



# Democracy Update

News and Views from the Democracy Coalition Project

Volume 2, Issue 1

June 2003

## Table of Contents

Community of Democracies Update	1
DCP Joins Forces with Club of Madrid	1
DCP Goals for Santiago	2
Geneva Report	3
Brussels Update	4
Latin America Update	5
UNCHR Analysis	6
Upcoming Events	10
Crisis in Burma	11
Staff Notes	12

## DEMOCRACY COALITION PROJECT, CLUB OF MADRID JOIN FORCES

The Democracy Coalition Project and the Club of Madrid agreed in May to work together as partners on a range of democracy promotion activities. The Club of Madrid, an association of former heads of state and government mainly from developing democracies, was organized in 2002 to support initiatives whose goal is to strengthen and consolidate democracy around the world. The President of the Club, **former Brazilian President Fernando Henrique Cardoso**, leads an executive committee that includes such leaders as Kim Campbell (former Prime Minister of Canada), Anibal Cavaco Silva (former Prime Minister of Portugal), Ernesto Zedillo (former President of Mexico), Lee Hong-Koo (former Prime Minister of the Republic of Korea) and Hanna Suchocka (former Prime Minister of Poland). Former U.S. President, Bill Clinton, serves as Honorary Co-Chairman. The association grew out of the landmark Conference on Democratic Transition and Consolidation held in Madrid in October 2001 at which current and former heads of state and government and

*continued on page 2*

## COMMUNITY OF DEMOCRACIES: FROM SEOUL TO SANTIAGO

Planning has begun for the third Community of Democracies Ministerial Meeting scheduled for early 2005 in Santiago de Chile. The Government of Chile, which became Chair of the Community of Democracies Convening Group in March, has initiated a series of consultations with other governments, civil society networks and international institutions focused on implementation of the Seoul Plan of Action. Chilean Deputy Foreign Minister Carlos Portales told DCP that Chile expects to hold meetings of the Convening Group senior officials on a quarterly basis for 2003, with the next session to be held in Santiago in mid-June. In addition, the Community of Democracies is sponsoring a meeting of senior officials and experts from 14 countries in Africa and the Americas to exchange information on the role of the Organization of American States and the African Union in responding to threats to democracy and other challenges to democratic governance. Other activities under discussion include a European regional meeting of governments to discuss implementation of the Seoul Plan of Action as well as an Asian forum for dialogue between governments and civil society on democratic transitions.

Building from the experience of the Seoul Non-Governmental Forum, discussions are also underway among civil society groups regarding plans for influencing the Santiago CD Ministerial. (For a summary of the Non-Governmental Forum proceedings, please see DCP's *Democracy Update* newsletter #1, dated December 2002, available at [www.demcoalition.org](http://www.demcoalition.org).) A committee representing Chilean civil society is being organized under the auspices of **Participa**, a Chilean nongovernmental organization with experience in managing civil society participation processes relating to the Summit of the Americas and the Free Trade Area of the Americas. The Chilean committee and other interested groups have asked to meet regularly with the Convening Group senior officials to exchange information and ideas for themes and priorities for the Santiago Ministerial. ✕

academic experts exchanged views on principles and practices of democratic governance.

Diego Hidalgo, President of the Spanish think tank Foundation for International Relations and Exterior Dialogue (FRIDE), which hosted the Madrid Conference; Antonio Alvarez-Couceiro, Secretary General of the Club of Madrid; and Timothy Phillips, Advisor to the Club of Madrid, met with Morton Halperin and Ted Piccone of the Democracy Coalition Project in May to discuss an action plan for the new strategic partnership. Cooperation will cover such activities as preparation for the next General Assembly of the Club of Madrid in November, which will address the impact of IMF policies on democratic governance, and dissemination of the results; participation in the Community of Democracies preparatory process leading to the next CD Ministerial meeting in Santiago in 2005; dissemination of research and policy papers on democracy-related topics (like the International Task Force Report on Threats to Democracy, which was released at the Seoul Community of Democracies meeting), and development of joint projects. ✦

### **DCP BRIEFS GOVERNMENTS AND CIVIL SOCIETY PARTNERS ON GOALS FOR SANTIAGO CD MINISTERIAL**

As part of its mission to critically examine the Community of Democracies process and influence its development, the Democracy Coalition Project has begun consulting with government officials, academics and advocates on its proposals for concrete outcomes for the Santiago Ministerial meeting. These ideas reflect many of the issues raised by participants at the Warsaw and Seoul meetings (both governmental and nongovernmental), including the "Appeal to Governments" petition DCP circulated in Seoul. DCP's objective is to make the Community of Democracies an effective and credible mechanism for improving the international community's role in protecting and consolidating democracies. *We welcome comments from interested parties and will continue to refine these proposals as we approach the Santiago ministerial.*

