



Discussion Paper

Social Inclusion, Political Participation, and Effective Governance in Challenging Environments

Independent Commission on Multilateralism

August 2015

The purpose of this paper is to highlight how the growing crisis of legitimacy in the relationship between citizens and governance institutions relates to the multilateral system. Given that the essence of multilateralism rests in the state, the efficiency and legitimacy of the multilateral system as a whole is affected when the state finds itself under stress, or no longer constitutes the primary source of political identification.¹ While the United Nations does not traditionally address peace and security challenges internal to the state, its mechanisms – at both the internal and inter-governmental level – continue to be hampered by the reverberations of distinctly “national” problems and their transnational permutations. The UN’s role in this regard is to uphold the norms and rules-based system enshrined in its Charter and to be at the helm of appropriate and effective multilateral responses to these challenges. The multilateral system cannot be reformed if the foundation upon which it rests – the state – remains under such stress.

Mapping the Landscape

The global political landscape is undergoing continuous change and transformation. As the number of state actors has grown four-fold since the creation of the UN², the number and variety of non-state actors, issue-based advocacy groups, civil society organizations and networks, and citizen-led movements have also increased dramatically, significantly challenging traditional notions of the social contract, social inclusion, political participation, governance, as well as the relevance of the vertical state-society relations framework.

In the context of this paper, the notion of “challenging environments” has multiple connotations. In the broader sense, it refers to a turbulent international environment that is in constant flux and increasingly unpredictable. Yet most of the salient problems pertaining to political participation, social inclusion, and effective governance outlined in this paper take place in challenging environments of a more specific kind, namely, fragile states.

The geopolitical and transnational dimensions of the governance crisis have made themselves apparent: borders are being challenged (epitomized by the situation in Iraq, Syria, and Ukraine), secessionist tendencies are in vogue in some regions and the nefarious transborder actions of armed non-state groups and criminal syndicates are increasing. In some cases, governance is so weak and disintegrative tendencies so strong that the sovereignty of the state is under threat.

In several countries there are unresolved tensions that threaten the territorial integrity of states, while increasingly diverse cities and communities face the challenge of integrating

¹ C. A. Crocker “The Strategic Dilemma of a World Adrift” - *Survival* 57 no. 1 (February-March, 2015).

² R. Thakur, “The United Nations in Global Governance: Rebalancing Organized Multilateralism for Current and Future Challenges”,

http://www.un.org/en/ga/president/65/initiatives/GlobalGovernance/Thakur_GA_Thematic_Debate_on_UN_in_GG.pdf

religious, linguistic, and ethnic minorities. Failure to manage diversity can lead to social unrest and populist reactions, while marginalization provides fertile ground for radicalization. These examples – among many – serve as clarion calls for the international community and its multilateral institutions to rethink approaches to governance.

The challenges to the values and institutions of multilateralism result not merely from changing shifts of power distribution, but also from systemic factors like migration, urbanization, the changing nature of the threats to international peace and security, the actors and factors that drive those threats, the global norms that regulate the international behavior of state and non-state actors alike, and the globalization forces that shape them. It is these challenges among others that also make effective governance such an elusive goal, with the gap between rhetoric and practice continuing to widen.

The State under Stress: A Diagnosis

The “state,” the classic provider of security and basic wellbeing in exchange for citizens’ loyalty, is under multiple pressures both internal and external. In many contexts, the nation-state is becoming a much weaker and more vulnerable institution; in several, it is disintegrating.

The complex, interconnected, and interdependent nature of today’s world is seriously affecting the art and craft of governing. Many local problems confronting national leaders have become transnational in origin and effect.³ As such, the **compartmentalized approach of threat assessment and response is no longer sustainable**; whether the issue is transnational organized crime, climate change, or Ebola governance challenges are central.

It should also be noted that multilateral intervention has often exacerbated pressures on the state. The policy induced failures in Iraq (2003) and Libya (2011), for example, are a testament that outside intervention can negatively influence or yield unintended consequences on the internal stability of a state, rendering the goals of political participation, social inclusion, and effective governance all the more elusive.

