

1 THE RATIONALE FOR DEMOCRATIC SOLIDARITY

When the Community of Democracies was convened for the first time in Warsaw in 2000, it was to find ways “to work together and strengthen democracy” in the spirit of solidarity with peoples aspiring to basic human rights everywhere.

For the first time in 300 years, as Professor Robert Legvold observed, there was no strategic rivalry among the world’s leading powers. The Community of Democracies member states made it clear that while they welcomed and actively encouraged further peaceful progress toward democratic governance in the world, the organization had no ambition to be a bloc defined by or formed in antagonism to non-democratic states. Democracies did not seek, in creating a like-minded “community,” to erect new walls between states.

Democracies see their vocation for the strengthening of democracy everywhere as flowing from the “venerable practice of international solidarity,” so well described in 1989 by Václav Havel in a letter he wrote to the PEN International Congress in Montreal, which he was not permitted by Czechoslovak authorities to attend in person: “In today’s world, more and more people are aware of the indivisibility of human fate on this planet, that the problems of anyone of us, or whatever country we come from — be it the smallest and most forgotten — are the problems of us all; that our freedom is indivisible as well, and that we all believe in the same basic values, while sharing common fears about the threats that are hanging over humanity today.”

Globalization has since strengthened the context for democratic indivisibility by multiplying awareness through greater ease of communication, even within formerly closed or remote societies.

Democracy is not an end in itself. As a form of governance relying on the consent of the governed, it is a means of fulfilling individual lives and pursuing common purposes. No single model of inclusive democracy has pride of place. Nonetheless, its most essential positive components are straightforward: elected, accountable government; the positive adjacency of a pluralist civil society; transparent and equitably applied rule of law; independent media; protection of human rights and freedom of speech, assembly and worship; and equal participation by all in selecting inclusive political representation.

A DIPLOMAT'S HANDBOOK FOR DEMOCRACY DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT

While each country experiences, in its own way, the passage toward the democratic form its citizens choose as most suitable, there is one cardinal point in common to all such passages: democracy cannot be imported from outside, much less imposed.

While reform movements can only emerge from within societies, democrats from outside can, in the spirit of solidarity, support aspiring democrats by defending their entitlement to non-violent defence and the pursuit of human rights, long-judged to be universal. Democratic governments and civil society can, and should, help to prepare those aspiring to democracy and their efforts to consolidate inclusive democracy once their passage begins.

How such support has been extended, or not, as the case may be, by democracies and democrats, in government and in civil society, is the substance of this *Handbook*.

THE LIVES OF OTHERS: THE COUNTER-RATIONALE

As Cambridge scholar John Dunn has observed, while democracy has come to “dominate the world’s imagination,” it has also aroused fear and suspicion in some quarters. In recent years, rivalry has deepened between authoritarian governments and democracies, though not in any existential sense of military confrontation.

A counter-community of non-democratic states has, to some extent, emerged as an informal coalition, termed by some “the authoritarian internationale.”¹ Modernization specialist Seymour Martin Lipset pointed out the “irresistible charm of authoritarian growth,” persuading coalition members to go so far as to claim that pseudo-liberal authoritarianism delivers superior performance to its societies than that of what they characterize as increasingly illiberal democracies. The Russian Federation presents a revisionist doctrine of “managed democracy” which democratic critics prefer to describe as “imitation democracy.”

The Chinese model presents itself as a systemic alternative to liberal democracy, able to mobilize economic growth and distribute prosperity without the gridlocks of political competition. Deng Xioping had vaunted “modernization with Chinese characteristics.”

The late Chinese physicist and dissident Fang Lizhi famously asked his university students if they believed in physics with Chinese characteristics.

Fang recalled five scientific axioms that inevitably lead to democracy:

- Science begins with doubt, not Mao-ordained fixed beliefs.
- Science stresses independence of judgment, not conformity.
- Science is egalitarian — no one’s subjective “truth” starts ahead of any other.
- Science needs a free flow of information.