DCP's proposals for the Santiago Ministerial cover five main themes:

Threats to Democracy. Building on the recommendations of the Independent Task Force on Threats to Democracy sponsored by the Council on Foreign Relations, governments gathered in Santiago should adopt **a global democracy clause** setting forth steps governments would take in the event of disruptions to the democratic order

or serious erosion of democratic norms and practices. The global trend toward establishment of such democracy clauses began in Santiago in June 1991, when the Organization of American States adopted Resolution 1080, which mandates a collective response to sudden or irregular interruptions of the democratic process. The adoption of a global democracy clause would help deter interruptions of democracy by putting authoritarian forces on notice that they cannot subvert popular will without risking isolation from the international community. Such a

---

***Empirical evidence now makes clear that democratic countries tend to perform better over time than authoritarian ones on a wide array of socio-economic indicators.***

---

clause would spell out measures the Community could take in the event that democratic governance is judged at risk. It could, for example, lend support to efforts by regional organizations that have democracy clauses and choose to invoke them. Where such mechanisms do not exist, the CD Convening Group could take the lead in building regional and global support for democratic restoration. It could, for example, reach out to an ad hoc committee of international experts, like the Club of Madrid, which could be asked to play a role in facilitating peaceful resolutions to political crises.

Democracy and Development. Empirical evidence now makes clear that democratic countries tend to perform better over time than authoritarian ones on a wide array of socio-economic indicators. Yet the international donor community has failed to invest development assistance adequately in developing countries on the democratic path. To adjust this imbalance, donor governments should grant **preferential benefits to newer democracies**, such as bilateral development assistance, trade privileges, and debt relief. Donors acting through the International Financial and Trade Institutions should likewise be encouraged to reorient multilateral assistance policies to reward democratizing governments and to avoid actions that would undermine democratic consolidation. The Club of Madrid plans to address this theme and make recommendations to governments at its next General Assembly in November.

International Standards for Elections and Political Party Financing. Through international treaties and agreements, the standard of "free and fair" elections has been accepted by all democratic governments as the best expression of the will of

the people to govern themselves. Yet the international community has not yet endorsed a set of international standards that would interpret what is meant by the term "free and fair" elections. Of special importance is the role of **financing of political parties** and campaigns and what impact different systems of political party financing can have on the fairness of an election process. The Community of Democracies should convene an intergovernmental dialogue on the subject, with a view to drafting and adopting **an international electoral code of conduct**.

Invitation Process. Determining which governments participate in the Community of Democracies remains an important tool for encouraging democratic reforms, particularly if members' progress is recognized through material and other benefits. The introduction of an observer status category, the downgrading of several governments and the welcome offered to new democracies for the Seoul conference constituted a significant step forward. But what has been lacking is systematic consultation with indigenous civil society organizations and individuals, and transparency of the Convening Group's decision-making. A strategy for putting this principle into practice should be developed before Santiago. A more prominent role for civil society also has the advantage of rendering the invitation process more transparent and hence more legitimate in the eyes of non-governmental actors.

Democracy Caucus. Another issue which would support these proposed strategic priorities is the establishment of informal democracy groupings at the United Nations and in regional organizations. Greater solidarity among both established and newer democracies within these institutions will help ensure that democracy-related goals are a priority in international affairs. It will also help avoid situations such as Libya being elected to chair the UN Human Rights Commission, which compromises that body's effectiveness and legitimacy. A meeting of such a democracy group should be held at this fall's UN General Assembly to consider ways to support democracy-related initiatives. ✖

---

***We will collaborate on democracy-related issues in existing international and regional institutions, forming coalitions and caucuses to support resolutions and other international activities aimed at the promotion of democratic governance.***

*Warsaw Declaration, June 2000*

---

## **Democracy Caucus Urged in Geneva**

During the 59<sup>th</sup> Session of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights (UNCHR), the Democracy Coalition Project (DCP), Freedom House and the Transnational Radical Party organized a conference titled "Enhancing Democratic Cooperation at the UN: Building Common Purpose among the UN's Democracies." It took place in the *Palais des Nations* in Geneva on April 9<sup>th</sup>, and featured the following speakers: Ambassador Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, head of the US delegation to the UNCHR; Hon. Marco Pannella, Member of the European Parliament and founder of the Transnational Radical Party; Adrian Karatnycky, counselor and senior scholar with Freedom House; and Claudia Caldeirinha, Regional Director for Europe of the Democracy Coalition Project. The event attracted around 100 people, both from the governmental and the non-governmental spheres, including Ambassadors and Heads of Diplomatic Missions of several countries (Poland, Italy, Romania), leading NGOs from all over the world, academics and opinion-makers.

