



10 Years of Foundations for Peace

Anniversary Conference Report,

4th November 2016

Philanthropy House,

European Foundation Centre,

Rue Royale 94, 1000 Brussels.

FFP is a Network of grass-roots funders working on social justice and peacebuilding in local communities affected by persistent conflict. The conference was an opportunity to share experiences with those committed to social justice and peacebuilding and to host conversations on the imperatives for sustainable peacebuilding work.

The convening:

- *discussed a new paradigm for development in contested or deeply divided societies*
- *explored the role of different types of community intervention in peace and conflict transformation*
- *explored new models of partnership working for community based conflict transformation in contested or deeply divided societies.*

Context:

In the past ten years, the world has changed beyond recognition. Alongside serious problems such as rising inequality and climate change, war has become the new norm, and peace and security issues dominate much of the globe. Many democracies are faltering with a rising prevalence of failed states, conflicted or deeply divided societies and stalled development.

Studies show that, despite the best efforts of many organizations, the architecture surrounding development aid does not contribute to lasting peace in conflict-affected communities. Indeed, the aid system tends to undermine the autonomy of local activism, which is essential to transforming conflicts.

Foundations for Peace, a network of 10 local foundations rooted in their country's contexts, supports community activists at local level over the long term, to open space for the growth of civil society, to develop a new narrative, and to work on conflict transformation. Its values are based on respect for all and included are diverse voices and people who are often marginalized or demonized.

Conference Opening Address: Friday 4th November 2016.



**Kamala Chandrakirana,
Chairperson: Indonesia for Humanity.**

Over the 10 years of our existence, the Foundations for Peace (FFP) has grown a culture of sharing and learning. As we look to the future, we believe that we must expand the circle of people with whom we share and learn. This is an imperative arising from a changing world. Thank you for taking time from your busy schedules to be with us today.

Almost 75 years since the Second World War, we are building armies again. In some states, this involves calls to amend the national constitution, such as is happening in Japan. We are inventing and using new and ever more sophisticated weapons – not only of mass destruction, but also for deep surveillance, applying advances in information and communication technology and big data systems. We are doing all of this for old and new agendas, related to ambitions for territorial control by certain supremacist states as well as ambitions to construct a state that transcends national borders through the appropriation of religious identity.

Every day, we witness how fear and hate have become the most potent currency of our time. Authoritarianism is back – among states as well as within religious communities. Inequality is rising, including in my part of the world, Asia, which has the world's highest rate of inequality. My own country, Indonesia, is second only to China on this front. Identity politics has become more and more institutionalized and is certainly far from disappearing for good.

The institutions developed since the Second World War to ensure that war and mass violence are not repeated are themselves in crisis. The UN Security Council is locked in a power play among its permanent members and, consequently, cannot effectively resolve current international conflicts. The UN Human Rights Council is being undermined from within by states that do not support the human rights agenda but nevertheless become members and appropriate the language of human rights for their own narrow interests and purposes.

The international aid system, which we know to have always been problematic, is now changing in fundamental ways. Its original primary focus on poverty is being replaced by a more direct inter-linkage with trade, as reflected in the emerging framework of 'aid for trade'. Even the notion of development has shifted and morphed into an unrecognizable form: it has more and more adopted a corporatist logic in which plans are neatly organized into matrices and success is defined in terms of big numbers. Corporations are viewed as the new development actor, including as the financiers of development, which is clearly

articulated in the 2015 Addis Ababa Action Agenda agreed upon by States and connected with the Sustainable Development Goals. Giant philanthropists are setting and financing their own development agendas, such as the Gates Foundation's work to provide birth control to 120 million women by the year 2020 and spending more than USD 1 billion to achieve this goal.

With the backdrop of these tectonic changes – in our institutions and in technology – and as hate, war and mass violence become the norm again, let me take you to FFP's policy publication – 'Laying the Foundations for Peace – a Policy Contribution November 2016', and a quote therein from Yanis Varoufakis, a Greek public intellectual who left academia to join party politics, became a minister and found himself negotiating with the big powers of the European economy, only to resign after a few months to go back to academia. He says, we are in "a state of intense puzzlement", that is, when our certainties fall into pieces. However, he also says that this is a very special moment in history ... one that humanizes us. It is precisely at this very special moment of history that members of the FFP insist that we are a significant part of the answer for lasting peace.

In this moment of "intense puzzlement", members of the FFP provide a unique contribution that comes from our embeddedness in divided communities, where our very presence is an offer of an alternative worldview and way of life. It comes from our choice of being enablers of small but grounded initiatives by committed individuals and groups who share common values of social justice and human rights. Indeed, we are testimony to the idea that small is beautiful. Our smallness and embeddedness allow us to be responsive to distinct contexts and to continuously sharpen our adaptive capacity based on a constant and deep analysis of our surroundings. We operate on the premise that money is not everything. In my own organization – Indonesia for Humanity – where we are dealing with a conflict that happened 50 years ago, in which more than 500,000 people were killed and tens of thousands were imprisoned without trial, we consider our work more in terms of the sharing of resources, not simply grant-making. We see resources in terms of funds but also knowledge, networks and volunteerism. We view our role in relation to a larger transformative agenda of resourcing a solidarity economy.

FFP members face at least a couple of challenges. First, we are in a state of constant fragility. This comes from the fact that our support system is thin. It is also the price we have had to pay for defending our autonomy within the prevailing international aid system that is steeped in unequal power relations. Second, as a consequence of our smallness and embeddedness, we are practically invisible. As many of our member organizations are led and operated by women, we understand what it means to carry a double burden and be invisible to the powers that be. But we also know that this situation can be overturned by collective effort. We believe that our visibility would better ensure our capacity to contribute to this very special moment in history.