In addition to **pressures from above**, the state has to contend with **pressures from below**. In many countries, disenfranchised citizens have grown less deferential to authority and have resorted to various ways of voicing their grievances, not all of them peaceful. Citizens around the globe have acquired an understanding of the realities they live in relative to those of their elite compatriots, and are pushing for greater agency in how they are governed. The last four

³ Leiva-Roesch, Jimena; Mahmoud, Youssef, and Steve Nation ‘Building a Sustainable Future Requires Leadership from Citizen and State’, Global Observatory, September 23, 2014 <http://theglobalobservatory.org/2014/09/sustainable-future-leadership-state-citizen/>

years are a testament to this phenomenon: from the Arab uprisings to the tumult in Ukraine and Thailand; to the rumblings in several austerity-afflicted European countries. It has been argued that open defiance, mass protests, and revolts, are challenging, rather than reinforcing, democratic governance, at times luring citizens away from compromise and careful deliberation to instinctive, maximalist claims, sometimes fueled by unscrupulous politics.

The management of diversity has also become a signal issue for many states. Nations and states seldom overlap perfectly, creating the challenge of ensuring effective participation of minorities in public life. Furthermore, history shows that contacts between people in neighboring countries that share the same ethnicity should be enabled in a way that does not lead to undue interference from “kin” states.⁴

Governments, for their part, frequently respond to pressures from below in ways that seem incomprehensible to their citizens. In some contexts, strong states conjuring up their sovereign rights have sought to roll back what they perceived as the unfettered exercise of individual rights and freedoms. In other contexts where state security is under threat, we have witnessed the militarization of public law and order, the allocation of a greater share of national budgets to internal national defense and, over all, an inherently **securitized approach**. In some circumstances, blind and brutal repression by security forces has backfired: militant groups have grown only more appealing to disillusioned and persecuted civilians. In time of perceived threat i.e., counter-terrorism measures, the pressures of governance requires a real balance between maintaining security and not curtailing civil liberties.

Furthermore, **notions of leadership have been severely challenged**. Given the sheer multiplicity of actors whose influence and power have increased dramatically outside the confines of the architecture of the state – including the private sector and civil society - top-down leadership no longer has the capacity to absorb the demands of a large and diverse citizen-base. A shift towards a style of leadership that is more “participatory, communicative and horizontal” may prove effective.⁵ It falls to government, business, and civil society leaders to foster such leadership and empower citizens to fully participate in, and bear responsibility for, policy decisions that affect their lives.

Civil society actors have acquired a higher profile at both state and global levels. In certain instances, the perception that, if the state does not deliver, civil society can do so is becoming more prevalent. This ultimately fuels the (wrong) perception that the state and civil society are

⁴ OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities, “The Bolzano/Bozen Recommendations on National Minorities in Inter-State Relations”, June 2008

⁵ Leiva-Roesch, Mahmoud and Nation , ‘Building a Sustainable Future Requires Leadership from Citizen and State’

competitive protagonists. Civil society and the state have to be seen in a balanced manner, theoretically as well as practically.

Rapid advances in technology have generated their own challenges and opportunities for governments. On the one hand, cyberattacks are on the rise and the internet has provided a vehicle for radicalization and dissemination of destructive ideologies. On the other hand, new information and communication technologies have empowered citizens in unprecedented ways, helping to flatten hierarchies in public organizations at local and central levels. Social media has resulted in creating virtual “non-state actors” out of each individual while empowering citizens by amplifying demands for accountability. Beyond making transactions more efficient, new technologies have the potential to transform how government works and how citizens interact with one another in a positive way.

In neglected rural or outlying areas where government institutions are weak, corrupt or non-existent, non-state actors have filled a vacuum and become service providers. In the most dramatic cases, actors capitalizing on citizen grievances have organized themselves into armed rebellions and forged alliances with criminal networks, challenging the state territorially. In several circumstances, the monopoly of violence is no longer the sole preserve of the state. In fact, a new breed of extremist entrepreneurs of violence, some with state aspirations, is emerging and proliferating. Taking advantage of technology and globalization, they are redefining how power is acquired, exercised, and maintained. Some have not shied from using religion to legitimize their authoritarian and brutal form of governance. As the seemingly irrational and violent behavior of certain groups has rendered the question of engagement an anathema, multilateral institutions have yet to find alternatives to engagement without fearing that such an approach may legitimize their cause.

There remains a serious gap in **how to include legitimate non-state actors** at the decision-making level, regardless if they are of a particular form or for a particular cause, or if they are amorphous entities. Legitimate interaction with legitimate non-state groups is a step forward towards greater inclusivity. In essence, as non-state actors continue to be important drivers of the peace and security agenda, twenty first century multilateralism cannot be confined solely to relationships among states: a more **pluralistic approach to international relations** ought to be considered.