In her address, DCP's Caldeirinha stressed that at the UN level, the past decade has witnessed an increased commitment toward promoting democracy around the world. Governments have also recognized that the fundamental objectives of the UN's work cannot be achieved in today's world without addressing the issue of strengthening democracy. To that end, the CD governments have strongly stated their support for the creation of an effective democracy group at the UN to promote a democratic agenda. The Warsaw Declaration itself states: "We will collaborate on democracy-related issues in existing international and regional institutions, forming coalitions and caucuses to support resolutions and other international activities aimed at the promotion of democratic governance." Moreover, in Seoul, government ministers charged the Convening Group with "encouraging the formation of coalitions and caucuses to support democracy."

Raising the need to put this idea into practice within the UN system, DCP argued that groups concerned with democracy and human rights should dedicate themselves to championing an agenda that reflects the shared values and policy commitments of their democratic members. There is every reason for democratic countries to collaborate to promote their common interests to, as stated in the Warsaw Declaration, "create an external environment conducive to democratic development." At a minimum, democracies at the UN should challenge authoritarian governments' efforts to undermine and obstruct progress on

democratic reform efforts developed by UN agencies and bodies.

Caldeirinha argued that the development of an effective Community of Democracies and the promotion of greater cooperation among democracies at the UN are fundamental to strengthening the UN and to advancing the cause of democracy and human rights nationally, regionally and globally. Through the work developed by the UN and by the Community of Democracies process, a set of international democratic norms is in place, and a mechanism for pushing governments in the right direction is being established. However, to translate these ambitious goals into reality, governments should: limit membership in the Community of Democracies to governments making demonstrable progress toward respecting the norms of the Warsaw Declaration and of the UN covenants; channel additional resources and benefits to help these societies to stay on the democratic track; and promote accountability, internal democracy and transparency in the member governments and within the different institutions (UN, CD, etc).

Caldeirinha concluded by arguing that increasing real participation in the CD and investing in cooperation among democracies inside the UN is one powerful way of promoting global democracy - in a multilateral and inclusive way-, freedom, human development and security, bearing in mind and learning from the lessons of history. ✖



Panelists discuss merits of greater cooperation among democracies at the UN Human Rights Commission in Geneva. From left to right: US Amb. Jeane Kirkpatrick, Adrian Karatnycky (Freedom House) European Parliamentarian Marco Pannella (Italy) and Claudia Caldeirinha (Democracy Coalition Project).

## Update from Brussels

Over the past year, due partially to the efforts of DCP and its partners in Europe, the key players in European politics have become more receptive to playing a bigger role in the Community of Democracies process. This evolution can be observed at different levels:

*The European Commission* has gradually evolved from a level of "no interest" to a more positive view. The continuing contact DCP has had with the Commission has been crucial in initiating a process that hopefully will lead to erasing this institution's doubts about the CD process. With these obstacles diminished, some progress has recently been observed: the EC services in charge of Human Rights and Democracy indicated they have interest in developing an internal evaluation on the importance of the CD process for Europe and on the advantages of greater engagement of EU institutions and member-states in the process. Moreover, EC staff has indicated they are presently considering integrating the CD as an important topic on its agenda (e.g., including it as a main topic of the Human Rights Forum organized by the Commission and the EU Presidency).

At the level of the *European Parliament*, DCP has gradually created a network of interested Members of Parliament (MEPs) who have been discussing the CD process internally and participating in CD-related events. High profile MEPs, like Emma Bonino and Pacheco Pereira (Vice-President of the EP) have frequently cooperated with DCP in CD-related activities, and are at the core of a process that DCP believes will lead to a broader EP interest and engagement.

DCP has regularly consulted the *Permanent Missions of EU Member-States* and other relevant third states (Chile, Czech Republic, etc) in Brussels. This has included involving them in a broader discussion on the importance of the CD process and in strengthening the democracy agenda DCP would like to push from now until the CD Ministerial meeting in Santiago scheduled for early 2005. Furthermore, DCP has made important contacts with senior Italian diplomats who have expressed their interest in promoting CD-related issues in Europe, including the possibility of giving democracy issues a higher profile in the EU agenda. This is particularly significant because Italy will be taking over the EU Presidency in July 2003.

On the non-EU front, DCP has been cooperating with some key non-governmental actors (NGOs, political party foundations in Germany, Netherlands, and United Kingdom, etc), both in Brussels and in some of the most relevant European capitals, in order to develop a regional debate on the democratic agenda for Santiago. ✖

## Latin America Update

**PERU:** The Coalition for Democracy in Peru, made up of the Peruvian Press Council, Transparencia, National Human Rights NGO Coordinator and Peru 2021 (a business organization), was launched in 2002 as a movement dedicated to creating a permanent space of dialogue between civil society and the main political forces in the country. The Coalition promotes the participation of civil society in decision-making processes, principally through its efforts to monitor implementation of the National Accord.