So, thank you again for your presence and engagement with us today. We consider this an affirmation of our choice of path. Your participation in this meeting is also witness to the fact that we are not invisible to everyone.

On this occasion of FFP's 10 anniversary, we are thinking about our future over the next 10 years. We would like to enhance our culture of sharing and learning. We want to improve our support systems so that we can become more effective in contributing to the complex ecosystem of peacebuilding, in which social justice and human rights are integral. We know we must better articulate our distinctive voice in order to engage productively in addressing the challenges of our times.

We look forward to our exchange with you, and hope that this is just the beginning of a long and productive relationship.

Let us start with our sharing of three distinct contexts from three members of our network.

BIO: Kamala Chandrakirana is an Indonesian advocate of human rights, justice and democracy, and sees growing the resource base for activism towards social transformation as a critical agenda. In this light, she initiated the founding of Indonesia's first women's fund, *Pundi Perempuan*, in 2003, under the auspices of the Indonesian National Commission on Violence Against Women, where she was Secretary General (1998-2003) and Chairperson (2004-2009). She is currently on the Board of Directors at *Indonesia untuk Kemanusiaan* (Indonesia for Humanity), based in Jakarta, and the Urgent Action Fund for Women's Human Rights (UAF), based in Oakland, California, USA – two activist-led grantmaking organizations for the resilience of social movements.

Additionally, Kamala is a member of the United Nations Human Rights Council's Working Group on discrimination against women in law and in practice; a founding member of the Asia Pacific Women's Alliance on Peace and Security (APWAPS) and Musawah: A Global Movement for Equality and Justice in Muslim Family; and, the coordinator of Indonesia's Coalition for Truth and Justice for Past Human Rights Violations.

Presentation One:



Impact of aid on peace and conflict transformation in a deeply divided society: Lessons from Sri Lanka

Ambika Satkunanathan, Chairperson, Neelan Tiruchelvam Trust, Sri Lanka

I am here this morning to share with you the impact of aid on peace and conflict transformation in Sri Lanka, which could be described as a deeply divided society. Before I begin my substantive remarks, as this is the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the Foundations for Peace Network, I think it is only fitting I remember and pay tribute to Sithie Tiruchelvam, the founder of the Neelan Tiruchelvam Trust (NTT), who passed away 2 years ago. As well as a founder member and the first Chairperson of the Foundations for Peace Network, Sithie was a visionary because, in 1999, when she mooted the idea of establishing an indigenous foundation in Sri Lanka many, including I, didn't quite understand the specific and special role of a local foundation, given at the time there were numerous bilateral and multilateral donors as well as global foundations, that were supporting human rights and peace-building work and they were the dominant players at the time.

Therefore, it was a bit of mystery to many of us what a very small indigenous foundation, such as the NTT, with a staff of 7 persons- more than Dalia Foundation's 4 ½ persons and a bit less than Indonesia for Humanity's 8 persons- could do in such a context competing with the larger donors. We had many questions- how would 2 you mobilise financial resources? Why on earth would the larger donors wish to use the Trust as an intermediary? It just didn't make sense at the time. However, we decided to go along with Sithie and what a journey it has been. Sithie was also a believer in the need for the existence of networks such as FFP, and was a strong supporter of the network. We miss her, especially at a gathering such as this one.

My remarks today will use as a basis a number of phrases used by FFP members over the years and during our discussions yesterday. The purpose of this is to illustrate that despite the different contexts our experiences are similar- as Kamala said yesterday, each of us is at a different point in the same journey - hence our experiences echo that of others- or at some point we will most likely experience what our fellow-members have already had to struggle with. While acknowledging the positive impact of aid, the funding I refer to in my presentation is that which is disbursed without a proper understanding of the socioeconomic and political context, and most importantly without understanding or responding to the needs and concerns of the communities the funding is supposed to assist. To quote the FFP 10th anniversary publication, 'Despite some successes in reducing poverty in some places, the new aid architecture has helped to create a

global development industry that may not be fit for purpose'. It is to this aid architecture I refer in my presentation.

One point which I think is important to raise here is that aid is felt to be an integral part of enabling peace and conflict transformation- this assumption came into being because of the inability or unwillingness of the state to invest resources, particularly financial resources, to support human rights and peace-building work. For decades, in many of our countries, civil society has stepped in during crucial periods of conflict and disaster to play the role the state should have. For instance, in Sri Lanka we have time and time again seen the state invest vast resources in vanity projects that sometimes adversely affect the population, while seeking foreign aid for post-war rebuilding and reconstruction. Therefore, it is important to question the responsibility and accountability of the state as well.

The other reason we are dependent on external aid is because in many countries it is extremely difficult to raise funds from within the country. As the FFP 10th anniversary publication states 'Where foundations in divided societies struggle is their access to resources, because, by definition, there is no stable community from which they can receive donations for their work, and the work itself can often be seen as controversial, particularly where emphasis is on the inclusion of excluded groups'. In Sri Lanka, local philanthropy is virtually nonexistent; we are more familiar with the notion of charity. Yesterday, an FFP member stated that money is part of the problem- not just lack of it but also when there is too much of it. This is something we in Sri Lanka have experienced, but from which we regrettably have not learnt lessons. We experienced this during the 2002 peace process, the post-tsunami context and now, in 2016, are entering that phase again with constitutional reform and transitional justice processes.

