

From Ernesto Zedillo (ed.), *Reforming the United Nations for Peace and Security*
(New Haven: Yale Center for the Study of Globalization, March 2005), pp. 19-38.

Promoting Democracy through International Organizations*

Robert Axelrod
University of Michigan

SUMMARY

The promotion of representative democracy is vital for three of the most important challenges of the 21st Century: securing human rights, preventing international and civil wars, and fighting terrorism. Unfortunately, the United Nations has had only limited success in promoting democracy. There are two reasons: some national governments fear that their own legitimacy could be undermined if democracy were to become a universal norm, and the United States has politicized the promotion of democracy by linking it to controversial aspects of its foreign policy such as the intervention in Iraq. Fortunately, there already exists an international organization that has great potential to further democracy, namely the Community of Democracies.

To realize its potential, the Community of Democracies itself needs reform. It needs an elected Council to replace the self-appointed group of ten nations that has provided leadership so far; it needs to obtain the institutional resources to be an active promoter of democracy; and it needs to restrict its membership to countries that adhere to democratic practices. The Convening Group of the Community of Democracies should help the Community to meet its full potential by supporting an elected Council of the Community, the institutionalization of the organization, and high standards for membership. Non-governmental organizations and individual democracies should lobby for reform of the Community of Democracies, and should support the Community's Democratic Caucus at the UN.

The UN Secretary-General should continue to "lead from the front" in promoting democratic reform. He should (1) articulate his vision of the UN's role in promoting democracy, (2) explain how the recognized human right to participate in "genuine elections" requires a multi-party representative democracy, (3) explain that the "responsibility to protect" includes protection against anarchy and brutal tyranny, as well as against starvation and genocide, and (4) address a meeting of the Community of Democracies and a meeting of the Democratic Caucus at the UN to show support for these organizations.

* This is a revised form of a paper prepared for a Workshop on the Report of the UN High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges, and Change, Yale University, February 11-12, 2005. The author thanks the workshop participants, as well as Nicole Bibbins Sedaca, Morton Halperin, and Richard C. Rowson for their many helpful suggestions. Naturally, the author bears sole responsibility for this paper.

THE GLOBAL STAKE IN DEMOCRATIC REFORM

The promotion of representative democracy is vital for three of the most important challenges of the 21st Century: securing human rights, preventing international and civil wars, and fighting terrorism.

Speaking at the founding meeting of the Community of Democracies in 2000, Secretary-General Kofi Annan articulated the value of democracy for human rights and for peace:

The principle of democracy is now universally recognized. The right of all people to take part in the government of their country through free and regular elections, enshrined in Article 21 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, is not peculiar to any culture....

Certainly, the record shows that democratically governed states rarely if ever make war on one another. But even more important, in this era of intra-state wars, is the fact that democratic governance—by protecting minorities, encouraging political pluralism, and upholding the rule of law—can channel internal dissent peacefully, and thus help avert civil wars...

Thus democracy offers us a double promise—as an agent of peace as well as liberation.¹

More recently, the absence of democracy is recognized as a facilitator of terrorism, for example by aiding terrorist recruitment. For this reason, the UN High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges, and Change recommended that:

The United Nations, with the Secretary-General taking a leading role, should promote a comprehensive strategy against terrorism, including... promoting social and political rights, the rule of law and democratic reform... (Recommendation 38).²

The UN has had substantial success in ending colonialism, eliminating apartheid, and undertaking peacekeeping. But it has not been as effective in promoting democracy. Why not?

THE GLOBAL POLITICS OF DEMOCRATIC REFORM

A. *The political limits on a UN role*

As we have seen, the Secretary-General is able to invoke the Universal Declaration of Human Rights for its affirmation of certain democratic rights.³ Unfortunately the Universal Declaration is not self-enforcing.

¹ The Appendix to this paper provides links to all of the documents mentioned in this report, including this speech by the Secretary-General and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to which he refers.