The National Accord was signed July 22, 2002 by President Alejandro Toledo, representatives of all the political parties in the Congress and the most representative sectors of civil society (labor unions, business associations, NGOs, university rectors, religious leaders, etc.). It contains 29 state policies in four main categories: democracy and rule of law; equity and social justice; national competitiveness; and a transparent, decentralized and efficient state.

After months of uncertainty and delay in organizing a forum to follow up the Accord's objectives, the Coalition decided to publish a monthly bulletin, which first appeared in February 2003. The bulletin, which has received extensive media coverage, rates progress on implementation of the Accord with green, yellow and red traffic lights. The reports cover such issues as access to information, human rights, education, and poverty. Other experts have contributed monitoring reports on gender, youth, armed forces, citizen security, employment, health and decentralization.

Transparencia reports that the monthly bulletins have had a dramatic impact in reenergizing the National Accord process and encouraging the government and other political leaders to respond to the monthly critiques, particularly the red light issues. For more information, see [www.transparencia.org.pe](http://www.transparencia.org.pe), or contact Emmy Decker.

**CHILE:** The Coalition for Democracy in Chile, made up of 16 civil society organizations, came together in May under the banner of Mas Voces por el Fortalecimiento de la Democracia to launch publicly a work plan to influence national and international debates on issues critical to democracy in Chile. A working group made of six organizations (Participa, Asociacion Chilena de Organismos No Gubernamentales (ACCION), Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO), Instituto Libertad, Fundacion Nacional para la Superacion de la Pobreza, and Ideas) has reached agreement on a detailed strategy and has begun a public outreach campaign through the media, public service ads and the internet.

The Coalition will focus its work on three areas: a research project to demonstrate the contribution civil society organizations make to Chilean society; a process of dialogue between civil society and political parties; and civil society monitoring and participation in Chilean foreign policy initiatives relating to democracy. For more information, see [www.masvoces.cl](http://www.masvoces.cl), or contact Andrea Sanhueza at Participa. ✦



**por el fortalecimiento de la democracia**



At the launch of the Coalition for Democracy in Peru, panelists present plans for expanding dialogue between civil society and political parties. From L to R: Pepi Patron of Transparencia; former President Valentin Paniagua; Enrique Zileri (Peruvian Press Council); and Francisco Soberon (Human Rights NGO Coordinating Group).

## **VOTING IN GENEVA UNDERSCORES NEED FOR DEMOCRACY GROUP AT UN India and South Africa Block Democracy Resolutions**

On the most important resolutions concerning democracy at this spring's session of the UN Commission on Human Rights (UNCHR), non-democratic governments demonstrated much greater solidarity as a voting bloc than governments belonging to the Community of Democracies (CD). According to a new Democracy Coalition Project analysis of the voting patterns of six democracy-related resolutions presented at the 59<sup>th</sup> Session of the UNCHR, delegations from non-democratic countries successfully blocked resolutions on Zimbabwe and Sudan, but narrowly failed to derail resolutions on Belarus, Turkmenistan, and Cuba.

On the other hand, despite their pledge at the first Community of Democracies ministerial meeting in Warsaw to work together "to support resolutions aimed at the promotion of democratic governance," members of the Community of Democracies sitting on the Commission were inconsistent in their support for pro-democracy resolutions. Governments like South Africa and India, which belong to the CD steering committee, were outright hostile to such resolutions, seriously calling into question their credibility as leaders of an initiative intended to strengthen cooperation among the world's democracies.

As further detailed in the accompanying chart, DCP collected data on the voting records of all 53 members of the UNCHR for six resolutions which called for greater respect for democratic principles and human rights. The resolutions on Zimbabwe, Belarus, Sudan, and Turkmenistan called on these governments to further the democratization process through various mechanisms like creating an environment where free and fair elections can be held, establishing independent judiciaries, and protecting journalists and civil society groups from harassment.

One of the least controversial resolutions, vis-à-vis democracy, to pass at the Geneva session was a Romanian-sponsored resolution on the interdependence between democracy and human rights. The resolution specifically endorses mechanisms that further UN consideration of how to promote democracy and calls for greater coordination among UN agencies working on democracy promotion. Some delegations, including Cuba, fought to block any language that would strengthen the measure, even in modest ways.

Venezuela was the only CD member government that did not vote for the watered-down resolution.