The Nexus between National and Global Governance

Current thinking has established that state actors depend upon multilateralism and the “underwriting of regularity and public goods in the international system” though at the same

time warning that, if they are to remain viable, international organizations and the values of multilateralism embedded in them must be “reconstituted in line with 21st century principles of governance and legitimacy.”⁶

The effectiveness and legitimacy of multilateral institutions is under stress. International organizations have increasingly expansive agendas, which are not always value-neutral. They convey a certain world-view about fundamental social and political choices regarding the balance between the market and equity, human rights, social justice, governance, and democracy. As such, the performance of these organizations is increasingly being scrutinized by an inter-connected citizenry.

In any discussion that begins with the state, the evolving nature of sovereignty and the impact that this is having on the concept of the state itself needs to be highlighted. Sovereignty is a relative concept and not a fundamental element of power. States may be seen as having a social contract with the multilateral system, because in adhering to this system, their sovereignty is protected. And yet, the status of the system is being impacted by the weaknesses of individual states, which is being compounded to such an extent that the system is being significantly weakened in its capacity to protect state sovereignty. In summary, there is both a **breakdown of the social contract within states and between states**, and one has an effect on the other.

From a multilateral context, the concept of marginalization is important for understanding the pressures on the state system. Weak states are marginalized in the system, which becomes a burden for the rest of the system because they become magnets for malign actors, further marginalizing them and thus further weakening their capability to stand against the pressures they present. As such, the multilateral system is prone to suffer from the “bad apple” syndrome: as one state falters, it serves as a threat to the stability of its neighbors and, ultimately, the system as a whole.

It is worth making the distinction between the UN as a collection of member states as opposed to the UN as an organization. There remains a number of states and non-state actors that do not wholeheartedly adhere to a notion of global governance entrusted to a multilateral bureaucracy that seems to reflect a **class system of unequal partners** not fully conversant with the needs or the realities of its constituents. This, in part, explains the **growing expansion of regional organizations**, and the assertive stance of certain emerging powers and regional organizations and arrangements in devising new practices and institutions to promote peace, security, and development as well as economic and financial stability in their respective “near

⁶ R. Thakur, “The United Nations in Global Governance: Rebalancing Organized Multilateralism for Current and Future Challenges”

abroad.” While such a trend is, to some extent, a reflection of a lack of faith in the multilateral order as a whole, it should also be seized as an opportunity: through improved links with regional organizations, the efficiency, effectiveness and legitimacy of the multilateral system could be augmented. Indeed, regional organizations can provide a platform for bridging the gap between national and global governance.

The participation of regional organizations can add to the legitimacy (nationally) of multilateral decision-making at the global level and can be seen to consolidate or amplify voices that might not otherwise be heard. Second, regional organizations are based “closer to home” and are thus more connected to specific environments, and can function as the first responders on location, which can be useful given the perception that global institutions are too far removed from the problems on the ground and thus lack local buy-in and participation. Third, regional organizations engage in pooling of resources and burden sharing, and could act as a force of stability in crisis. Regional and subregional organizations can make the multilateral system more credible through linkages and arrangements that focus the issues and leverage local knowledge. However, it is hard to create one particular model of regional organization because there is great diversity among them and many still have to develop before they can fulfill their potential.

Additionally, there are notable examples where the multilateral system is learning to integrate the voices of the people and their organizations in its deliberation and decision-making processes. This is particularly evident in the areas of sustainable development and climate change where systematic attempts have been made to reach out directly and through web-based social media platforms to non-state actors and other local stakeholders. Given the capacity limitations as well as the legitimacy and trust deficits that plague many governments, the multilateral system is finding ways to expand such inclusionary practices to other fields of human endeavor deemed to benefit from a global approach.

Sooner or later, states will need to acknowledge and reconcile the growing space for malign and benign non-state actors; civil and uncivil society. An imperative way forward for multilateral institutions therefore is to recognize the important nexus between global governance and local governance. If the state is to remain the enduring pillar of a stable and credible multilateral system, ways must be found to enhance its capacities to be responsive and responsible to the needs of its citizens. Over the long term, state sovereignty is better guaranteed through accountable, participatory, inclusive and democratic practices, however difficult their implementation may be in the face of the new local and the global challenges outlined above. How do we bring the state back in a new way that is both sustainable, resilient and in tune with the realities of today’s political, social and economic landscape?

Towards a Holistic Definition of Governance, Participation and Inclusion

Governance

Effective governance means many things to many people, and yet, the key challenge is precisely defining the principles upon which it rests. At the national level it refers to the processes, mechanisms and policies that equitably deliver essential public goods and services that citizens have come to expect. Its hallmarks include access to fair justice, institutions that combat corruption, curb illicit financial flows, and provide safeguards to protect personal security.