² *A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility. Report of the High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges, and Change.* New York: United Nations, A/59/565, 2 December 2004. Online at <http://www.un.org/secureworld/report2.pdf>

In practice, the United Nations has had only limited success in promoting democracy. There are two reasons why. First, some national governments fear that their own legitimacy could be undermined if democracy were to become a universal norm. Second, most governments want to sustain what is left of the norm against non-intervention. The political reality at the UN is that with few exceptions, such as humanitarian crises in failed states, the UN has undertaken operations on the ground only with the permission of the government in question.

Since the United Nations is an organization of governments, the implications for promoting democracy are clear. Activities to strengthen a democratic government are acceptable at the UN, but activities that aim to establish a democracy where none currently exists are not. Thus “democratic reform” is acceptable because it implies that there is already a democracy in place to reform. Apparently, this is what allowed the High-level Panel to attain a consensus in favor of “democratic reform.” Even then, the Panel recommended democratic reform only in the context of a comprehensive strategy against terrorism.

The current Secretary-General, Kofi Annan, and his predecessor, Boutros Boutros-Ghali, have both been avid supporters of democracy. In their speeches and reports they have often advocated UN support for representative democracy. Indeed, their advocacy has gone considerably beyond anything to be found in resolutions passed by the General Assembly or the Security Council.

B. The international politics of democracy

In his Second Inaugural Address on January 20, 2005, President Bush declared that “the policy of the United States [is] to seek and support the growth of democratic movements and institutions in every nation and culture, with the ultimate goal of ending tyranny in our world.” The interpretation of the *Wall Street Journal* was that, “The entire speech was about Iraq, as a way of explaining to Americans why the sacrifice our troops are making there is justified.”

Many others had differences with the foreign policy implications of President Bush’s policy. For example, Kenya’s *Nation* said,

The differences are over what he understands by “freedom” and how the benefits of democracy should be spread in the world—or indeed whether it is any country’s business to export democracy to others...It is possible to have the freer world that Bush speaks of, but the idea that those who are strong and have a larger arsenal have an unchallenged right to impose their will on the weak, undermines democracy.

³ Article 21 of the Declaration of Human Rights states, “(1) Everyone has the right to take part in the government of his country, directly or through freely chosen representatives. (2) Everyone has the right of equal access to public service in his country. (3) 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 and shall be held by secret vote or by equivalent free voting procedures.”

China's interpretation was more blunt: "Judging from Bush's inaugural theme in 2005, being morally conceited and militarily aggressive are two major elements of American nationalism."⁴

Clearly this was not the first time the promotion of democracy was invoked as a principle for policy. Throughout the entire Cold War, the US and its allies fought communism in the name of "The Free World." Nevertheless, they worked with some established tyrannies such as Franco's Spain. The US even supported coups against democratic governments, such as the coup in Chile by Pinochet. It is little wonder, therefore, that appeals to support freedom and democracy in other countries are often viewed *not* as a matter of principle but rather as a cloak that can be worn or shed in the pursuit of national interest.

Since the invasion of Iraq in 2003, the pursuit of democracy abroad has become deeply entangled with many other issues, from Palestine to globalization, and from torture to terrorism. The effect has been to make it harder than ever to achieve an international consensus to foster democracy where it does not currently exist.

The international politics of restraint at the UN has not prevented many non-governmental organizations and private foundations from playing an effective role in helping to establish democracies as well as strengthening existing democracies.