How exactly did too much money impact on peace and conflict transformation in Sri Lanka? Due to the nearly 30 year armed conflict, there was not merely destruction of infrastructure, property and lives but also values- values of humanity, decency and democracy. Yet, at the same time the conflict also saw people risking their lives to save others, it saw volunteerism and communities stepping up to address the needs of those affected. The influx of external aid in 2002 and then to some extent post-2009 after the end of the armed conflict, resulted in the destruction of this spirit of volunteerism. We found that many young persons preferred to work for INGOs rather than community-based groups due to much larger salaries and benefits. We saw property and rents in certain areas increase manifold. We also saw small organisations struggle to absorb the large grants given by donors. We saw corruption and breakdown of relationships within networks and civil society groups due to competition for these resources. For instance, there was conflict within a network of 2000 women due to the creation of 2 paid positions by a donor to manage the affairs of the network, whereas previously it was done on a volunteer basis. This not surprisingly led to conflict about who should be hired for those positions because most of the

members were economically disadvantaged and as this was seen to benefit only 2 of 2000 women.

Yesterday Martin Macwan (Dalit Foundation India) used the term “gatekeeper” during our discussions. In Sri Lanka, we saw the influx of large amounts of funding create new hierarchies within the non-profit sector. We witnessed civil society become the “non-profit sector”. Several urban organisations with English speaking, foreign educated staff, who had the capacity to easily access these funds became the gatekeepers and spokespersons for local communities. The donors often prefer to support them as they find it too much trouble and resource intensive to support small CBOs who require considerable hand-holding and other forms of non-monetary support to access and effectively use financial resources.

It is exactly this kind of non-monetary support that the NTT provides to CBOs. Very often, the relationships that urban-based organisations have with the communities are tenuous and likely based on their own need, especially the need for information for research or advocacy. The repressive environment that came into being post-2009 enabled the perpetuation of these hierarchies since most community-based groups were under severe threat, and without the support mechanisms that the urban-based groups had, the CBOs were forced to work under the radar and were unable to articulate their concerns themselves. For instance, the urban-based groups had access to diplomatic missions that would intervene if these organisations faced any threats, while a small CBO in a rural part of the Northern Province was far more vulnerable to threats and violence. As I mentioned to colleagues yesterday, during the 2009 era of repression we saw numerous CBOs come into being in the North and East - these were people who came together to respond to local needs. They were not professionals in the non-profit sector, they knew nothing about project proposals and came together at great risk to their lives.

Post the 2015 regime change and the initiation of the constitutional and transitional justice processes, we are seeing increased donor interest in Sri Lanka as it is now seen as one of the very few success stories in a world full of intractable and emerging conflicts. Therefore, we are now faced with the danger of a repetition of 2002 where these organic formations will likely be assailed by a large influx of financial resources. There is the danger that these initiatives might focus on short-term outputs rather than supporting long-term initiatives that focus on structural change, and strengthen the community based organisations. In this context, NTT is focusing not only on strengthening CBOs to prepare them to withstand and survive this onslaught, but also dedicating energy to finding means of strengthening the relationship between groups- i.e. we seek to support the creation of moving away from being part of the “non-profit sector”, to moving towards being a part of civil society once again.

What we at NTT are trying to do is break down these barriers and erode the power of the gatekeepers. During the post-2009 era we did this by actively seeking and supporting the small CBOs, by enabling them to have access to safe spaces to articulate their concerns, by strengthening their institutional structures, by enabling their access to information and providing opportunities to strengthen capacity of institutions as well as the key individuals within them. In the post-2015 context, after the regime change, we continue to support local groups to gain access, space and visibility to articulate their concerns and, in particular, to support their participation in constitutional reform and transitional justice processes. It is undeniable that development aid impacts deeply divided societies in ways that exacerbate conflict and deepen existing cleavages.

In Sri Lanka there are perceptions that the international community only supports, both politically as well as through financial resources, the Tamils in the North and East, while the poor and marginalised in other parts of the country are ignored. These perceptions can be both true and false. Some donors do only support projects in the North and East, while there are many who support initiatives all over the country- yet there isn't enough awareness or information in the public domain about this, leading to misconceptions. At the same time, it also must be acknowledged the North and the East were devastated by the armed conflict and hence would need more resource allocation than other parts of the country. Yet, what donors need to realise is that ignoring the majority of the population in the rest of the country, or leaving them behind, will not enable conflict transformation but rather promote the opposite. Further, it will leave them open to the machinations and manipulations of extremist, right-wing groups that will mobilize them against reform processes. We witnessed this in 2002 during the peace process and are now witnessing it again in 2016.

What kind of initiatives do the large donors support? The tendency of donors has been to support high visibility projects with immediate impact. Long-term social change is hence not something that appears to attract their support. For us in Sri Lanka, particularly as a post-war society, the importance of socio-economic rights cannot be downplayed, and although aid seems to prioritise development, there is avoidance to tackle complex issues such as the structural change required to enable economic empowerment, particularly of the marginalized, to develop. The development initiatives tend to be ad-hoc - for instance, livelihood projects for women headed households that tend to ignore the various structural elements that must be put in place if women are to earn a living wage from these projects. For example, women need to be linked to distribution and marketing processes, from which they are isolated for many reasons. Also, when we speak of economic security of those who have lost everything in the war, we cannot deny their need and that we might have to change the rules of the game, i.e. the way in which the commercial sector functions, if the extremely disadvantaged are to not just survive but thrive.

Finally, development aid as we discussed yesterday is driven by the policy and political agendas of donors. This tends to be a double-edged sword as we have experienced in Sri Lanka. If your interests align with that of the donors, then you are able to secure financial resources. Also in Sri Lanka, during the post-2009 era of repression, donors/bilateral development partners provided protection to civil society organisations and helped them lobby and advocate with the UN and other bodies. In Sri Lanka, this protection was imperative for engagement in human rights work during this period. However, when the political status quo changed and a more democratic government was elected in 2015, the donor-civil society dynamic also changed. We now find development partners/donors have close relationships with the government and the impact of this is that they may not then be supportive of valid criticism of government policy or direction, given that they find them to be generally open to donors and the international community. Hence, those who are rightly being very critical of the various reform processes of the state, like the transitional justice process for instance, may not be able to secure grants, as they would be seen to be too radical, or disruptive or spoilers. This could lead to the marginalisation of these groups and the silencing of their concerns and voices.