For the first time, the UNCHR endorsed a resolution that calls on the government of **Turkmenistan** to "ensure full respect for all human rights and fundamental freedoms, in particular the freedoms of expression, religion, association and assembly, the right to fair trial by an independent and impartial tribunal established by law and the protection of the rights of persons belonging to ethnic and religious minorities." Brazil, Bahrain, India, Russia, Senegal, South Africa, Thailand and Venezuela joined all of the non-democracies in voting no or abstaining on the resolution.

On **Cuba**, after a contentious debate over a more strongly-worded resolution offered by Costa Rica, the Commission adopted a resolution urging the Castro Government to allow an appointed representative to visit the island. The measure passed, but without the support of CD participants Argentina, Bahrain, Brazil, India, Russia, Senegal, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Venezuela. Cuba promptly rejected the resolution, a move which did not stop it from being elected to another term on the Commission.

On the resolution regarding **Belarus**, which called for releasing journalists and ceasing harassment of NGOs, three CD member governments – India, Russia and South Africa – joined such countries as China, Libya, Sudan, Viet Nam and Zimbabwe in voting against the resolution.

Unity among the non-democratic members of the Commission against the two other resolutions studied by DCP (Sudan and Zimbabwe) was decisive in blocking their passage. But they could not have succeeded without the collusion of a number of democratic states. India and South Africa, two members of the CD Convening Group charged by other governments with fostering a democracy caucus at the UN, were the worst offenders by far. South Africa voted against four of the country resolutions studied by DCP and abstained on the fifth resolution (Turkmenistan). India, on the other hand, voted against all five country resolutions. Venezuela, Thailand and Bahrain did not perform much better, opting to abstain rather than vote on several key resolutions, while Russia voted against all five. Notably, Armenia, Kenya and Ukraine, countries that were not invited as full members to the second Community of Democracies meeting in Seoul, had better voting patterns than India and South Africa.

✘

**SCORECARD: HOW COMMUNITY OF DEMOCRACIES MEMBERS VOTED ON DEMOCRACY RESOLUTIONS AT THE UN HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION, April 2003**

Country	Interdependence Dem/Hum Rts	Belarus	Cuba	Sudan	Turkmenistan	Zimbabwe*
Argentina	Yes	Abst	Abst	Yes	Yes	No
Australia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Austria	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Bahrain	Yes	Abst	No	No	No	Yes
Belgium	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Brazil	Yes	Yes	Abst	Yes	Abst	Abst
Canada	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
<b>Chile</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Costa Rica	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Croatia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
France	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Germany	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Guatemala	Yes	Abst	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
<b>India</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Ireland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Japan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
<b>Mexico</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Paraguay	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Peru	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
<b>Poland</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Russian Federation	Yes	No	No	No	No	
<b>South Korea</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Senegal	Yes	Abst	Abst	No	Abst	Yes
<b>South Africa</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Abst</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Sri Lanka	Yes	Yes	Abst	No	Yes	Yes
Sweden	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Thailand	Yes	Abst	Abst	Abst	Abst	Yes
United Kingdom	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
<b>United States</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Uruguay	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Venezuela	Abst	Abst	No	Abst	Abst	Yes

\*A vote of Yes was a vote to block consideration of a resolution on Zimbabwe.

*Governments in bold italics are members of Community of Democracies Convening Group.*

**Interdependence between Democracy and Human Rights: Approved**  
**36 Yes, 0 No, 17 Abstained**

**Cuba: Resolution Adopted**  
**24 Yes, 20 No, 3 Abstained**

**Turkmenistan: Resolution Adopted**  
**23 Yes, 16 No, 14 Abstained**

**Belarus: Resolution Adopted**  
**23 Yes, 14 No, 16 Abstained**

**Zimbabwe: Motion to not consider draft Resolution Adopted**  
**28 Yes, 24 No, 1 Abstained**

**Sudan: Resolution Not Adopted**  
**24 Yes, 26 No, 3 Abstained**

**SCORECARD: HOW NON-DEMOCRACIES VOTED ON DEMOCRACY RESOLUTIONS  
AT THE UN HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION, April 2003**