Some international organizations have also promoted democracy:

- The European Union has been very effective in promoting democracy among countries seeking membership in the Union. Membership in the European Union is so valuable that countries from Estonia to Turkey have undertaken major political and economic reforms to meet the Union's entry requirements. Among these requirements are the institutional and legal foundations for a functioning and secure democracy.
- Among regional organizations, the Organization of American States (OAS) has taken the lead by asserting an obligation to promote representative democracy. Its Charter states that "the people of the Americas have a right to democracy and their governments have an obligation to promote and defend it." Following its mandate, the OAS was effective in helping to restore democracy in Peru, but it was unable to reverse the government's own withdrawal of democratic rights in Venezuela.⁵
- The Community of Democracies is an international organization of more than 100 countries dedicated to the promotion of democracy. Unfortunately, it deserves its reputation as "the best kept secret in multilateral diplomacy."⁶

⁴ These three responses to the speech are quoted in Jim Bencivenga, "World Media: Bush Inaugural a Jolt," *Christian Science Monitor*, January 21, 2005.

⁵ For a comprehensive review of democracy clauses in regional organizations and other multilateral agreements, see Theodore J. Piccone, "International Mechanisms for Protecting Democracy," The Democracy Coalition Project, 2004.

⁶ Mark Palmer in (London) *Sunday Times*, January 4, 2004. See ccd21.org/news/ditching_dictators.htm

THE BEST KEPT SECRET: THE COMMUNITY OF DEMOCRACIES

Despite its present obscurity, the Community of Democracies (CD) has the potential to become a major contributor to the promotion and protection of democracy around the world. To see what needs to be done for the CD to realize its potential, one must understand its history and operations. In particular, one must understand why the CD initially included countries that are not at all democratic, why it has no executive or fixed location, and why it is governed by a self-appointed unchanging group of ten countries.

A. *The Helsinki analogy*

The Community of Democracies was founded at the initiative of US Secretary of State Madeleine Albright and Poland's Foreign Minister Bronislaw Geremek. The US and Poland recruited five other countries, and these seven recruited three more to form a ten-nation steering committee known as the Convening Group.⁷ The Convening Group, in turn, drafted a statement of Democratic Principles and Practices that become the Warsaw Declaration. These principles and practices include the basic elements of a democracy, such as elections open to multiple parties, independent judiciary, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom of the press, and equal protection of the law. The founders hoped that the Warsaw Declaration of 2000 might do for democracy around the world what the Helsinki Accords of 1975 had done for human rights in Europe. Following this analogy, the Convening Group invited not only established democracies, but many countries that were on the path to democracy.

At the founding Ministerial Meeting, more than 100 countries signed the Warsaw Declaration, declaring their intent to pursue the detailed list of democratic principles and practices enumerated in the document.⁸ Secretary-General Kofi Annan addressed the closing session, endorsing the new coalition and declaring democracy to be a universal value.

B. *The Community of Democracies today*

Unfortunately, in the five years since its founding, the Community of Democracies has yet to become a major contributor to the promotion of democracy. After the First Ministerial Meeting, the same ten countries announced that they would determine which countries to invite to the second meeting, and that their decisions would “not [be] based on participation in the Warsaw meeting but rather on a state's *adherence* to main requisites (emphasis added).” The Convening Group also declared that, “In subsequent years the CG will review each participant's, observer's, and non-participant's compliance with requisites to determine participation.”

The Second Ministerial Meeting, held in Seoul in 2002, was something of a disappointment. US Secretary of State Powell had been expected, but shortly before the meeting a critical UN vote on Iraq prevented him from attending. Following this announcement, many other

⁷ The Convening Group is Chile, the Czech Republic, India, Mali, Mexico, Poland, Portugal, South Africa, South Korea, and the United States.

⁸ There are now a total of 110 signatories, representing 60 percent of the world's population.

foreign ministers dropped out as well. The attendance of less senior delegations at Seoul than at Warsaw gave the appearance that the Community of Democracies was losing steam. The conference itself did reach agreement on the Seoul Plan of Action, which provided a list of the essential elements of representative democracy⁹, and a range of measures that the CD could take to promote democracy.

Unfortunately, the Seoul Conference and its Plan of Action received virtually no media coverage in the United States and little elsewhere around the world—which is what led to the comment about the Community of Democracies being the best kept secret in multilateral diplomacy.