Marginalisation breeds anger and resentment, and in turn conflict. At the same time, donors may also place pressure on the government to drive the reform process in ways that could cause harm or impact adversely on certain communities or affected persons. For example, some donors wish to support projects dealing with sexual violence in armed conflict. The reality is that while some women may wish to speak of the violence they encountered, there are many more who are not ready to speak of it publicly. Therefore, it could be that victims might face pressure to come forward even though they do not wish to do so. Within such a context, in the absence of a nuanced, strategic intervention, as we witnessed in the past, for instance in 2002, development partners could become complicit in the grave errors the state makes, or might push the state too hard on the wrong issues, which could cause further conflict.

I would like to conclude by raising two issues we must keep in mind: In the FFP publication we say that, as indigenous foundations, we conceive ourselves to be partners with local communities i.e. equals. Yet we must also acknowledge that, despite our best efforts, power disparities exist by virtue of the fact we are the ones who possess the financial resources. Hence, at every point we must be mindful of this to consciously counter any negative impact that could result.

Secondly, we cannot avoid the question of how far externally driven change be sustained. If foreign aid is to result in transformation, rather than freeze the status quo, it needs to support local mobilisation efforts to change attitudes, tackle structural change and build support for progressive reform processes and initiatives. This is where we, as indigenous providers of resources, come in- this is where we have an important role to play as indigenous foundations. To quote from the FFP publication, 'The evidence suggests that such transformation has to

come from within. Unless local people own and develop the change themselves, it will fail to take root. A key role for external funders and agencies is to support local efforts to build social justice and peace. Indigenous forces for change make for lasting peace and no amount of external intervention on its own can deliver this'.

BIO: Ambika Satkunanathan: Neelan Tiruchelvam Trust, Sri Lanka

Ambika was appointed Commissioner of the Human Rights Commission of Sri Lanka in October 2015. From 1998- 2014, she was Legal Consultant to the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, attached to the UN-Resident Coordinator's Office in Colombo. Her research has focused on transitional justice, militarization, and gender. Her forthcoming publications include contributions to the Oxford Handbook of Gender & Conflict and the Routledge Handbook on Human Rights in South Asia.

Ambika is Chairperson of the Neelan Tiruchelvam Trust, an indigenous grant-making organization in Sri Lanka. She is also an Advisory Board Member of Suriya Women's Development Centre, Batticaloa in the Eastern Province. Ambika has a Master of Laws (Human Rights) degree from the University of Nottingham, where she was Chevening Scholar, and earned Bachelor's degrees (LL.B / B.A) at Monash University, Australia.

Presentation Two:



The growth of Community Philanthropy for Peacebuilding and Social Justice in Georgia

Marina Tabukashvili, Taso Foundation, Georgia.

Taso Foundation (TF) is the national women's fund & memory research center active in Georgia since 1998. From 1998-2006 it was part of the Women's Program of the Open Society Georgian Foundation but, since 2007, it is an independent indigenous Foundation

The main programs since inception by the Open Society Foundation:

OSGF WP: 1998-2006

- *WHRs: Combating Domestic Violence & Trafficking in women: 1998-2007;*
- *Gender and Media: 2000 – 2009;*
- *Women's Oral Histories: since 2001 till now;*
- *Gender studies: 2003-2007;*
- *Reproductive Rights & Health: 2003- 2007;*
- *Economic Strengthening and Social Participation of Rural & Ethnic Minority Women: 2004-2008*
- *Participation in policy making: since 2005 till now*
- *Women's Social Responsibility centers in Rural Georgia: 2006 -2008*
- *Publishing and documentary producing: since 2000 till now*

Since becoming the Taso Foundation (TF) in 2007:

- Livelihoods Provision for IDPs & IDPs returnees: 2008-2009;
- Social Mobilization of IDP, Conflict Affected, Rural Ethnic minority communities:
- Building Community Resource centers: since 2010 –
- Participation in local governance: GRB etc.: since 2011 -
- Social Justice and Peace Program: since 2012
- Youth groups of volunteers;
- Philanthropy legislation;
- Community Philanthropy.

The post-2008 War Strategy/change:

- TF strategy – a period of rethinking/rewriting;
- Joined the Foundations for Peace Network and met sister foundations working on peace and social justice;
- Attended the Philanthropy for Social Justice and Peace Cairo Gathering and the FFP Meeting: Alexandria;
- Made 53 grants for women in 9 war affected villages and IDP settlement;
- Established the Karaleti Women's Solidarity center in Shida Kartli conflict zone;

- Published oral histories of war affected women;
- Developed understanding of the lack of people's participation in democracy building as a basis for conflicts/wars;
- Social mobilization of IDPs/Conflict Affected communities;
- Asked: Where is the mandate for civil society organizations?

WEPD Project: The 2010-2015 – the TF experience of social mobilization of IDP, Conflict Affected & Ethnic Minority Communities

- 124 self-help groups active in 46 communities - up to 750 people (98 % women); 13 youth/children' groups of volunteers – 139 people (76% girls);
- 23 self-help groups established 4 community foundations;
- SHGs & CFs implemented 124 projects; including the 30 community resource centres/libraries;
- Gender-responsive budgeting municipal work groups & community committees (4) and project activists (in villages of ethnic minority) cooperate for rural development in 5 target municipalities: From municipal budgets, GEL2,306,200 was spent for welfare of the communities, while total amount of grants made from the project budget is GEL 336, 236 = \$186, 043;
- NAP UN SCR1325+ was developed based on recommendations of 13 conflict-affected villages/IDP settlements:2011;
- The WEPD project paved a way for social movement in Georgia: the 16-days campaigns against violence in 2014 & 2015, etc.