¹ The term itself was coined by the late Belarusian analyst Vitali Silitski, in a publication of the German Marshall Fund.

CHAPTER 1 — THE RATIONALE FOR DEMOCRATIC SOLIDARITY

- Scientific truths are like human rights principles — they are universal and do not change when they cross a border. (cited in Link, 2012)

In a *Foreign Affairs* essay in response to the perception that the “euphoria” of the great third wave of democratization has “crested and may be receding,” Daniel Deudney and G. John Ikenberry (2009) called for a new “liberal internationalism,” which could strengthen the sense of community among democracies, moderate great power rivalry and strengthen resistance to resurgent nationalist, populist and xenophobic movements.

Surveys show the record is mixed. There have been over 60 democratic revolutions since 1974. The number of countries judged to be “free” today approaches 100. But in 2012, overall, for the seventh year in a row, Freedom House recorded more democratic declines than gains. While Egypt, Libya, Côte d’Ivoire, Burma/Myanmar and Senegal moved toward the democratic column, more regimes — notably in the Middle East — showed evidence of illiberal backlash: Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Oman and, of course, Syria, which was plunged into a cruel civil war.

It is especially noteworthy that mixtures of democratic progress and recession are present on every continent, reinforcing the reality that democracy is not a “Western” phenomenon.

As Chilean novelist Isabel Allende (2006) declared, “Latin America has opted for democracy.” At the same time, in some countries in the hemisphere, still-shallow democratic roots are struggling against militant and divisive populism. In Africa, there will be 23 competitive national elections in 2013, but the continent is also home to the world’s largest number of corrupt dictatorships. The Middle East is a cauldron of emerging democratic aspiration pressing against authoritarian regimes that are reluctant to concede their monopoly on power. Asia, too, is a mixture of notable progress, such as in Burma/Myanmar and the abject repression of North Korea. The experience of North Americans and Europeans is also mixed: even if their democracies are established, their own democratic and pluralistic practices are being critically scrutinized by citizens reeling from recent economic challenges.

The mixed record shows that no region or culture is exempt from democracy and, moreover, democracy is a garden that needs constant tending. To cite Allende (2006) again, democracies are “like husbands. There is always room for improvement.” At the onset of democratic transitions, institutional fragility and initial efforts at consolidation are almost inevitably ragged and contradictory. But the process is never-ending: Poland’s Foreign Minister Radosław Sikorski spoke at the Lisbon 2009 Ministerial of the Community of Democracies of the continuing need of a democracy “to re-design itself consensually, without violence.”

While it is hardly plausible that humans anywhere would prefer governments that ignore the principle of consent of the governed in favour of coercion, authoritarian repression can keep the lid on for a time. Public fear of violence and disorder is the authoritarian’s friend. Often, as in Syria, repressive regimes claim they are defending against repressive takeover by an ethnic or sectarian majority on behalf of fearful minorities.

But repressive government will fail in the longer run: as Gandhi observed, “Even the most powerful cannot rule without the cooperation of the ruled” — an axiom truer now than ever, when democratic norms are much more widely apparent because of migration patterns and the information revolution.

THE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS AND NON-VIOLENT CHANGE

Democratic Transition

Democracy theorist Thomas Carothers (1999) has famously described democratic transition as consisting of two “chapters.” Chapter one is the preparation and completion of a revolution to throw off a dictator or repressive regime; chapter two represents the transition to democracy, which commences the morning after. There is no shortage of those with direct experience who ruefully recognize the first chapter as the relatively “easy” part.

Among authoritarian regimes, there are both “hard” cases and “softer” ones. The hard cases are seldom only one-man rule. As Morgan Tsvangirai pointed out when he was opposition leader in Zimbabwe, a political culture of abuse and corruption can outlive any specific authoritarian leader, as beneficiaries seek to consolidate and perpetuate their dominance. The security apparatus and other elites that repressive leaders install to maintain order and their own power acquire vested interests against change, often becoming the real powers behind authoritarian government.