The working uses of the term “effective governance” include a variety of “good things” that do not necessarily fit together in any meaningful way.⁷ While it is a better term than “good governance” – in that it has allowed us to transcend normative boundaries of good and bad – it remains a term that has its limitations. Indeed, effective governance is a term that can apply to various case studies of authoritarian regimes that boast a strong central state, effective service delivery, and economic prosperity for its people with little attention to social and political rights and freedoms.

As such, the multilateral system is best suited to promote the twin norms of **effective governance**, i.e., capacity of the state to provide and deliver effectively and **legitimate governance**, which entails democratized leadership, enhanced citizen engagement and “a participative manner of governing” for the purpose of promoting the “rights of individual citizens and the public interest.”⁸ The latter concept is comprehensive enough to capture notions of greater accountability and horizontal styles of leadership. It promotes free, active, and meaningful engagement of civil society and advocates at the community level giving voice in particular to women and youth. It also entails a commitment to reciprocity: the people have to be involved, and there has to be a mutual acceptance of the need to cooperate; there needs to be mutual confidence—confidence of leaders in the people and people in their leaders, each learning from and giving to one another.⁹

Having explained the qualitative distinctions between “legitimate” and “effective” governance, it is worth noting that it is possible to have: 1. neither (i.e., illegitimate and ineffective governance); 2. one or the other (legitimate but ineffective governance or illegitimate and effective governance); or, the most ideal, 3. both (legitimate and effective governance). Most

⁷ R. Gisselquist, ‘What Does “Good Governance” Mean?’ <http://unu.edu/publications/articles/what-does-good-governance-mean.html>

⁸ Surendra Munshi, as quoted in Civil Society News, “Understanding good governance”, April 2009, <http://www.civilsocietyonline.com/Archive/mar09/mar0918.asp>

⁹ Ibid

states that make up the multilateral system fall somewhere on this continuum.

Political Participation:

While the advantages of a democratic political system—as opposed to one-party states, authoritarian governments, or military dictatorships—seem obvious, especially with respect to the authority derived from the consent of the governed, what is important is that those who are elected to power not only function in the interests of all but also do so in a responsible and transparent manner. Democratic governments would appear, however, to be failing to live up to these expectations both in established and emerging democracies. And yet, in country after country, even where democracy is supposedly in crisis, a large majority of people prefer democracy to any other form of government. The problems currently facing democracy and the unsuitability of alternatives raise questions of where to go next, especially given that expectations to deliver are even more heightened in consolidated and emerging democracies. It is here that a reassessment of current models has become necessary. There is a need for a concerted effort on the part of multilateral institutions to **recognize that the practice** (i.e., implementation) **of democracy is as important as the system** (i.e., classification) **of democracy.**

Inclusion:

In the midst of these difficult trends, there is growing recognition that inclusive societies are more likely to be peaceful and stable. As such, the multilateral system has a responsibility to promote inclusive societies, particularly ones that take into account women and youth. The new 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development includes a stand-alone goal on peaceful and inclusive societies, access to justice and effective institutions, known as SDG 16. Throughout 2015, the UN, governments, and civil society actors are marking the anniversaries of two milestones for the inclusion and participation of women: the Platform for Action in Beijing (1995) and UN Security Council Resolution 1325 (2000). But the vital underlying principle of Resolution 1325 has yet to be fully understood and embraced – that women’s participation is critical for peace and security for all. There is now compelling evidence that women’s physical security and gender equality in society are linked to broader peace and stability in states.¹⁰ The empowerment of women as equal citizens—and global citizens—can therefore help to prevent conflict and make the state-based multilateral system itself more legitimate, credible, and effective. The slow but steady progress on women’s participation in the realm of the state and society serves as a key example of the transformative power of inclusion in building responsive states and effective governance.

¹⁰ V. Hudson, B. Ballif-Spanvill, M. Caprioli, and C. F. Emmett, *Sex and World Peace*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2012.

It is worth noting that deficiencies in social inclusion quotient manifest themselves in societies that are seemingly anti-fragile or resilient. One example that outlines this is the growing number of foreign fighters leaving European societies to fight in Iraq and Syria. While this can be attributed to various “pull factors,” the “push factors” often include exclusionary community structures and social alienation.¹¹

Role of the Multilateral System

Multilateral institutions work closely with governments in pursuit of effective national governance. They also work closely with civil society and groups from the private sector. This ranges from providing policy advice, technical support, and strengthening the capacity of institutions and individuals to engaging in advocacy and communications, supporting public information campaigns, and promoting dialogue. They also facilitate “knowledge networking” and the sharing of good practices. The United Nations, for example, has made a point of promoting effective governance as a key thread through all UN system activities from the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) to the United Nations Democracy Fund (UNDEF) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF).