The documentary: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wPd6KzTIGf0>

Social Justice and Peace Program: developing an in-country network of community foundations

- 4 community organizations established and developed with the purposeful support of TF in years 2006-2010, committing themselves to grant-giving as one of the work directions of their mission. In 2012, the network of our affiliate organizations was joined by 4 community funds established by self-help groups of IDP and conflict-affected women.
- The Community Philanthropy Program implies prospects for years-long activities in the following directions: unwavering institutional development of community foundations and support to their philanthropy; support for the cooperation of community foundations between one another and with other civil society organizations & donors; expansion of the network.
- The end 2012 was time of training CFs in grant-making. The community philanthropy manual was developed and conditions of the partnership community philanthropy program were agreed.

The network of community foundations: 14, among them based in conflict zones & IDP Settlements

- **Leli Community Organization** (Leliani village, Kakheti);
- **Rural Women for Human Rights** (Saniore village, Kakheti);
- **Rural Women for Regional Development** (Dvabzu village, Guria);
- **Karaleti Women's Solidarity Center** (Karaleti village, Shida Kartli);
- **NEFA Community Foundation** (Anaklia village, Samegrelo);
- **Egrisi Community Foundation** (Orsantia village, Samegrelo);
- **Shida Kartli Community Foundation for Peace and Development;**
- **Kodori Community Foundation** (Tsintskaro IDP settlement, Kwemo Kartli);

- **Tanadgoma (Samegrelo)** and **Civic Initiative** (Kakheti) joined the network in end 2015 and participated in TF's 3rd cycle (2016) of community philanthropy.

- 4 more rural groups of women, formed in process of community mobilization in years 2014-2015, are officially registered as philanthropy organizations in 2016 and ready to join the Community Philanthropy Network.

TF message to Community Foundations: participatory democracy

... and therefore we are interested not only in efficiency/sustainability of the projects you supported, meaning – social development of communities targeted, but also:

1. Strengthening of CFs with participation of honest, motivated, responsible and skillful people: grantee partners and participants/audience of their initiatives/projects. This is our work and responsibility to share and spread the values of peace and justice through direct interactions with people.
2. Continuous growth of CF' reputation, gaining trust and support from communities; so we have mandate for speak out on their behalf and present their needs to decision makers, which means that we ourselves are empowered to be the decision makers: political participation.
3. Continuous improvement of the quality of local governance through ensuring our (CFs', grantees & communities) sensible and responsible participation in planning and budgeting. They have to recognize us as those doing big impact with small money and turn to financing CFs' & community activists.
4. Promoting culture of volunteering: social justice and peace as the goal and process are impossible without responsible voluntary participation & activism, which can't be dependent on outside financing only and project by project fragmentary work.
5. Geographic coverage, i.e. influence, building of civil society; seems, that we can do this, we have done a lot already;

6. Documenting and archiving of achieved. We need to be able to prove and demonstrate our ability and unique role in democratization.

What is done by CFs' grantees

- Community resource centers/libraries, including movable ones;
- Rehabilitation & establishment of kindergartens;
- Creation of open air public spaces;
- Roads rehabilitation;
- Puppet theatres;
- Oral histories for peace & photo exhibitions;
- Crafts workshops;
- choreographic studio & music centers;
- Improvements of outpatient clinics;
- Women' clubs for healthy life; etc.
- Public awareness campaigns for combating violence against women and early marriages;
- Awareness raising campaigns: on WHRs, peace (Kakhati) and environmental;
- Peace center (Zugdidi) and Georgian-Abkhazian folk festival (Anaklia);
- Forum theaters on: GBV & early marriages;
- Art exhibitions of ethnic minority & Georgian rural women;
- building bridges between youth and elderly, WOHs and documentary making;
- Consultative centers for girls/women;
- Recording histories on Georgian-Osetian cultural relationship; etc.

Three cycles of community philanthropy partnership program: 2013, 2014, 2016

Total grants made by community foundations with TF support: 130

Total amount of grants made by CFs: equivalent of 36 865, 35 USD, which is up to 50% of the total grant amount TF supported with.

This does not include the 42 grants (\$25 455) Tanadgoma made in Samegrelo conflict zone before joining of the Network.

Story of philanthropy legislation: 2012-2016

Base to the concept of the draft-law: **SJPF WG publications & experience of 30 Georgian CSO's including members of the Community Philanthropy Network.**

Working groups and participants: **small and large groups, total up to 60 organizations & experts.**

The 1st submission: 2013

The 2nd submission: 2014

The 3rd submission: 2016

Documentary: https://www.youtubcome./watch?v=glwVrlgZ9_4

Published: The book on social justice and peace philanthropy Georgian case for TF 20 years anniversary (in 2017)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ppez0AiGM3Y&feature=youtu.be>

BIO: Marina Tabukashvili is General Director of Taso Foundation which, since 2007, operates as national women's fund with the mission *Women's Empowerment for Social Justice and Peace in Georgia*. The main programs of Taso Foundation's grant-making and operational activism are: Community Philanthropy; Social Mobilization of Rural, IDP, Conflict Affected and Ethnic Minority Women/Communities; Combating GBV; Women's Oral Histories; Participation in Gender Equality Policy Making as well as Documentary Producing and Publishing (the two series: Women's Memory and Feminist Library).