Country	Interdependence Dem/Hum Rights	Belarus	Cuba	Sudan	Turkmenistan	Zimbabwe*
Algeria	Abst	Abst	No	No	Abst	Yes
Armenia	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Burkina Faso	Abst	Abst	No	No	Abst	Yes
Cameroon	Yes	Abst	Yes	No	Abst	Yes
China	Abst	No	No	No	No	Yes
Cuba	Abst	No	No	No	No	Yes
Congo	Abst	Abst	No	No	Abst	Yes
Gabon	Abst	Abst	No	No	No	Yes
Kenya	Yes	Yes	Abst	No	Abst	Yes
Libya	Abst	No	No	No	No	Yes
Malaysia	Abst	No	No	No	No	Yes
Pakistan	Abst	Abst	No	No	No	Yes
Saudi Arabia	Abst	Abst	No	No	No	Yes
Sierra Leone	Abst	Abst	Yes	No	Abst	Yes
Sudan	Abst	No	No	No	No	Yes
Swaziland	Abst	No	Abst	No	Abst	Yes
Syria	Abst	No	No	No	No	Yes
Togo	Abst	Abst	Abst	No	Abst	Yes
Uganda	Abst	Abst	Abst	Abst	Abst	Yes
Ukraine	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Viet Nam	Abst	No	No	No	No	Yes
Zimbabwe	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes

\* A vote of Yes was a vote to block consideration of a resolution on Zimbabwe.

**SUMMARY OF DEMOCRACY-RELATED RESOLUTIONS AT UNCHR**

**Interdependence between Democracy and Human Rights, Approved 36 Y, 0 N, 17 A**

*Calls upon* the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights:

(a) To pay increased attention to the work done with respect to the promotion and consolidation of democracy by the United Nations system, other regional and international intergovernmental organizations and relevant non-governmental organizations; (b) To engage in coordination efforts with the Department of Political Affairs and the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the Secretariat, the United Nations Development Programme and other relevant United Nations bodies that undertake activities aimed at promoting and consolidating democracy; (c) To use the work of special procedures of the Commission on Human Rights in order to collect and analyse data on relevant cases where protection of human rights was

served by democratic practices or where lack of democracy or setbacks in democratization processes triggered violations of human rights; (d) To invite the views of various regional, subregional and other organizations and arrangements on the role they play in promoting and consolidating democracy, and to report to the Commission on the contributions resulting there from at its sixtieth session;

*Calls upon* the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights to organize to that purpose a second expert seminar, in 2004, to examine further the interdependence between democracy and human rights, with the topic of "Democracy and the rule of law", to be funded by voluntary contributions, and to include observers from interested Governments, experts of the United Nations specialized agencies, funds and programmes, other relevant intergovernmental organizations and interested non-governmental organizations. ✦

**Turkmenistan:** Resolution Adopted: 23 Y, 16 N, 14 A

UNCHR calls upon the Government of Turkmenistan to ensure full respect for all human rights and fundamental freedoms, in particular the freedoms expression, religion, association and assembly, the right to fair trial by an independent and impartial tribunal established by law and the protection of the rights of persons belonging to ethnic and religious minorities, and to take the necessary measures to refrain from subjecting conscientious objectors to imprisonment, to remove restrictions on the activities of non-governmental organizations, particularly human rights NGOs and other civil society actors and to cooperate fully with all the mechanisms of the Commission on Human Rights, including the Special Rapporteurs on the independence of judges and lawyers, on the question of torture, on extrajudicial, summary and arbitrary executions, on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression, and on freedom of religion or belief, as well as the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention and the Special Representatives of the Secretary-General on internally displaced persons and on the situation of human rights defenders, including by issuing invitations to visit the country. ✖

**Belarus:** Resolution Adopted, 23 Y, 14 N, 16 A

In the draft resolution put forward by the European Union, UN High Commissioner on Human Rights would urge the government of Belarus, to **establish independence of the judiciary and end impunity for persons responsible for killing or injuring individuals; and to release journalists and other individuals detained for politically motivated reasons and to cease harassment of non-governmental organizations and political parties.** ✖

**Zimbabwe:** Motion to not consider draft Resolution Adopted, 28 Y, 24 N, 1 A

The draft resolution submitted by the European Union expresses concern about the continuing violations of human rights including incidents of arbitrary arrest, attempts to restrict the independence of the judiciary as well as the violations of the freedoms of expression, opinion, association and assembly in Zimbabwe. The resolution urges the Government of Zimbabwe to support independent civil society in Zimbabwe and to allow it to operate without fear of harassment or intimidation. It calls

upon the Government of Zimbabwe to comply fully with its international human rights obligations, **to create conditions that would allow for the proper exercise of democratic rights in Zimbabwe which would be a genuine all-inclusive political process that ensures the free expression of the will of the people in the country, and free and fair elections; to ensure full respect for freedom of opinion and expression, including freedom of the press in relation to all types of mass media, as well as freedom of association and assembly throughout Zimbabwe;** to remove restrictions that limit non-governmental organizations in promoting and defending human rights and to promote human rights awareness by strengthening cooperation with civil society, including all human rights organizations. ✖

---

*The General Assembly proclaims this Universal Declaration of Human Rights as a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations, to the end that every individual and every organ of society, keeping this Declaration constantly in mind, shall strive... to promote respect for these rights and freedoms and by progressive measures, national and international, to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance –*

*Universal Declaration of Human Rights*

---

**Cuba** Resolution Adopted, 24 Y, 20 N, 3 Abstained

The UN High Commissioner for Human Rights has appointed Ms. Christine Chanet as his personal representative and urges the government of Cuba to receive the personal representative of the UNHCHR and to provide all the facilities necessary for her to be able to fulfill the mandate contained in resolution 2002/18.

