the world's nations had received UN assistance in holding and monitoring elections and many more have received UN help in crafting or reshaping their constitutions. The United States also contributes to separate, voluntarily funded agencies of the United Nations that promote democracy and good governance, like the UNDP or the UN Democracy Fund, which was created on July 4, 2005, with the support of the Bush Administration. The Democracy Fund provides small grants to governments and civil society organizations around the world to support emerging democracies with legal, technical, and financial assistance and advice.

This pluralism in democracy assistance has served the United States well, allowing for diverse yet complementary programming that, over the long-term, could not be sustained by a highly static and centralized system. Funding by the NED, for example, has allowed its core institutes to respond quickly and flexibly to emerging opportunities and sudden problems in rapidly shifting political environments. In addition, the NED has been able to operate effectively in closed societies where direct government engagement is more difficult. Funds from USAID have provided the basis for a longer-term commitment in helping to develop a country's democratic institutions; while funding from DRL and other programs within the State Department, such as MEPI, have given the U.S. government the capacity to support—without cumbersome regulations—cutting-edge and highly focused democracy programs in individual countries as well as regional and global initiatives.

While the U.S. government can set the tone and foreign aid can provide needed resources for democratic development, much of the work on the ground must be done by nongovernmental organizations (NGOs).



Young leaders develop a message for a candidate in a fictional campaign during an IRI Leadership Institute for Central and Eastern Europe.



Election observers in Sierra Leone.

This is particularly true in the Middle East and Central Asia. Nonprofit NGOs are capable of assuming responsibility, yet are not constrained by the stringent rules of formal diplomacy. Such NGOs can readily share information, knowledge, and experiences with groups and individuals who are pursuing or consolidating democracy, sometimes without the cooperation or sanction of their government. Perhaps most important, in countries where a primary issue is the paucity of autonomous civic and political institutions, the fundamental idea that government ought not to control all aspects of society can be undermined by a too-visible donor government hand.

Providing assistance to those promoting democracy, like all activities, requires an ethical framework. At least four criteria are important: activities must be grounded in international law (e.g., humanitarian and human rights law); NGO initiatives must grow out of the needs and requests of democrats in the country and the democratic partners must be the people of the country where the reform is being sought (i.e., reinforcing sovereignty and domestic empowerment through knowledge transfer); and the techniques must embody good-faith efforts to provide the best practices for achieving democratic development. Finally, the work should be conducted in the open and with partners committed to pluralism and nonviolence. Attempting to assist those who often risk their lives and livelihoods to advance genuine democratic development in their countries, without giving weight to these ethical considerations, risks wasting time and resources, serves interests other than the “common good,” and may even violate international norms. In essence, successfully undertaking this important activity must be done properly and with great sensitivity, including consulting the U.S. Congress, the State Department, and the relevant agency such as NED, DRL, or USAID.

Building Support for Democracy Building

While the image of democracy building in the United States has suffered from association with the war in Iraq, the backlash against international support for democratic reform often comes from nondemocratic regimes. Leaders of these regimes often make false accusations to try to undercut support for indigenous democratic movements. Using the strength gained from economic windfalls in extractive industries, certain governments are on the offensive to stymie reform movements that are seeking peaceful reform and

respect for a broad range of human rights (in some cases including economic, cultural, and social rights).

“As of 2007, about half of the world’s nations had received UN assistance in holding and monitoring elections.”

While the late 20th century saw an unprecedented expansion in democracy, there have been many setbacks. These include the emergence of populist demagogues, the re-emergence of authoritarianism in some states of the former Soviet Union, and the election or increasing strength of radical Islamist groups in some Arab countries. While the reasons are varied, democracy—as a system and concept—has sometimes been blamed for not delivering increased living standards or for not

adequately providing the necessities of life. Authoritarian leaders—whether in Eurasia, the Middle East, or Latin America—have used these perceived failings to push their own brand of one-party or one-man rule. To be successful, democracy cannot be just a set of concepts or processes; it must produce improvements in people's lives.