In years 2000-2006 Marina was coordinator of Women's Program of Open Society Georgia Foundation, running the long-term programs: Violence Against Women (combating domestic violence and trafficking in women); Women's Oral Histories; Gender Studies; Gender and Media; Reproductive Rights & Health; Women's Political Participation and Economic Strengthening and Social Participation of Rural Women. In years 1996-1999 she was country representative of French international humanitarian organization Premiere Urgence.

Marina, who started her career as philologist and art historian, is active in social domain since 1987. She is the current Chairperson and a Trustee of the Foundations for Peace Network.

Presentation Three:



The Impact of War: Antimilitarist feminist activism in Serbia - The need to question external agendas.

Slavica Stojanovic, Reconstruction Women's Fund.

To locate myself: I am an antimilitarist feminist activist in Serbia managing financial support to my peers for 18 years now. Our responsibilities started with the wars in 1991 led from our home all over former Yugoslavia. So we built our feminist political platform against the war, nationalism, racism, all kinds of discrimination and violence against women and we still practice it with reason.

Since the beginning, we had genuine support from pacifist groups internationally but the striking quality of living in Serbia in the nineties was isolation. The country was excluded from what we refer to locally as – the international community. In that decade, we accumulated experience and created knowledge like committed, concentrated, active women under pressure do.

Finally, the wars were over, the regime was toppled and international presence flew into our scope. We were ripe to step into the institutional struggle for transitional justice and lustration as well as for women's human rights to mend the harms of the re-traditionalization imposed on women during the war times. I need to mention that Yugoslavia and Serbia, as its federal republic, used to be an antifascist and socialist country and that we as citizens felt offended being led by the aggressor military regime and the new gender regime, both in need of recognition as serious harms, and demanding concentrated effort to be deconstructed to the level of an historical episode. Hence, we had the rightful expectations both from ourselves and all others.

The story could go wide about pre-war and war missed opportunities and the actors who were responsible for the social ruin which Serbia became. After year 2000, there was a clear need to make it a human space. Our experience was substantial and focused, as explained above, and new breath from outside was more than welcome. But the mistakes made to my domain were stunning. I will recollect them in couple of steps:

Myself and my feminist friends from a group developing a new perspective of women's political rights, which had been at full strength engaged in activating women to vote in the elections which toppled the war regime, and were now ready to work with so called 'women in politics', actually women in political parties to transfer our civic political platform into the new emerging system encountered many barriers and impossible expectations. Among the first visitors was a couple from a Scandinavian parliament who asked us very seriously if we

were going to be democratic. Their strong opinion was that we would have to invite women from all political parties into our educational programs, including the two parties who had been in power until very recently, waging the wars and inflicting, with profit, their fascist ideologies into a decade long life in Serbia. Without a trifle of doubt, we said No. But the 'democratic couple' was persistent: Where is the red line? The red line, answered my friend, is the Hague Tribunal for war criminals.

Women thinking about transitional justice, lustration and confronting the past was not on the so-called gender agenda!

The next encounter happened soon after when a representative of a UN body appeared with copies of manuals on how to report to the CEDAW committee. We had already worked hard on our shadow report, aware of its importance, and well self-educated about the mechanism. Our coalition of women's groups gathered concentrated efforts to make the report accurate and to keep it political. The representative, when she arrived, was focused on an out-dated mandate with no clue about the strength and resilience of long term activist work, but she tried to fight with a blunt message: You must 'help' your state to report to CEDAW. We successfully chased her away. I don't need to explain the concept of the state and the civic reports functioning independently, but our specific experience taught us that the best help to the state we could give was from a position which labelled us as "traitors".

Finally, a non-stoppable train of EU institutions and funders came who demanded cooperation with state institutions when it was obvious to us that the only result could be corruption of both the institutional and civic "sectors" as we had become known. Even 16 years after the new regimes in Serbia, activists fight to get basic information from state institutions – the communication which is the first and obligatory step for any cooperation.

Special programs have also been developed, called "gender mainstreaming and equality", in the midst of the worst mainstream ongoing fascism and the legalized overall context of inequality. Their specialty is ensuring that the empowerment of women is treated as if they themselves have been the most problematic.

For 25 years now we have been struggling against the building of damaging systems. And the most hurtful and dangerous is when we see the consequences of the continuous erasure of the human experience. To help humanity to survive, we keep creating political spaces. To be clear about the meaning of the political, I invite Hannah Arendt to conclude: "Whenever in political questions sound human reason fails or gives up the attempt to supply answers, we are faced by a crisis; for this kind of reason is really that common sense by virtue of which we and our five individual senses are fitted into a single world common to us all and by the aid of which we move about in it."

BIO: Slavica Stojanovic: Reconstruction Women's Fund, Serbia

Born in Belgrade, Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia. Graduated from the Department of World Literature and Theory of Literature. Editor of students weekly and a political-cultural review, the period ended on the grounds of political dissent. After years of enjoying free-living, she was honored to receive support for a short research project at the British Center for Literary Translation just established by W. G. Sebald, followed by committed free-lance translating of Virginia Woolf and Hannah Arendt.

When the wars in Yugoslavia started, Slavica joined the feminist antimilitarist group Women in Black, Women's Studies and SOS telephone line for Women and Children Victims of Violence. Gradually co-founded an Autonomous Women's Center, a non-profit publishing house, Feminist 94 and The Voice of Difference. All the work, including education and publishing, combined pacifism, feminist activism and theory. As an activist, Slavica was invited to develop the national Women's Program in the Fund for an Open Society Serbia within the OSI Network Women's Program. In 2004, she founded the first local women's foundation: Reconstruction Women's Fund in Belgrade.