REALIZING THE POTENTIAL OF THE CD

A. *How the CD can promote democracy*

The Seoul Plan of Action suggests a variety of measures the Community of Democracies could undertake, preferably within the framework of regional or international organizations. These potential measures include:

- regional democracy-monitoring mechanisms;
- monitoring systems for democratic crisis so that early assistance can be provided;
- creating a cadre of experts to assist countries facing a threat to their democracy;
- long-term technical support or monitors to strengthen democratic institutions, election processes, and reform efforts;
- on-site analysis to provide recommendations to uphold democratic principles and rights;
- good offices to assist governments and other political actors, civil society, and public institutions to produce an accord committing to prescribed remedial measures;
- public information campaigns regarding democracy, civil rights, and civic responsibilities;
- encouragement of the media to play a role in public education and in spreading democratic values;
- promotion of the rule of law, for example by seeking to ensure open and transparent budgetary procedures that provide for oversight by an independent legislature;
- mechanisms to promote transparency in political parties' financing;

⁹ The Seoul Plan of Action defines the essential elements of representative democracy as:

- respect for human rights;
- civil, political, economic, social and cultural including freedom of expression,
- freedom of the press, and freedom of religion and conscience;
- access to and free exercise of power in accordance with the rule of law;
- the holding of periodic free and fair elections based on secret balloting and universal suffrage monitored by independent election authorities;
- freedom of association, including the right to form independent political parties;
- separation of powers, especially an independent judiciary; and
- constitutional subordination of all state institutions, including the military, to the legally-constituted civilian authority.

- convening countries when needed to coordinate diplomatic or other efforts or political mediation;
- supporting actions through rapid consideration mechanisms by regional and international organizations; and
- enhancing existing regional and international instruments and democracy clauses, for example by strengthening positive economic incentives, and by preventing not only ruptures in, but also the deterioration of, democracy.

While each of these potential activities is worthy in itself, perhaps the greatest impact the Community of Democracies can have is through certifying which countries are democracies and which are not. Although the Community will never have the attraction of the European Union for prospective members, a great many regimes are eager to be accepted as democratic by their peers and potential foreign investors.¹⁰

After the founding meeting, the Convening Group started evaluating the status of individual countries. In 2002, they downgraded 13 countries that had signed the Warsaw Declaration, namely Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Egypt, Georgia, Haiti, Kenya, Kuwait, Madagascar, Qatar, Tunisia, Ukraine, and Yemen. For the Santiago meeting of April 28-30, 2005, the Convening Group will, no doubt, welcome Ukraine and possibly a few others back into the Community. It may also decide that several more signatories of the Warsaw Declaration are not, in fact, adhering to the main requisites of democracy.

The important point is that the ability of the Community of Democracies to fulfill its potential depends a great deal on who can speak in its name.¹¹ Understandably, the harder it is for a country to become certified and to stay certified, the greater the value of the certification. The more the Community itself is an accurate reflection of democracy, the greater will be its ability to carry out its mission. For example, an activity or policy statement would carry much more weight with the US public, and therefore with the US government, if undertaken by a Community that was not diluted with governments whose democratic status was questionable.

In addition to activities to promote democracy, and the certification of democracies, the CD can serve as a venue for democratic governments to coordinate their pursuit of common interests. In fact, the Community would be a good place to seek consensus on when and by what means a democratic government or organization is justified in supporting opposition movements in other countries.

B. Necessary reforms in the CD

¹⁰ Even the Chinese regime, which has no intention of giving up one-party control, has made great efforts to promote the rule of law, largely to satisfy the needs of foreign investors.

¹¹ The UN Human Rights Commission provides an extreme example of credibility being destroyed by its own members. It has gotten to the point where the major violators of human rights successfully seek membership on the Commission precisely in order to avoid criticism of their record.