The challenge today is understanding how the promotion of these ideal practices continue in situations where there is growing repression of social movements and civil society, the shrinking of democratic spaces, and the criminalization of legitimate political dissent.

How can social inclusion, political participation, and effective governance in challenging environments contribute to conflict prevention and enhance peacebuilding?

This question ought also to be considered in light of a decline of citizen participation in conventional electoral politics in some parts of the world and erosion of public trust in organized politics and elected elites. Indeed, as the state system continues to be challenged, there is a risk that more groups will opt out of the existing formal structures of government and society, upending the social contract and carving new – at times radical - paths forward. The consequences of radicalization rarely remain within the confines of a particular territory; and this is at the root of the various transnational malignancies that have morphed into major global peace and security threats. One example of this can be found by closely examining non-state military actors like Al Qaeda and Daesh, who use the fault line in state-society relations as a means of recruitment and to provide political justification for their cause.

¹¹ Richard Barrett, “Foreign Fighters in Syria,” New York: The Soufan Group, June 2014. <http://soufangroup.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/TSG-Foreign-Fighters-in-Syria.pdf>

Conclusions and Recommendations: Risks and Opportunities for the Multilateral System

To the extent that the notion of a “community” of nations in pursuit of collective goals lies at the heart of the multilateral system, it has lost some of its currency in recent years. The feeling of togetherness is most strongly felt at the local and community levels but weakens in relation to higher levels of political organization. For many people the state does not provide the main source of political identification. And yet, based upon its universal membership, the state-based United Nations remains the principal body capable of lending legitimacy to international action in support of international peace and security.

The thrust of this paper has explored multiple crises of “legitimacy” at the state and multilateral level. The following presents a series of four frameworks from which to understand how the challenges and risks highlighted above represent opportunities for the United Nations and multilateral system at large.

1. Leadership:

- a. **Cultivate engaged leadership:** In times when the world seems adrift, a concerted effort must be made for stronger, more effective and engaged leadership at the multilateral level, one which is fully aware that peace/security and governance/development ought to be addressed jointly.
- b. **Improve and reaffirm the “benefits” of belonging to the multilateral system** as a useful entry point to boost the credibility and relevance of global governance institutions. One way of pursuing this is to promote the concept of a “peace dividend” as a reward for social stability. In other words, trust in the system could have an economic signifier.
- c. **Integrate and reaffirm the “We the Peoples” component of the UN charter** to inspire and support collective and citizen-oriented action in the face of the complex, interconnected, and fast evolving transnational problems facing humanity. There is a need to reconcile the distinction between “We the peoples” and an international system of states.
- d. **Reaffirm the twin norms of effective governance and legitimate governance.** Legitimate governance concerns processes regarding political representation, participation and accountability. It is how power is organized within a state and defines how or whether society holds the state accountable. Effective governance concerns the capacity for the state or government to “deliver” on goods and services to its citizens.

2. Inclusivity:

- a. **Diversify national and global decision-making centers:** The centers of national and international decision-making need to be made more inclusive and reflective of global diversity. For the United Nations in particular, a concerted effort toward Security Council reform remains particularly worthy as a means to enhance the system's legitimacy and credibility.
- b. **Engage non-state actors:** A more concerted effort should be made to recognize non-state actors as potential partners for peace. Innovative means of engagement represent a potential for peacebuilding, conciliation, and healthier state-society relations, and ultimately, more stable inter-state relations
- c. **Promote the evolving paradigms of effective governance and healthy state-society relations:** The multilateral system should use these evolving paradigms as a means to promote responsible, responsive, and resilient states that will thus enhance the performance legitimacy of the multilateral system.
- d. **Learn from participatory governance models world wide:** Given that participatory governance has already begun in many parts of the world – from online constitution platforms to online civic town halls - the multilateral system should better understand and catalogue effective practices as a means to promote useful models. A more “people-centered” approach from below will undoubtedly enhance the legitimacy of the system(s). A central component of this multilateral message is that governance at the national level is not just “state business”, but the partnership between the government and the people. Effective and legitimate governance can be best guaranteed if there is a central universal feedback system that allows all members of the community to give inputs and therefore feel like they are influential “governance” actors.
- e. **Promote civic empowerment:** Social accountability has three elements: informing citizens of their rights, enabling citizens to keep “scorecards” of the processes, and enabling citizens to engage in constructive local level dialogue between communities and the government. Without these elements, an empowerment gap and a lack of social accountability will ensue. The multilateral system as a neutral intermediary can provide expertise, logistics, and support for such local level dialogues.
- f. **Implement and further women's empowerment:** Resolution 1325 has yet to be fully understood and implemented. The slow but steady progress on women's participation in the realm of the state and society serves as a key example of the transformative power of inclusion in building responsive states and effective governance. Implementing and building on past and present successes should remain at the heart of multilateral priorities.