Workshops reflections on the way ahead:

- **New models of Partnership for Conflict Transformation in Divided Societies:**

The workshop reflected on the difficulties encountered with attracting resources for local peacebuilding and social justice work. The message of the need for local sustainable peacebuilding is not getting to those that need to hear it. Is our language a barrier? We have a strong message and should not dilute that – autonomy and clarity of purpose is crucial.

FFP should:

- seek unexpected allies and champions of local peacebuilding work to promote the message of the added value of local peacebuilding efforts;
- convene a meeting with like-minded donors and stakeholders;
- ask a donor to convene a donors meeting on our behalf;
- enter the donors space/use existing opportunities like the Global Summit, EFC and other donor gatherings with our message/input;
- continue to document and share our stories of the added-value of local peacebuilding and social justice work.

- **Local experience of Development Aid;**

The workshop reflected on the growth of development aid and the rise (and mission drift) of many INGO's involved. Government and corporate involvement with lack of transparency. A whole new industry.

- Negative impact on local development/ creating dependencies;
- lack of accountability and short-termism;
- imposing external agendas that don't meet local need.
- How can we build accountability into development aid?
- The need to continue to develop horizontally to influence vertically.

- **Local Peacebuilding and Conflict Transformation work.**

- Local knowledge and access is crucial to local PB/SJ work
- Listen and respond appropriately/sensitive to context/political nuance
- Conscious of our impact and live with our decisions
- Need to get a simple but effective message out to those who are like-minded
- Continue to document our work/successes and challenges
- We need to better understand the challenges that donors face
- We must reflect, re-map and create new mechanisms for engagement.

Reflections on the presentations and discussions:



Christopher Harris: Guest Speaker.

Good afternoon. Before I begin, I would like to thank Monina O'Prey for inviting me “back” to chat with old and new friends from Foundations for Peace at your 10th anniversary—Happy Birthday.

Monina has asked me to comment on your discussions today—and did so for three reasons:

1. As the (former) Senior Program Officer on Philanthropy at the Ford Foundation for a decade, as the founder of the Working Group on Philanthropy for Social Justice & Peace (there are three other members in the room) and from work with NOREF (the Norwegian Centre for Conflict Resolution), I have had the chance to see a variety of individual foundations and networks of funds focused on social justice and peace—and have seen both successes and setbacks.
2. I was fortunate to be present at the birth of Foundations for Peace.
3. I was privileged to serve as the program officer for Ford's grants to FFP and have watched its progress as an arms-length friend for its work over the years.

Let me share with you my impressions of Foundations for Peace. The theme that emerged as I thought about the network was “maturity”:

- At the meeting in Leuven in January 2004, I was impressed with the **collective maturity** of the funders. They—you—did not rush to become an association as many do, but consciously took the time to consider the positive and negative aspects of working as a group. They—you—conducted what I would call a mature analysis of first, whether to exist, and second, to take on work that was aspirational—but doable. The group emphasized internal efforts—strengthening the members—and only modestly trying to influence others. I think that was wise.
- I was struck by the diversity of the funds (more than location—but included differing political analyses) though they all shared a modest financial base. But I was particularly impressed by the caliber of the leadership around the table—the quality of commitment & thought.

Context

The world has changed remarkably over the past decade.

On the positive side:

- There have been important advances in knowledge (though not universally) within the peacebuilding “field”. There is increased recognition about the complexity of peacebuilding—from the necessity of a gender lens to a growing understanding of the relationship among climate change, marginalization & violence.
- There have been a few, if limited, successes in working toward peace.
- There are some new foundations with fresh approaches to funding in the areas of peace and development.
- There are many more foundations, but few that “get” peace—that is both a constraint and an opportunity.
- And there are networks—like Foundations for Peace—that through their struggles offer a different way to peace that emphasizes respect, dignity and self-determination.

On the less heartening side:

- There are ongoing and many new violent conflicts around the world—that do not have an obvious end in sight. Think Palestine or the missed chance in Colombia.
- There are more—and more complex—non-state violent actors, as well as more “external” nations supporting “proxy wars”—a horrible term. Syria, Yemen.
- There is an alarming number of countries closing down the space for civil society—and a rise in populist, racist, xenophobic, and anti-democratic state power—along with increased public discourse permissive of sexual violence. We see this from India to Russia to European & Australian views on immigration to the U.S. elections.
- We face dramatically increased economic inequality that has profound potential to fuel future violence.

And we see related disturbing trends in funding:

- There have been substantial shifts in the amount and emphases of bi-lateral development aid—much of it undermining local decision-making.
- The “peacebuilding industrial complex” despite increased resources and power, shows itself increasingly unhelpful in connecting with and dealing with the myriad issues at the community-level that make peace “stick.”
- Many private foundations that were known for funding peace have changed their focus and no longer consider it a priority.
- The latest Foundation Center data shows only 3,917 U.S. foundations out of 90,000 support “conflict resolution.”

What to do

Given the violence in the world, the political and social forces that fuel it, and the direction of state and private funders—peace and justice funders and in our case, Foundations for Peace, need to be smarter, more creative and **willing to reconsider old assumptions.**

I see two overarching questions:

Should Foundations for Peace continue?

What are FFP's strengths that should be prioritized in this new context—**What is both strategic and achievable?**

Comments from Sessions

This morning's session was extremely impressive.

Kamala Chandrakirana offered us a comprehensive and sobering reminder of the larger and complex context in which we now operate. It was a brilliant "landscape sketch."

Ambika Satkunanathan outlined the dual problems of not enough/too much money in aid and the damaging dynamics of power related to them. Her examples from Sri Lanka, while specific to that struggle, offer universal analyses. *Marina Tabukashvili* provided us with the historical development of the Taso Foundation in Georgia—a living case study. Its history shows maturity in its ability to adapt constantly to changing circumstances and learn from those new challenges. She poignantly noted, "We are the *demos*."