It is why “pacting” between old and incoming orders — at least in “softer” cases of transition such as Chile, Spain and to some extent Egypt — enabled a relatively peaceful transition. The pacts consisted of compromises and guarantees from both sides, preserving property rights and limiting the agenda for change, but committing the retainers of power from the old order to the democratic project.

Harder cases, however, resist pacting. Syrian President Bashar al-Assad has confided that he wouldn’t be “allowed” to pursue an exit strategy by the myriad of those whose sectarian privilege or even security and material stakes under the current regime would be at risk if “his” regime fell.

Hard cases include those where the regime’s control over the society has been developed and implanted over many years. But a critical feature would include the willingness to use deadly force against the people if dissent emerges.

Democracy activists and members of civil society struggling to create democratic conditions under undemocratic regimes face the harsh dilemma of finding the most effective methods for wresting change from unbending authoritarians. Impatient partisans of change are sometimes tempted by the option of violent, direct action. But repressive state security machinery can wield a cruel upper hand against violent insurrection, which can, in any case, alienate the majority of citizens concerned about safety.

CHAPTER 1 — THE RATIONALE FOR DEMOCRATIC SOLIDARITY

Non-violence is the greatest force at the disposal of mankind. It is the supreme law. By it alone can mankind be saved.

— Mohandas K. Gandhi

The most effective approach to authoritarian repression has been that of peaceful assembly and demonstration, including organized civil resistance, often when a specific issue or grievance fires public discontent and protest. Gandhi defined the model for non-violent civil disobedience against unjust laws in the first human rights campaigns he launched in South Africa, which he then applied in the campaign for the self-determination of India.

Non-violent civil resistance has played an important and beneficial role in democratic transition because in contrast to violent insurgency, it teaches democratic values en route to change. Non-violent movements provide autonomous space for learning decentralized and deliberative methods of policy choice and coalition building. Because non-violent movements are participatory and decentralized, they can constitute “incubators of democracy” that assist the transition to democratic governance after a repressive regime collapses. Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) constitute a factor of continuity as a country transitions from top-down control to an institutionally accountable pluralist society.

It is sometimes argued that resorting to violent means to overturn a repressive regime is faster. It usually is not. Violent repression of non-violent protest can discourage reform movements for a time, as was the case in Burma/Myanmar in 2007 or Iran in 2009. It can also lead to civil war, as happened in Libya and is now the case in Syria.

“Sniper, sniper, what do you see? Here are our necks; here are our heads” was the chant of the incredibly brave non-violent demonstrators in Dara’a in 2011. The Syrian security forces shot to kill. By the spring of 2013, 70,000 had died in the ensuing civil war. Its outcome cannot conceivably be happy for the regime. The question is whether the effects of the traumatic conflict can ever be repaired.

When Regimes Collapse: Democratic Transition’s Chapter One

When Do Democratic Revolutions Occur?

US scholar Clay Shirky (2011) has outlined a thesis that the buildup of “shared awareness” of the unacceptability of control by a non-democratic regime over peoples’ lives reaches a tipping point when “open secrets become public truths” about abusive entitlement and privilege, corruption, cronyism and systemic police abuse in the repression of rights. Glaring social inequity, the lack of opportunities for poor and professional citizens alike, and often-abrupt adverse changes, such as the rise of food prices, all fuel discontent to a point where the people feel the need to act in support of change.

A DIPLOMAT'S HANDBOOK FOR DEMOCRACY DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT

There can be flashpoints — such as a flagrantly fixed false election, the self-immolation of alienated vegetable vendor Mohammed Bouzizi in Tunisia or the Facebook dissemination of photos of Khaled Said's fatal beating at the hands of police in Egypt — but in reality, combustible resentment builds over years.