- g. **Empower, support and engage youth:** multilateral institutions are not configured towards youth: communication channels are limited and ineffective. The majority represent great partners in working for peace and capable of real agency. The argument should not solely be based on employment: research shows that livelihoods alone are not enough to circumvent confrontational tendencies in youth, but that peace skills must accompany employment. Such a powerful combination not only helps to avoid unrest and/or radicalization, but also enables youth to become partners in peacebuilding and agents of positive change.
- h. **Promoting pluralism and the equitable management of diversity:** in situations where states are fragmenting or experiencing a collapsing social fabric, an emphasis on re-drawing internal – rather than external - borders i.e., promoting a more equitable redistribution of power (through constitutional provisions of inclusiveness) should be the first resort recommended by the multilateral system as a peaceful means towards managing diversity.

3. Efficiency and Effectiveness:

- a. **Forge and improve local partnerships:** if there are three systems of governance in the international community,¹² the potential of the international community to strengthen the state could ultimately come through forging and improving partnerships between the international community and local-level communities, through the appropriate relevant intermediaries. In order to be perceived as legitimate and build trust, the international community needs to reach out to a broad group of relevant local constituents. Such an approach should result in empowering local knowledge stakeholders. Leveraging local knowledge could result in innovative multilateral approaches to resource mobilization, streamline decision-making and produce tangible results for the benefit of the people.
- b. **Improve understanding of new technologies:** the role of modern technology tools in state-society relations should be better understood and utilized by the multilateral system. The intersection between technology and better governance ought to be better leveraged by the multilateral system. Much has yet to be expanded on: from open government data, to the use of mobiles for government service delivery, to citizen reporting on government abuses. The multilateral system is at an advantage by investing in providing assistance on how new technologies can enhance

¹² 1. The international community, which offers partnerships, 2. the state, which should offer resources, and 3. sub-national actors, whose influence depends on the level of the state's institutional strength.

governance processes. There is a need for an interdisciplinary critical analysis — quantitative, narrative, economic, historical, anthropological, political, and more — to make sense of how new technology impacts transparency and accountability.

- c. **Break down siloed approaches:** the fragmented and siloed nature of various UN departments and agencies continues to undermine important linkages when it comes to threat assessment and response. Given that the risks and challenges are becoming increasingly interconnected, a more holistic response and approach would be of tremendous value to the multilateral system at large. Indeed the nexus between security and development cannot continue to be compartmentalized.

4. Partnerships:

- a. **Strengthen international partnerships:** To revitalize its role at the center of multilateral governance, the United Nations must strengthen its capacity to engage with international partners. . While the UN remains the best placed and most legitimate vehicle for international action, an emphasis on greater cooperation with regional and subregional organizations, civil society actors, and the private sector, would help bolster its standing as an effective leader in setting norms, coordinating responses, delivering services, and providing assistance when necessary. The reality that regional organizations and powerful member states have at times bypassed the UN can result in the unfortunate perception that the latter is redundant. Such an assumption is ultimately false given that the UN Security Council remains the only instrument mandated by international law to authorize enforcement actions to maintain or restore international peace and security. . Stronger engagement and bolstered cooperation would thus be mutually beneficial. While the UN does not have to “be” everywhere, it still needs to be able to rely on functional partnerships and a holistically sound protocol for approaches on regional governance, in conjunction with the national and local level.
- b. **Enhance Cooperation with Regional and Subregional Organizations** to add to perceptions of legitimacy at the national level of multilateral decision-making at the global level; to consolidate or amplify voices that might not otherwise be heard; to leverage local knowledge; to support the capacity of “first responders” on location; to engage in pooling of resources and burden sharing, and to act as a force of stability in times of crisis.