The Community of Democracies needs three reforms if it is to realize its full potential:

An elected council to replace the convening group. The Convening Group has served the Community well since its founding in 2000. Inevitably, however, the legitimacy of the CD itself will require fixing the anomaly of an organization for the promotion of democracy being led by a self-appointed and self-perpetuated group of ten countries. The Convening Group needs to be succeeded by an elected Council.¹² The election process for such a Council could take many forms. I refer the reader to my memo on the relative merits of several of these electoral mechanisms.¹³ In any case, the method to elect a Council for the CD should be acceptable as a legitimate process consistent with democratic principles, should prevent domination by either a few large countries or by many very small countries, and should not privilege any specific countries.

Institutionalization. The Community of Democracies, as presently constituted, is primarily a series of ministerial meetings that takes place once every two or three years.¹⁴ To realize its potential the Community needs to be reconstituted as a permanent organization. In particular, it needs a Secretary-General, a staff, a headquarters, and the resources necessary to undertake the kind of activities suggested in the Seoul Plan of Action.¹⁵

High standards for membership. As mentioned earlier, the Convening Group has already downgraded 13 governments that it decided were not adhering to democratic requirements, even though these countries had signed the Warsaw Declaration. This is a good start. The Convening Group can be expected to make further progress as it evaluates countries for invitation to the April 2005 meeting. Once the Community is established as a permanent organization, the requirements for membership will need to be established, and a mechanism to add or suspend members will need to be agreed upon. The criteria published by the Convening Group for its own use could be adapted for use by its successor. The essential factor is one that cannot be written down: namely the political will to make hard judgments. The Convening Group has served well in this regard. A noteworthy example is the Convening Group's refusal to invite Egypt as a full participant to the 2002 Seoul meeting despite the public support of its government by the Group's most powerful member, the United States. The successor to the Convening Group will also need political will. In fact, its task will be even more demanding because it will need to suspend members that do not meet its standards, rather than simply refrain from inviting them to the next meeting.

¹² Perhaps a term other than "Council of the Community of Democracies" should be used, to avoid confusion with the NGO called the Council for a Community of Democracies (emphasis added).

¹³ See the last item in the Appendix.

¹⁴ The Convening Group itself has taken a leadership role for several important initiatives. Among these are support for the launching of the Democratic Caucus at the UN, and a Democracy Transition Center. It has also sponsored two conferences on Democratic Education, and a visit to East Timor. The NGO Council for a Community of Democracies has provided valuable support to the Community.

¹⁵ Secretary-General Annan has already "noted with interest" similar proposals for institutionalizing the fifteen-year old International Conference on New and Restored Democracies. He finds that without institutionalization the "follow-up action has not been as effective as it should be and it needs substantive and logistical strengthening." (A/58/392, p. 15).

RECOMMENDATIONS

A. *Recommendations for the UN Secretary-General*

The Secretary-General should:

1. Continue to “lead from the front” in promoting representative democracy. Among the themes he can draw upon are:
 - (a) the universal value of democracy, and the emerging global consensus in its favor;
 - (b) the long-established role of the UN in promoting democracy as a fundamental human right, as a partner of economic and social development, and as a means of reducing international conflict;¹⁶
 - (c) the mutual dependence of democracy and many other important goals, including women’s rights, the end of racism, clean government, state capacity, and the rule of law;
 - (d) the recent priority given to good governance and democratic reform by the UN, the World Bank, and the IMF;
 - (e) the “responsibility to protect,” which should be seen as extending beyond humanitarian relief to include protection from anarchy (absence of the rule of law), and brutal tyranny (absence of even the most rudimentary human rights);¹⁷
 - (f) the right to “genuine elections” in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which should now be understood to require multi-party representative democracy (except perhaps in micro-states);
 - (g) the need to distinguish appropriate from inappropriate measures to support democracy and democratization.
2. Advocate that the mission of the proposed UN Peacebuilding Commission include the promotion of democracy. (See Recommendations 82-85 of the High-level Panel.)