Outside democracies are usually caught by surprise. There is a long history of over-investment in dictators who promise support for wider interests, such as the Shah of Iran and the Cold War rivalry; Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak and his convenience as a working ally in the “war” against Muslim extremists and Egypt's pivotal role in Mid-East relationships regarding Israel; or the Uzbek dictator Islam Karimov and the NATO countries' need to facilitate supply to their troops in Afghanistan.

There is an inherent conservatism in diplomatic reporting when such interests are at stake. Even when the extent of regime abuse and growing public resentment are detailed in reporting, officials in capitals have often turned a blind eye in deference to national “interests” and personal relationships with despots, as the *Handbook* will illustrate.

The *Handbook* details the ways that outside democracies have helped prepare for successful transitions through capacity building, human rights defence, direct negotiation with repressive governments, international networking and, when necessary, the organization of concerted sanctions.

Pasting it Together:

The Hard Slog of Chapter Two's “Morning After”

Once launched, democracy's concrete rewards must be evident to citizens. There is a certain urgency to this task: showing that democracy works for the benefit of citizens is essential before a would-be Napoleon occupies the vacuum of public confidence.

Democracy relies on the realization of certain basic human needs and must aim for their improvement. The test of the democratic process is at the intersection of the citizens' participation in their own governance and the effectiveness of governance in confronting the practical challenges that individuals face. Freedom from extreme poverty, for example, has been termed the first of the essential freedoms. As Amartya Sen (2001) succinctly put it, “Freedom and development are inextricable.”

John Dunn records the history of democracy's triumphs as a “history of political choice.” To succeed, the choice must be a demonstrably effective one, not just for the majority reaping the spoils of electoral victory, but across society as a whole.

Elections

As noted earlier, holding elections represents only one of many starting points for democracy. In some cases, election winners are tempted to limit democracy or slide back toward outright autocracy once they are in power. “One person, one vote, one time” was a slogan skeptical of democracy in South Africa and has been used to deny office to the Muslim Brotherhood in more than one Arab country.

CHAPTER 1 — THE RATIONALE FOR DEMOCRATIC SOLIDARITY

Sadly, the slogan has described a real tendency elsewhere. Elections are abandoned or become rigged in order to preserve power, with a deeply corrosive effect on public morale that can endure for many years. Publics whose protests led to the introduction of democratic reform can reignite when the outcomes slide back into authoritarianism, as in Kyrgyzstan, or are overturned by the military, as in Thailand.

When elections take place in thoroughly non-transparent and repressive conditions, as in Iran's presidential election in June 2009; where there is neither independent electoral commission, nor foreign observers, and where opposition representatives were pushed away from scrutinizing the transport and opening of ballot boxes and the counting of ballots, a regime pays an enormous price in international credibility. But the internal costs run even deeper. Ultimately, regimes without demonstrable, verifiable public support through a legitimate and transparent electoral process will be contested and will fall.

Unfortunately, the attention of too many democratic donor countries tends to flag once sufficiently free and fair elections have been held. There is a "legitimacy moment" when a new democracy needs immediate international support. Yet, it is only at this point that the really hard chore of transparent and accountable self-government begins. The Kenyan experience shows the importance of helping emerging democracies to do more than mimic election management techniques: human rights need to be embedded in practice and in law so that winning partisan or ethnic majorities do not suppress minority losers. Effective mechanisms for the mediation of conflicts are needed to ensure post-election stability. Office holders need to habituate themselves to the competition of those who legitimately oppose them, which runs against the grain of custom in many societies.

Inclusive Pluralism

The management of inclusive pluralism is an imperative for successful development. Ethnic, tribal, sectarian and confessional pluralisms capture much of the attention — but there are also cultural and social factors that must be addressed for democracy to succeed. In Yemen, the displacement of the Saleh regime has been followed by an organized national dialogue prior to the elaboration of a new constitution and the forthcoming presidential elections in February 2014. The exercise has brought together representatives of all the pluralities — northerners, southerners, easterners, Islamists, women, youth, political activists and stalwarts of the old regime are enmeshed in a pacting framework where concessions are expected from all involved and no one side needs to accept "defeat." Eastern tribesmen's comments to the BBC — that it is the first time they have ever been consulted on their place and future — are typical.