Annex 1. Relevant Global Conferences and High-Level Summits

1. Beijing Program for Action. The United Nations Fourth World Conference on Women. Beijing (1995) – *an agenda for women’s inclusion and empowerment, this conference follows up on three earlier conferences on women (1975, 1980, 1985) and outlined 12 critical areas of concern including women in power and decision-making, declaring that the “improvement of women’s social, economic and political status is essential for the achievement of both transparent and accountable government and administration and sustainable development in all areas of life.”*
2. World Summit for Social Development and the Copenhagen Declaration on Social Development. Organized by UN DESA and ECOSOC. Copenhagen (1995) – *this largest gathering of world leaders at the time reached a new consensus on the need to put people at the center of development, stating “democracy and transparent and accountable governance and administration in all sectors of society are indispensable foundations for the realization of social and people-centered sustainable development” and committing to “promote social integration based on the enhancement and protection of all human rights.”*
3. Community of Democracies Conference and the Warsaw Declaration. Warsaw (2000), Seoul (2002), Santiago (2005), Bamako (2007) – *consisting of 107 countries, the opening ministerial conference of the Community of Democracies in Warsaw committed themselves to build on shared principles and goals to promote democracy in all regions of the world and to coordinate policies to enhance the effectiveness of democratic governance. They agreed that “government institutions be transparent, participatory and fully accountable, and take steps to combat corruption.”*
4. “United Nations Conference on anti-corruption measures, good governance and human rights.” UN High Commissioner for Human Rights. Warsaw (2006) - *the conference focused on the impact of corruption on human rights both through the “weakening of institutions and the erosion of public trust in government” and its role in undermining fulfillment of economic and social rights of the most vulnerable and marginalized.*
5. “Expert Group Meeting on Practical Strategies to Promote Social Integration.” UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs. Paris (2007), Helsinki (2008), Accra (2009) – *convened in the context of ECOSOC resolution 2008/19 which decided on “social integration” as the theme for the 2009-2010 review of the Commission for Social Development, these conferences reviewed challenges and opportunities to promoting social inclusion stating that social integration is a “multi-dimensional” process creating conditions conducive to “full and active participation” by*

all members of society, and that responsibility is shared by all of society including the government, private sector, and civil society.

6. “International Conference on Social Inclusion of Women: From Beijing to Post-2015.” United Nations Development Programme. Buenos Aires (2015) – *ten years after the Beijing Program for Action, this conference reflected on persistent and emerging challenges facing women and girls living in poverty around the world and to review actions taken to address women’s poverty and inequality since the adoption of the Beijing Program for Action.*
7. “High-Level Thematic Debate on Promoting Tolerance and Reconciliation: Fostering Peaceful, Inclusive Societies and Countering Violent Extremism.” UN General Assembly. New York (2015) – *the debate discussed practical strategies to counter the threat of radicalization through people-centered and inclusive measures, and the need to address drivers of violent extremism through “renewed focus on good governance, rule of law, sustainable development, respect for human rights, accountable institutions, the equitable delivery of services, the role of youth, women and marginalized and disenfranchised communities, education and inclusivity in the political process.”*

Annex 2: Annotated Bibliography of Selected Relevant Literature.

Reports by the UN and Affiliated Bodies

1. Boutros Boutros-Ghali. An Agenda for Democratization. A/51/761 (1996) - *Few UN documents have made a more explicit case for the UN’s involvement in promoting democratic governance than Boutros Boutros-Ghali’s Agenda for Democratization, a companion to his earlier Agenda for Peace and Agenda for Development. The Secretary-General argued that democratic governance is “inextricably linked” to peace, development, and human rights. In doing so he advanced a norm of democratic governance and argued persuasively for the UN system to become involved in promoting democratic governance.*
2. The World Bank. “World Development Report: The State in a Changing World” (1997) - *a backlash against the Washington Consensus, the strategy focuses on state effectiveness: not less government, but better government, including rules and restraints on public officials and less corruption. The strategy calls for “bringing the state closer to the people,” by allowing those most directly affected by decisions greater participation in making those decisions and by devolving power to the level of government best placed to deal with a problem.*