Resolution 2002/18 “invites the Government of Cuba, whose efforts to give effect to the social rights of the population despite an adverse international environment are to be recognized, to make efforts to achieve similar progress in respect of human, civil and political rights, in accordance with the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the principles and standards of the rule of law. It further *requests* the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to take the steps necessary to send a personal representative with a view to cooperation between her Office and the Government of Cuba in the implementation of the present resolution and *urges* the Government of Cuba to take all the necessary measures so that such a visit may take place as soon as possible. ✖

**Sudan:** Resolution Not Adopted, 24 Y, 26 N, 3 A

The draft resolution, submitted by the European Union would endorse the UNHCHR's call to the government of Sudan **To lift the state of emergency and to undertake further efforts to promote an environment conducive to democratization, and to ensure the rule of law**

**and respect for human rights by bringing legislation more into line with the Constitution and into conformity with international human rights instruments.** While this language is somewhat weaker than those of the other countries, much of the resolution focused on maintaining peace in the region and preventing blatant human rights abuses. ✦

## Upcoming Events:



### **International Civil Society Forum On Democracy, Good Governance And Civil Society**

Date: September 7-10, 2003

Place: Ulaanbataar, Mongolia

Objective: Promote a forum for discussion among activists, academics and other civil society actors to identify mechanisms for the promotion of democracy, good governance and to strengthen civil society. Provides a strategic mechanism for organizations to influence democratic reforms.



### **Fifth International Conference of New or Restored Democracies**

Date: September 10-12, 2003

Place: Ulaanbataar, Mongolia

Organizers: Government of Mongolia, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

Objective: Share experiences on democratization, development of civil society and identify means by which to promote good governance in developing countries.

### **Community of Democracies Convening Group meetings**

June 17: Santiago, Chile

September: Washington, DC

December: Santiago, Chile

The purpose of these meetings is to do follow-up work on the Seoul Plan of Action and planning

for the Third Community of Democracies Ministerial Meeting in Santiago, Chile in 2005.



### **World Movement of Democracy's Third Assembly: "Building Democracy for Peace, Development, and Human Rights,"**

Date: February 1-4, 2004

Place: Durban, South Africa.

Objective: To bring together hundreds of democrats to share practical ideas and experiences in democracy promotion and to develop collaborative strategies to advance democracy in their countries and regions. Any questions or comments should be directed to [world@ned.org](mailto:world@ned.org).



*Seoul Non-Governmental Forum participants present report to Seoul Ministerial Conference. The planning for the 2005 CD Conference is well underway with meetings planned throughout 2003 and 2004*

## Crisis in Burma: Appeal to Convening Group Members Urging Action

*On June 13, 2003 the following letter was sent to senior officials of the 10 convening group countries (Chile, Czech Republic, India, Mali, Mexico, Poland, Portugal, South Korea, South Africa, USA) condemning the recent attacks on Aung San Suu Kyi and other democracy activists in Burma and urging them to issue a statement calling for her immediate release:*

Dear Ambassador Portales,

In light of recent events in Burma, we urge the Convening Group of the Community of Democracies to adopt a statement at its meeting on June 17 calling for the immediate release of Daw Aung San Suu Kyi. The Convening Group appropriately called attention to the democratic crisis in Burma by inviting Daw Aung San Suu Kyi to address both the Warsaw and Seoul meetings. Now it should add its collective voice to the growing chorus of governments calling for her immediate release and the release of other members of the National League for Democracy (NLD) who have been detained since the violent government crackdown on May 30.

A Nobel Peace laureate, Daw Aung San Suu Kyi is the leader of a party which won elections in 1990, but was prohibited from taking office by a military junta that has repeatedly prevented her and her supporters from exercising their right to participate freely in the political process. At the Ministerial Conferences of the Community of Democracies in Warsaw and Seoul, Daw Aung San Suu Kyi implored the Community of Democracies to play a more active role in promoting democracy in Burma:

*So for the sake of peace in our country, for the sake of the progress and human development of our people, and for the sake of peace and harmony in our region and in our world, we would like to urge the peoples of the free world to work harder towards bringing true democratic progress everywhere. We would like to see action, rather than words. (Warsaw: June 26, 2000)*

In Seoul, the Community of Democracies professed its commitment to protecting against and responding to threats to democracy, specifically calling for “improving diplomatic engagement and dialogue with countries where respect for human rights, fundamental freedoms and universally-accepted principles of democracy are in question, in order to highlight international concerns and promote democratic change.”