Opportunities for Women

Achieving both rightful opportunities for, and the end to the abuse of, women are fundamental tasks in this context, which if well managed, have vast developmental benefits. "The world is awakening to a powerful truth," Nicholas Kristof and Sheryl WuDunn have written in *The New York Times* (2009). Recalling the Chinese saying

A DIPLOMAT'S HANDBOOK FOR DEMOCRACY DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT

that “women hold up half the sky,” they stress the growing recognition on the parts of organizations as different as CARE and the US Joint Chiefs of Staff that “focusing on women and girls is the most effective way to fight global poverty and extremism.” Education, the availability of daycare, microloans for women and even such mundane but essential things as the generalized provision of sanitary pads for girls are essential areas for democracies to support.

Succession

The orderly succession of democratically elected political leadership is also a universal need. The Mo Ibrahim Prize for Achievement in African Leadership recognizes and rewards a voluntary, democratic and peaceful succession of power. While it has not been bestowed every year because of a dearth of qualified candidates, its citations illuminate considerable progress.

In announcing the winner of the prize in October 2007, Kofi Annan cited ex-President of Mozambique Joaquim Chissano’s efforts to build democracy on conciliation among ex-opponents. The following year, the prize was given to Festus Gontebanye Mogae of Botswana for “careful stewardship of the economy and management of Botswana’s mineral resources, a tough stance on corruption, and success in combatting HIV/AIDS” (Mo Ibrahim Foundation, 2013). In 2011, Pedro de Verona Rodrigues Pires was honoured for “transforming Cape Verde into an African success story, recognized for good governance, human rights, prosperity and social development” (ibid.).

Economic Conditions and Models

It is debated whether specific economic conditions and models favour democracy taking roots in a given society. Some argue that democracy works most effectively only above a certain income threshold — generally a per capita income of about US\$2,000 per year, which is the applicable level in Egypt and Indonesia — to accommodate an aspiring middle class and social network capacity. Zambian economist Dambisa Moyo is one who maintains that democratic transition first needs an established middle class to succeed. The author of *Dead Aid: Why Aid Is Not Working and How There Is a Better Way for Africa* charges that the West’s “obsession with democracy” has been harmful to countries unequipped for it. While it is true that an emerging middle class fuelled democratic reform in Mexico, Korea and Taiwan, there are also notable examples of poorer developing countries choosing and sustaining democracy, such as Botswana or Mongolia, both of which have been lifted economically. Supporting the development of the capacity for civil society to habitualize the demands of democracy to increase the absorptive capacity of the new democratic government are the essential preparatory duties of outsiders responding to the impulses of solidarity.

As to models, China’s one-party rule system, combined with pragmatic reliance on free markets and state enterprise in the economy seems at first a seductive model for some poor countries, with special appeal among autocrats who welcome China’s economic cooperation that comes without lectures on corruption and human

CHAPTER 1 — THE RATIONALE FOR DEMOCRATIC SOLIDARITY

rights. The model, however, fails to provide a context for creativity, invention and innovation.

Rule of Law

A central focus of democracy development support needs to be helping to build the capacity of transitional countries to support the rule of law at the core of free societies and market economies. But as Thomas Carothers (1999) has written, statutes and courts are not enough if the sense of law does not reside “within the heads” of citizens. Moreover, as Gary Haugen and Victor Boutros (2010) point out, in many countries laws are rarely enforced. They note that in a June 2008 report, the United Nations estimated that four billion people live outside the rule of law because “without functioning public justice systems to deliver the protections of the law to the poor, the legal reforms of the modern human rights movement rarely improve the lives of those who need them most” (ibid.).