¹⁶ If democracy is also advocated as part of the fight against terrorism, one must stress that this is only a longer-run consideration. In the short and medium run, democratization may actually cause instability.

¹⁷ When Boutros-Ghali was Secretary-General, he argued for the even broader justification for dealing with non-democracies. He argued that authoritarian governments tend to reject transparency and accountability, and “[t]he resulting atmosphere of oppression and tension, felt in neighboring countries, can heighten the fear of war.” Therefore, the UN could act on the basis of one of its first purposes, as stated in the Charter, namely “to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace.” See paragraph 19 of his “Agenda for Democratization,” at the URL given in the Appendix to this paper.

3. Address the Third Ministerial Meeting of the Community of Democracies, to be held in Santiago, April 28-30, 2005. The Community of Democracies is an ideal setting for the Secretary-General to articulate his vision of the UN's role in promoting democracy.
4. Address the Democratic Caucus in New York in conjunction with the start of the 60th Session of the UN in September 2005. A precedent for addressing a caucus is the Secretary-General's speech to the Group of 77 on September 25, 2003.

B. Recommendations for the Convening Group of the Community of Democracies

The ten-nation Convening Group is responsible for the invitations and agenda of the Third Ministerial Meeting of the Community of Democracies, to be held in Santiago, April 28-30, 2005. To prepare for the Ministerial Meeting, the Convening group will meet March 1 in Santiago, and April 1 in Washington, DC.

The Convening Group should:

1. Invite only those countries that adhere to the requirements of the Community's policy enunciated in September 27, 2002. Among these requirements are freedom of speech, the rule of law, an independent judiciary, and multipartidarism—which is the freedom to form democratic political parties that can participate in elections. The Convening Group should recognize that the credibility of the Community of Democracies depends upon the inclusion of only those countries whose governments embody the principles of democracies. In deciding which countries to invite to Community meetings, the Convening Group should give due regard to the country assessments provided by the Democratic Coalition and Freedom House.¹⁸ In 2005, the most fraught decision will be the one about Russia. Quite properly, Russia was a full participant at Seoul in 2002. A detailed assessment of developments in Russia since then has led the Democratic Coalition and Freedom House to recommend against inviting Russia to Santiago in this year.
2. Invite the Secretary-General to address the Third Ministerial Meeting of the Community of Democracies in Santiago in April 2005. The presence of the Secretary-General would increase the visibility and legitimacy of the Community of Democracies. In addition, his participation would encourage members to send high-level delegations, which would further increase the visibility and legitimacy of the Community.

¹⁸ Working jointly, the Coalition Project and Freedom House recommended in their December 2004 report downgrading to Observer status Bahrain, Jordan, Moldova, and Morocco; and not inviting Russia and Nepal. They also recommended upgrading Georgia, Kenya, Madagascar, and Ukraine to full participation.

3. Propose the ways and means by which the Community of Democracies can reach its full potential:
 - (a) Replace the Convening Group itself with an elected Council. The election process could be an adaptation of the regional quota system used to elect non-permanent members of the UN Security Council. Alternatively, the Convening Group could propose a more transparent method that explicitly takes account of the vast differences in size of the members. (My own proposal in this regard is available at the last site listed in the Appendix to this paper.)
 - (b) Institutionalize the Community of Democracies with a Secretary-General, a staff, a headquarters, and the resources necessary to carry out missions such as those described in the Seoul Plan of Action. (See section IV A above.)
4. Until other procedures are in place, provide leadership for the Democratic Caucus at the United Nations so that the Caucus can be an effective coordinating and lobbying group on behalf of democracies.
5. Consider the recommendations of the 2003 report by Madeleine Albright and Bronislaw Geremek including, for example, a treaty to establish serious unconstitutional interruptions of the democratic process as crimes under international law.