Slavica Stojanovic gave us a powerfully thought-provoking "essay" about the contradictions and obstacles to real peace in the experience of Serbia, but again, offering universal principles.

I sincerely wish that Foundations for Peace find a way to capture this extraordinary morning session and share it more widely.

My recommendations for moving forward—given the changed context over the past ten years: (Of course, this is just my opinion as an outsider).

Foundations for Peace should continue as a group. Its importance as a source of solidarity (internal) and learning (internal and external) appears very strong. Marina writes in the collection of stories about how the solidarity and learning from other funds have had profound positive effects.

Foundations for Peace should reassess its priorities, functions and structure—with the same type of mature analysis it used at its beginning. This includes an unromantic assessment of its strengths and weaknesses. That assessment should be followed by realistic planning. What is both strategic and achievable?

Foundations for Peace should systematically capture and more powerfully share its knowledge and experience of community-based, locally controlled peacebuilding and development. You know what works and why—in ways that almost no one else does. **You are the living counter-narrative for "funding peace."** Others need to learn from your experience. What you do every day offers powerful lessons for the rest of us—and can help both to influence others and to serve as evidence of a more effective way to address violence, injustice and development. Foundations for Peace members have content but not sufficiently powerful delivery mechanisms. Do the first (provide content—

experience and stories) and partner with someone else (who communicates powerfully) to produce cases, design webinars, produce and distribute web-based products. Play to your strengths (your practice)—but find partners who can increase the reach and power of your knowledge and vision.

Serve as an ally to influence foundations and development organizations—but do not dissipate your energy and power by taking on this task. You have raised at least two functions that are needed. One has to do with confronting the dominant development paradigm, the other with engaging foundations to fund the sort of work that you do. There are numerous other organizations advocating for changing the development aid design. They can use your products—but you need to produce them.

As far as foundations are concerned, I am increasingly convinced that it is time to develop a more powerful advocacy and learning voice to influence foundations to increase their funding for peace and for the efforts of groups like Foundations for Peace. A critical analysis tells us that FFP is not the vessel to do this.

In anticipation of this meeting I have had some informal conversations with several people here and a number of people not present, about the need to develop such a capacity—ideally at an existing institution. This is an effort that others should take on, but one that Foundations for Peace should support with both solidarity and with knowledge content. Consider who your best allies are and find new ways to work together—emphasizing each group’s strengths. Explore the possibility of inviting key outsiders to serve on tasks forces or advisory groups—some “friends of Foundations for Peace.”

So, in summary, I would recommend four sets of actions:

1. Foundations for Peace should continue to exist and operate—with an emphasis on solidarity and peer learning.
2. FFP should reassess its priorities, its functions and its structure—and plan intelligently.
3. FFP should aggressively identify and capture lessons from the members practice—and partner with creative communication groups who can more powerfully get the word out.
4. FFP should do the above and while not taking the lead in changing development aid or foundation funding for peace, assist and encourage others to do so.

I hope that these reflections are helpful. Thank you and happy birthday.
Christopher Harris; November 4th, 2016.

BIO: Dr. Christopher M. Harris

Christopher Harris is currently Senior Consultant to the Norwegian Centre for Conflict Resolution (NOREF) Oslo. Until 2010 he served for a decade as the Senior Program Officer on Philanthropy at the Ford Foundation where he worked on how philanthropy can be best used as a tool for social justice and peace. He supported the founding of Trust Africa and the Arab and Brazil Human Rights Funds. In 2007 he founded the international *Working Group on Philanthropy for Social Justice and Peace*, on which he still serves. Earlier he was a vice president at the Council on Foundations and served with the Council of Chief State School Officers, where he worked on improving US and state education policy for the most marginalized students. He has worked in the West Bank and Gaza with Palestinian educators, and in Somalia and Ethiopia analyzing emergency assistance.

He has a doctorate from Harvard University and was on the editorial board of the *Harvard Educational Review*. He is currently on the editorial board of *Alliance* magazine (UK) and on several other boards. He has edited several books on education policy and written a number of articles and reports about philanthropy. He lives in Philadelphia (US).

What indigenous independent Funds and Foundations can offer in terms of added-value includes –

- Acting as a knowledge hub of the local conditions and bringing particular sensitivity to the adverse impact of violent conflict and social injustice on specific communities and groups within their society.
- Being open to a range of different approaches – both grant-making and development roles – in order to proactively support work around peacebuilding and social justice.
- Being both practical and innovative in delivering support to grass-roots communities impacted by conflict, using knowledge of local political and environmental nuance to enable urgent needs to be met.
- Offering a convening role to bring groups together across sectarian, ethnic, caste and other divides, and working with partner organisations and initiatives to ensure that this can happen safely.
- Networking at community level with marginalised or excluded groups and testing ways to support their active participation in alliances for change.
- Acting as a bridge between different levels in society.
- Offering flexible and timely grant delivery – in situations of rapid change, as often occurs during peacebuilding or conflict, a small grant made in a timely and flexible manner can be more effective than a larger grant.
- Helping to develop broad platforms/alliances to build cooperation and solidarity around issues of social justice and peacebuilding. This can entail indigenous Funds and Foundations using their position in society and their reputational capital to stand by advocates for change.

- Acting as a channel for external philanthropy and/or Development Aid either through a partnership approach to the delivery of funding or as a source of active consultation.
- Offering a signposting service for external funders, particularly advising on how planned interventions might be interpreted (or misinterpreted) and applying a peace and conflict impact assessment with regard to proposed initiatives.