Growing recognition of the interconnectedness between economic prosperity and democracy has produced over the last decade an ever-increasing trend among nations, intergovernmental and nongovernmental organizations, and international financial institutions to support democracy and human rights activities. U.S. nonprofit NGOs engaged in assisting democratic activists around the world have been most successful when they have joined with others to share democratic skills. As a practical matter, peoples making the transition to democracy require diverse experiences. Those of democrats from other nations—from new and established democracies alike—are often more relevant than our own.

Cooperative approaches also convey a deeper truth to nations attempting a transition to democracy: they are not ceding something to the United States; they are joining a community of nations that have traversed the same course. They can show that while autocracies are inherently isolated and fearful of the outside world, democracies can count on natural allies and an active support structure because other nations are concerned and are watching.

In the past decade, a number of countries and intergovernmental organizations have established new democracy support initiatives. Within the UN system, the efforts of the UNDP and the UN Democracy Fund, noted earlier, have provided international support for new or flagging democracies. The UN Electoral Assistance Bureau and other bodies have similar mandates to support emerging democracies with electoral advice, assistance, monitoring, and implementation. The Organization of American States (OAS) adopted the Inter-American Democratic Charter in 2001 and conducts initiatives through its Office for the Promotion of Democracy and other mechanisms. The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe's (OSCE) Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights is active throughout Europe and Eurasia. The African Union put forth a Draft Charter on Democracy, Elections, and Governance in 2006. The Commonwealth conducts active democracy assistance programs. New intergovernmental institutions, such as the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, have come into existence.

Governments, political parties, and associations of parliamentarians have also provided assistance through, for example, the major international associations of political parties: the German political party institutes; the Netherlands Institute for Multiparty Democracy; the United Kingdom's Westminster Foundation for Democracy; and governmental initiatives by Australia, Canada, South Korea, India, South Africa, and Taiwan. The Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, European Parliament, the Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly, the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, the Southern African Development Community/Parliamentary Forum, and the Inter-Parliamentary Union have all taken democracy assistance as part of their mandates. These efforts are complemented by initiatives of development aid agencies of the United Kingdom, Canada, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands, Australia, and other countries. The European Union has provided democracy support through the European Commission and has included democracy as criteria in its assistance agreements.

“Cooperative approaches convey a deeper truth to nations attempting a transition to democracy... they are joining a community of nations that have traversed the same course.”

Recommendations for the Next Administration

Underpinned by centuries of American history and political culture, democracy building has been a bipartisan constant in U.S. foreign policy for the last 30 years. Scores of nations have become democratic during that period, and have advanced economically and achieved political stability. Meanwhile the United States has benefited from an increased number of democratically governed nations, bolstering economic ties and common global interests and goals. Reactions against democracy building are coming from the diminishing number of authoritarian states, and successful American efforts to help advance democracy with sensitivity and patience are now being joined by both multilateral organizations and the ever-increasing number of democracies. For both our national interests and our ideals, the United States should remain engaged in this important effort.

Promoting democracy should be a central pillar in the conduct of U.S. foreign policy. The next President can and should rejuvenate this core concept by implementing the following recommendations in his first 100 days in office:

- **Re-energizing U.S. alliances among democratically minded nations inside and outside of the United Nations, including within the UN's regional groupings;** announcing the intent to conduct democracy promotion as much as possible by working with allies and through international organizations to give such efforts greater legitimacy and an international face. In this regard, announce continued support and funding to the United Nations Democracy Fund and the United Nations Development Programme.
- **Committing diplomatic resources to fixing the UN's new Human Rights Council** and/or expanding U.S. financial and political commitments to the UN's Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights and its field-based operations.
- **Ensuring continued financial support for and high-level participation in regional organizations, such as the OAS and the OSCE,** which are proponents of democratic principles and of which the U.S. is a member. The U.S. should also support the democratic promotion efforts of other regional intergovernmental bodies, such as the African Union.
- **Enshrining democracy promotion as one of the key pillars of U.S. foreign policy in the National Security Doctrine,** as was done in the Clinton and Bush Administrations.
- **Continuing or expanding funding for democracy support programs** by the National Endowment for Democracy, the Department of State's Bureau for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor, the Department of State's Middle East Partnership Initiative, and the U.S. Agency for International Development.
- **Maintaining support for and funding to the Millennium Challenge Corporation and the Community of Democracies.**