Religion and Democracy

Building democracy and human rights are secular political issues for many, but the reconciliation of religion and democracy is a central theme of the search for change in MENA, where the Muslim Brotherhood in its various forms has effectively challenged authoritarian rule, as the case studies on Egypt and Tunisia document.

There is a long history of faith-based groups assuming active roles in democracy development support. The Roman Catholic Church played a central ethical and practical role in comforting opponents of the dictatorships in Poland, Chile and the Philippines, though it has deferred to authoritarian regimes in Argentina and Spain. The martyrdoms of Archbishop Oscar Romero in El Salvador and of the Maryknoll sisters have inspired countless Salvadorans and democrats everywhere. Buddhist monks have been at the forefront of opposition to dictatorial rule in Burma/Myanmar and in support of human rights in Tibet today. In Cuba, religious communities draw social partnership and development support from related congregations outside.

It is not surprising that the sense of values at the core of democracy support in foreign policy has also helped enlist the support of faith-based groups in promoting human rights abroad. Particularly noteworthy was the expulsion of the South African Dutch Reformed Church from the World Alliance of Reformed Churches, which deepened the sense of isolation felt by those parts of the public on whose support the apartheid regime relied.

Church groups are at the forefront of advocacy for development assistance as well, and many support faith-based NGOs such as World Vision, Caritas or Catholic Relief Services. The Sant'Egedio Foundation is an example of a faith-based group dedicated to the mediation and peaceful settlement of disputes.

Private Investment

Socially responsible outside private investment can undoubtedly support democratic transformation if an ethical corporation can transfer habits of transparency and meritocracy, and valorize the local population in the upgrades, promotions and

A DIPLOMAT'S HANDBOOK FOR DEMOCRACY DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT

responsibilities it extends to local associates. International companies are learning that it is more important to generate goodwill with the public in the long term than to curry favour with powerful individuals. But the rewards of outside investment need to be felt generally by the population as a whole. What is clear is that to sustain public confidence, governments must be able to point to positive economic achievement with public benefit from outside investors whose projects they have welcomed.

The US government vaunted “start-up diplomacy” to support employment-generating entrepreneurship, but it has been slow to engage in Egypt and, in this sense, risks making the same mistake as it did in Russia in the 1990s, by providing too little economic assistance too late. Thomas R. Nides, former deputy Secretary of State told *The New York Times* that the “US Government has done a terrible job focusing on economic issues in the Middle East. You have huge public unemployment and no hope” (cited in Rohde, 2013). US Secretary of State John Kerry has requested that Congress approve US\$580 million for an “incentive fund” for Middle Eastern countries that, in the spirit of the EU’s guideline of “more for more,” would reward democratic norms, independent courts, civil society and market-based economic initiatives.

National Defence

Even though the record of free peoples in self-defence is eloquent, it has been charged that democracy can impede the firm conduct of foreign relations or the organization of national defence, especially at a time of peril. Authoritarian regimes such as Cuba and Iran invoke threats from outside to justify the arbitrary imprisonment of democratic opponents and the general curtailing of civil liberties. In recent years, democratic societies have debated the need to constrain some measure of their established civil liberties in the interests of national security and counterterrorism. The process of narrowing freedoms is often vexed and the outcome one of unsatisfactory compromises. It is clear that transparency of purpose and full democratic debate are essential to public support.

Subject to civilian controls, military leadership in democracies can have a significant mentoring benefit for military colleagues in countries on the verge of transition to democracy, by supporting the principle of defending the people, rather than defending the entrenched regime. (For further details, see the military handbook *Military Engagement: Influencing Armed Forces Worldwide to Support Democratic Transitions*, also published in cooperation with the CCD.)

This *Handbook* cites numerous examples where the military refused orders to repress nonviolent protests — often decisively and in communication with military colleagues from democracies urging restraint. In democratic transitions, the training of competent civilian defence officials that uniformed personnel report to is another key function.