The crisis in Burma demands an unequivocal response from the international democratic community. We request that the matter be given serious consideration at the next meeting of the Convening Group on June 17 in Santiago. In particular, we urge the Convening Group to adopt a statement condemning the May 30 attack by the Burmese junta and calling for the immediate release of Daw Aung San Suu Kyi and NLD supporters arrested in the crackdown. We also request that the Convening Group circulate its statement to all governments belonging to the Community of Democracies, and urge them to issue similar statements in support of efforts to restore the democratically-elected leaders in Burma.

Sincerely,

Genaro Arriagada  
Chile

George Soros  
Chairman, Open Society Institute

Sonia Picado  
Costa Rica

Emma Bonino  
Member, European Parliament

Bronislaw Geremek  
Poland

Michelle Rocard  
France

Madeleine Albright  
Chairman, National Democratic Institute

Frene Ginwala  
Speaker of the National Assembly, South Africa

### **On June 17<sup>th</sup> the Convening Group issued the following statement regarding Burma and the release of Aung San Suu Kyi:**

The Convening Group of the Community of Democracies expresses its deep concern for the unjustified arrest of Mrs. Aung San Suu Kyi, democratic leader of Burma and Nobel Peace Prize Winner. This repressive and anti-democratic action has led to an international condemnation. We demand her immediate release and that of other Burmese democratic political leaders. All of them have been unfairly detained.

Likewise, we reiterate the previous appeal to the military authorities of Burma to promptly re-establish a transparent process to return to democracy and respect for fundamental human rights.

## Staff Notes

Following a period of reorganization, the Democracy Coalition Project has refocused its strategy on promoting a policy research and advocacy agenda relating to monitoring and influencing the Community of Democracies. The policy agenda will cover such areas as improving international responses to democratic crises, encouraging the donor community to reward democratic progress, supporting creation of a democracy caucus at the United Nations, and making the Community of Democracies more transparent, active and credible. This activity will include policy briefings, coordination with nongovernmental networks working on democracy issues, and advocacy aimed at influencing governments leading the intergovernmental process, which will culminate in a ministerial meeting in Santiago, Chile in early 2005. During this two-year phase, the Democracy Coalition Project will be working as strategic partners with the Club of Madrid, a new association of former heads of state and government mainly from developing democracies. DCP is supported by the Open Society Institute and the Fundacion para las Relaciones Internacionales y el Dialogo Exterior (FRIDE). Ted Piccone serves as Director of the Project; Claudia Caldeirinha serves as DCP's representative in Brussels. Martha Larson is Program Assistant. Siham Nurhusein is DCP's Research Fellow.

**DCP bids a very fond farewell** and best wishes to our extended democracy family: Robert Herman (Senior Associate, Management Systems International); Alexander Lomaia (Executive Director, Open Society Georgia Foundation); Marcelo Varela-Erasheva (Consultant, World Bank); Kwaku Nuamah (Johns Hopkins University); Mary Gardner Coppola (State Department); and Claudia Vinay (United Nations).

One of the *“the most comprehensive research and evaluation tools available”* on democracy, according to Foreign Policy Magazine



**DEMOCRACY  
COALITION  
PROJECT**

## Defending Democracy: A Global Survey of Foreign Policy Trends 1992-2002

COUNTRY	Trend	Defending Democracy Score	Response to Overthrow of Democratically Elected Governments	Promotion of International Democracy
CHILE	↔	Good	Good	Good
CZECH REPUBLIC	↔	Good	Good	Good
INDIA	↔	Fair	Good	Good
MALI	↔	Fair	Fair	Good
MEXICO	↑	Fair	Fair	Fair
POLAND	↔	Good	Good	Very Good
PORTUGAL	↔	Good	Fair	Very Good
SOUTH AFRICA	↔	Fair	Good	Good
SOUTH KOREA	↔	Good	Good	Good
UNITED STATES	↓	Good	Fair	Good

As seen in the chart above, the ten Convening Group members of the Community of Democracies had a mixed record on democracy promotion over the last ten years. See the full chart and analysis of how forty governments were rated in the Democracy Coalition Project's survey of democracy promotion and foreign policy trends. For more information visit our website at [www.demcoalition.org](http://www.demcoalition.org) or request a copy by contacting us at 202-721-5630 or [info@demcoalition.org](mailto:info@demcoalition.org)