- Supporting congressionally-initiated funding for democracy support programs in Iraq.
- Ensuring that the value of democracy promotion efforts is understood by American diplomats through extensive programs by the Foreign Service Institute and other mechanisms. USAID should establish, fund, and staff a Bureau for Democracy, headed by an Assistant Administrator.



NDI conflict mitigation program in Yemen.

About the Authors

Lorne W. Craner

President, International Republican Institute

Lorne Craner returned to the International Republican Institute (IRI) as President in August, 2004, following his unanimous selection by IRI's Board of Directors. He has led the strengthening of IRI's programs in countries such as China, Colombia, Pakistan, Russia, and Turkey. Since 2004, IRI has broadened its work in areas such as governance, women's participation, access for the disabled, and the use of technology in democracy promotion. IRI has also built an unprecedented level of cooperation with U.S. and foreign democracy building organizations.

Previously, Craner was Assistant Secretary for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor for Secretary of State Colin Powell. Upon his departure from the State Department, Secretary Powell presented Craner with the Distinguished Service Award, the department's highest honor.

From 1995 to 2001, Craner, as IRI's President, led the Institute to new levels of programmatic achievement, fundraising, financial accountability, and news coverage. He joined IRI as Vice President for programs in 1993. From 1992 – 93 he served at the National Security Council as Director of Asian Affairs, and from 1989 – 92 was Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs. Craner was Senator John McCain's legislative assistant (LA) for foreign policy from 1986-89; he began his career as then-Congressman Jim Kolbe's foreign policy LA.

Craner received his master's degree in National Security Studies from Georgetown University and his bachelor's degree from Reed College in Portland, Oregon.

Kenneth Wollack

President, National Democratic Institute

Kenneth Wollack is president of NDI. He has been actively involved in foreign affairs, journalism, and politics since 1972. Wollack joined NDI in 1986 as executive vice president. The Institute's board of directors, then chaired by former Vice President Walter Mondale, elected him president in March 1993.

Now chaired by former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, the Institute maintains offices in more than 60 countries and works to support democratic elections, political parties, parliaments, civic engagement, and women's political empowerment.

Before joining NDI, Wollack co-edited the Middle East Policy Survey, a Washington-based newsletter. He also wrote regularly on foreign affairs for the Los Angeles Times. From 1973 to 1980, he served as legislative director of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC).

Wollack has been active in American politics, serving on the national staff of the McGovern presidential campaign in 1972. He graduated from Earlham College in Richmond, Indiana, and was a senior fellow at UCLA's School for Public Affairs.

He has served on various Task Forces sponsored by the Brookings Institute, the U.S. Institute for Peace, the council on Foreign Relations, and the Center for Global Engagement. Wollack currently is a member of the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid and is the chairman of the board of directors for the U.S. Committee for the United Nations Development Programme.



Top photo: A candidate debate in Cambodia, 2007.

Bottom photo: Civic group volunteers in Nicaragua receive polling station results during the Quick Count of the 2006 presidential election.

Better World Campaign
1800 Massachusetts Avenue, NW 4th Floor
Washington, DC 20036
Phone: (202) 462-4900
www.betterworldcampaign.org

International Republican Institute
1225 Eye Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: (202) 408-9450
www.iri.org

National Democratic Institute
2030 M Street, NW, Fifth Floor
Washington, DC 20036
Phone: (202) 728-5500
www.ndi.org

This publication was designed and printed by the Better World Campaign.

All photos in this publication were collected from field programs managed by NDI and IRI.



This piece is printed on recycled paper with soy ink.

This paper contains 50% recycled content including 25% PCW.