Ten Features of Successful Democratic Transition

Each democratic culture emerges from civil society in a singular way, but many of the challenges in achieving and consolidating democracy are shared, especially the always-challenging transition from a non-democratic society toward democracy.

Drawing from the *Handbook's* ongoing consultative process and workshops on how diplomats can best support democracy development, some basic, if somewhat self-evident, conclusions can be drawn about the process of democratic transition.

- What happens in a country emerges from its own citizens, not from outside. As Freedom House has put it, “The men and women of each country are really the authors of their own democratic development.” Change cannot be imported or exported.
- There is no single model or template for democratic development. Each trajectory is different, depending on traditions and states of readiness.
- Violence is rarely effective as a force for change, as repressive governments have a near-monopoly on instruments of violence and the risk of violence alienates many citizens from campaigns in favour of change. But non-violent civil disobedience has historically been an important determinant of the course of events, as well as an essential preparation for post-transition responsibilities.
- The refusal of military and security units to use deadly force against protestors — as in Moscow in 1991, Kiev in 2005 or present-day Egypt and Tunisia — can be decisive. Contrary examples, such as in Tiananmen Square in 1989, Rangoon in 2007 or Iran in 2009, can have the opposite effect — but for how long? Much depends on whether the armed forces have a system of civilian control.
- The building blocks of change are in civil society. Supporting the building of capacity capable of underpinning a successful transition to democracy is an essential preparatory contribution from outside. Civil society necessarily forms a broad tent that includes citizens organized for any peaceful civil purpose. As nineteenth-century political philosopher Alexis de Tocqueville so famously put it, “civil society makes citizens” and also places a limit on the scope and power of government itself.
- Organic and durable change is rarely elite-driven; rather, it is usually bottom-up and is often generated by functional causes and socially or culturally oriented groups with practical and non-political aims.
- Successful transition relies on civic behaviour. It is not a process to be downloaded or transferred; thus, democracy has to be learned and implemented over time. It is essential for established democracies to keep a chronological perspective and humility about comparisons. As Egyptian democracy pioneer Saad Eddin Ibrahim has said, “You gave Mubarak thirty years. Give the Egyptian people some time as well.”

A DIPLOMAT'S HANDBOOK FOR DEMOCRACY DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT

- New governments should make — preferably in partnership with civil society — a determined effort to instill democratic values through education, as well as through the power of example.
- Free and fair elections constitute only one of many starting points. Equally decisive for representative electoral democracy is the acceptance of the transfer of power after elections and the inclusion of women, youth and minorities of all kinds.
- Democracy needs a viable state able to ensure security, which predominates in the hierarchy of needs. To sustain popular acceptance, democracy must deliver beneficial outcomes, such as transparency, fairness, justice and adequately shared economic progress.

What is clear, as Fareed Zakaria (2003) has warned, is that the “long, hard slog” of democratic consolidation means that donor and partner democracies must accept “constant engagement, aid, multilateral efforts and a world not of black and white, but of grey.”

The citizens of the new democracies are the ones who will bring clarity and definition to their own society. External support should play a secondary role in helping to provide them with the greater capacity and means their development process requires; its design is to support their self-empowerment to choose their own government representatives and policy goals. As President Salvador Allende predicted for Chile, it is the people who make history. It is then up to the people to perform what Sikorski calls the “audit function” of elected government: through vibrant participatory and representative democracy, buttressed by free and responsible media. But all this requires mentoring and support.

If this general policy of outreach and support is contradicted by selective and uncritical support for non-democrats as a function of energy, economic or security interests, there are costs to credibility. As former British Foreign Secretary David Miliband (2008) said in Oxford, “We must resist the arguments on both the left and the right to retreat into a world of *realpolitik*.”