C. Recommendations for non-governmental organizations

1. The Democratic Coalition and other non-governmental organizations involved in the promotion of democracy should help to develop concrete proposals for transforming the Community of Democracies from a series of ministerial meetings into a permanent organization with the credibility and capacity to fulfill its mission.
2. Private foundations whose mission includes the furtherance of democracy and human rights should help the Community of Democracies achieve the financial independence and headquarters building needed for its future activities.
3. The Club of Madrid should use its International Summit on Democracy, Terrorism, and Security on March 8-11, 2005 to articulate when the promotion of democracy by outside governments and organizations is a proper means to secure human rights, reduce the likelihood of international and domestic conflict, and eliminate a facilitating factor in terrorism.

4. Freedom House, the Heritage Foundation, and other organizations involved in assessing the status of specific countries should take care to assure the continued impartiality and accuracy of their indicators. Since important consequences follow from changes in these indicators, the organizations that develop them need to be insulated from political pressures. The stakes include the billions of dollars of aid from the US Millennium Challenge Account to be dispersed under eligibility requirements that take into account the Civil Liberties and Political Rights indicators of Freedom House, the Trade Policy indicator of the Heritage Foundation, and measures of Voice and Accountability and the Rule of Law by the World Bank Institute.

D. Recommendations for individual governments as well as NGOs

Individual governments as well as NGOs should:

1. Support the Democratic Caucus so that it can become a major vehicle for coordinating the activities of its members within the UN.
2. Encourage regional organizations such as the African Union, which already take the promotion of democracy as one of their goals, to be more active in this regard.
3. Lobby the Convening Group to take the lead in transforming the Community of Democracies from a series of ministerial meetings into an effective organization capable of actively promoting democracy, with an elected council, a standing executive, and a headquarters. Among the democracies *not* in the Convening Group who might insist on at least being eligible to play a leadership role are Japan, UK, Germany, Argentina, and Turkey.
4. Help the Community of Democracies attain the financial and other resources that it needs to realize its full potential.

Appendix: Online Resources

Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948)

un.org/Overview/rights.html.

Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali, "Agenda for Democratization," a comprehensive (and apparently controversial) statement that is not available on any UN web site (1996)

library.yale.edu/un/un3d3.htm

Secretary-General Kofi Annan's Speech to the Community of Democracies (2000)

un.org/News/Press/docs/2000/sgsm7467.htm

Warsaw Declaration and Signatories (2000)

state.gov/g/drl/rls/26811.htm

Convening Group's Criteria for Invitation to the Meetings of the Community of Democracies (CD) (2002)

demcoalition.org/pdf/CD_participation_criteria.pdf

Seoul Plan of Action for the Community of Democracies (2002)

bucharest-cd-ngoforum.ro/Seoul_Plan_of_Action.doc

M. Albright and B. Geremek, "Threats to Democracy: Prevention and Response" (2003)

cfr.org/pdf/Threats_Dem_TF.pdf

T. Piccone, "International Mechanisms for Protecting Democracy" (2004)

demcoalition.org/pdf/Protecting_Democracy_Piccone.pdf

Democracy Coalition Project and Freedom House country-by-country assessment of which countries should be invited to the April 2005 CD meeting in Santiago (2004)

freedomhouse.org/media/pressrel/011005.htm

International Conference on New and Restored Democracies

<http://www.icnrd5-mongolia.mn/>

Report of the UN High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges, and Change (2004)

un.org/secureworld/

President George W. Bush's Second Inaugural Address (2005)

whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/01/20050120-1.html

Preparations for Third Ministerial Meeting of the Community of Democracies to be held in Santiago, April 28-30, 2005

ccd21.org/santiago.htm

Democratic Caucus at the UN

ccd21.org/Initiatives/undc.htm

NGO Council for the Community of Democracies

ccd21.org/

Proposal for an Elected Council for the Community of Democracies (2005)

umich.edu/~axe/research/Community_of_Democracies_proposal.pdf