This is not to dismiss lightly either the merits of foreign policies grounded in the realities of national interests or aspirations. But the tendency to concentrate funding for democracy support in a relatively small number of countries where interests are particularly evident, such as Mexico, Ukraine, Indonesia, Georgia, Mali, Afghanistan or Iraq, should not come at the expense of other countries whose democratic transitions are at a vulnerable stage.

The Hippocratic oath’s admonition to “do no harm” also has merit in this context. There is indeed a harmful *realpolitik* history, especially during the Cold War, of democracies intervening to influence, and even to counter, democratic outcomes elsewhere. The subversion of democratically elected governments for perceived reasons of international competition — Iran comes to mind — leaves a bitter legacy that haunts some relationships for generations. When non-democracies band together, there can also be consequences once a democratic shift occurs. Fidel

CHAPTER 1 — THE RATIONALE FOR DEMOCRATIC SOLIDARITY

Castro's support of the Soviet-backed coup against the Czechoslovak government in 1968 and invasion to stifle political reform haunts Czech-Cuban relations to this day.

More recently, there have been efforts to force democracy on others, most notably the invasion of Iraq, which was justified by some using a misappropriation of the tenets of the "responsibility to protect" doctrine. Ill-prepared attempts to democratize unstable states by force without the support of the people invite ethnic and sectarian conflict. This *Handbook* favours outside democracies' arm's length commitments to the long-term development of civil rights and civil society, with an emphasis on responsive support for citizens, democracy activists or human rights defenders already engaged in peaceful efforts toward democratic empowerment.

There is, of course, something of a paradox involved. On the one hand, there is a long international history of democrats aiding each other, from the intermingling of the American and French revolutions, to the waves of change that swept over Europe in 1848 or in 1989. On the other hand, democracy is about people developing popular self-government for themselves. Diplomats from democracies need to carry on the tradition of supporting democrats and sharing practical know-how, while deferring to the truth that ultimately, democracy is a form of self-rule requiring that things be done by a domestic civil society itself.

It is in this spirit that the Community of Democracies' participating countries, on behalf of democrats everywhere, value the opportunity to respond to requests for support from reform-minded groups and individuals struggling to introduce and improve democratic governance and human rights in their own societies, and to work with governments and non-governmental groups to improve democratic governance.

Attempts to block such responsive support for international civil society are a matter of great concern, especially, as the *Handbook* will set out, the rights to help and be helped are consistent with the aims and obligations of the UN Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Declaration on Human Rights Defenders, as well as the Warsaw Declaration. These documents, as well as others committing signatories to best practices are catalogued in the Annex, available on the project website.

WORKS CITED

- Allende, Isabel (2006). "Chile Under the Gun." *The Independent*, December 12.
- Carothers, Thomas (1999). *Aiding Democracy Abroad: The Learning Curve*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Deudney, Daniel and G. John Ikenberry (2009). "The Myth of the Autocratic Revival." *Foreign Affairs*, January/February.
- Haugen, Gary and Victor Boutros (2010). "And Justice for All." *Foreign Affairs*, May/June.
- Kristof, Nicholas and Sharon WuDunn (2009). "The Women's Crusade." *The New York Times*, August 17.

A DIPLOMAT'S HANDBOOK FOR DEMOCRACY DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT

- Link, Perry (2012). "On Fang Lizhi (1936–2012)." *New York Review of Books*, May 10.
- Miliband, David (2008). "The Democratic Imperative." Aung San Suu Kyi Lecture at St. Hugh's College, Oxford.
- Mo Ibrahim Foundation (2013). "Prize Laureates." Available at: www.moibrahimfoundation.org/prize-laureates/.
- Rohde, David. (2013). "Start-Up Diplomacy." *The New York Times*, May 7.
- Sen, Amartya (2001). *Development as Freedom*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Shirky, Clay (2011). "The Political Power of Social Media." *Foreign Affairs*, January/February.
- Zakaria, Fareed (2003). "Iraq Is Not Ready for Democracy." *The Guardian*, November 12.