3. The International Monetary Fund. Guidance Note on “The Role of the IMF in Good Governance” (1997) – recognizes a strong consensus among IMF Executive Directors on the importance of good governance for macroeconomic stability and sustainable growth and sets out a greater commitment to advocating for policies that promote good governance including the rule of law, public sector accountability, and tackling corruption.
4. United Nations Development Programme. “Human Development Report 2002: Deepening Democracy in a Fragmented World” (2002) - a forthright appeal not simply for good governance, but “democratic governance,” the report argues that political participation is part and parcel of human development. It also argues that democratic governance helps to protect the poorest of the poor from economic and political catastrophes via government accountability mechanisms, and can trigger a virtuous cycle of development: political freedom empowers citizens to press for policies that expand opportunities.
5. Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights. “Good Governance Practices for the Protection of Human Rights” (2007) – explores and reinforces via use of case studies the links between good governance and human rights focusing on four areas, namely democratic institutions, the delivery of State services, the rule of law and anti-corruption measures. It argues that good governance reforms to democratic institutions create avenues for participatory policy-making and mechanisms for inclusion of social groups into decision-making.
6. UN Secretary-General Report on “Follow-up to the implementation of the World Summit for Social Development and of the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly.” A/64/157 (2009) – this follow-up to the 1995 World Summit in Copenhagen concluded that “the promise to take action towards social integration remains largely unfilled,” with even greater exclusion as a result of globalization and the economic crisis. This has implications for economic growth as well as peace and stability. It recommended that the UN system “develop a coherent system-wide approach to support national efforts for fostering social integration ... [and] mainstream[ing] social integration objectives.”
7. UN Secretary-General’s Guidance Note on Democracy (2009) - more direct than Agenda for Democratization, this non-binding document lays out a normative framework for UN democracy assistance that is “based on universal principles, norms and standards” and commits the UN to “principled, coherent, and consistent action in support of democracy.” As in Agenda for Democratization, democratic governance is linked to peace and security, development, and human rights.

Resolutions by UN Bodies

1. UN General Assembly Resolution. “Strengthening the role of the United Nations in enhancing periodic and genuine elections and the promotion of democratization.” A/Res/45/150 (1991),

A/Res/46/137 (1992), A/Res/47/138 (1993), A/Res/48/131 (1994), A/Res/49/190 (1995), A/Res/50/185 (1996), A/Res/52/129 (1998), A/Res/54/173 (2000), A/Res/56/159 (2002), A/Res/58/180 (2004), A/Res/60/162 (2006), A/RES/62/150 (2008), A/RES/64/155 (2010), A/RES/66/163 (2012), A/RES/68/164 (2013) - approximately every other year between 1991 and 2013, the UN General Assembly passed a nearly identically-worded resolution that reflects on the need to strengthen democratic processes and increase citizen participation particularly to women and youth, reaffirming that the participation of women “at all levels of decision-making is essential to the achievement of equality, sustainable development, peace and democracy.”

2. UN Human Rights Commission Resolution. “Promotion of the Right to Democracy.” E/CN.4/RES/1999/57 (1999) - affirms a series of rights related to democratic governance including “the right of political participation, including equal opportunity for all citizens to become candidates.”
3. Millennium Development Declaration. UN General Assembly. A/RES/55/2 (2000) - the Millennium Declaration of September 2000 declared “democratic and participatory governance” to be a “fundamental” value for the 21st century, although the eight MDGs that followed failed to codify any concrete action in favor of promoting pluralistic or inclusive government.
4. UN Security Council Resolution 1325. S/RES/1325 (2000) – this landmark resolution on women, peace, and security stresses the importance of women’s equal participation and full involvement in all efforts for the maintenance and promotion of peace and security, specifically women’s representation at decision-making levels in institutions relating to conflict resolution and peace processes.
5. 2005 World Summit Outcome Document. A/RES/60/1 (2005) - this gathering of the UNGA brought together 191 Member States which unanimously declared their commitment to “sound policies, good governance at all levels and the rule of law [and] solid democratic institutions responsive to the needs of the people and improved infrastructure [as] the basis for sustained economic growth, poverty eradication and employment creation.” Included a paragraph whereby the GA reaffirmed that democracy is a “universal value based on the freely expressed will of people” and established the United Nations Democracy Fund (UNDEF) to promote it.
6. UN Human Rights Council Resolution. “The role of good governance in the promotion and protection of human rights.” A/HRC/RES 7/11 (2008), A/HRC/RES/19/20 (2012) – recognizes that good governance is “indispensable” to the full realization of human rights including economic growth, sustainable development, and fighting corruption. Defines “transparent, responsible, accountable and participatory government, responsive to the needs and aspirations of the people, including women and members of vulnerable and marginalized groups” as the foundation on which good governance rests.

7. UN Economic and Social Council Resolution “Promoting Social Integration.” 2010/12 (2010) –*in line with the Copenhagen Declaration, this resolution recognizes the importance of a people-centered framework to development, the importance of political and civic participation as an essential part of promoting social integration, and a need to respond to challenges and threats to social integration and cohesion.*

8. Proposal for the Post-2015 Sustainable Development Goals (2015) - *the outcome document of the post-2015 process includes 17 proposed sustainable development goals for consideration by the General Assembly in September 2015, including Goal 16 on promoting just, peaceful, and inclusive societies. Targets include “developing effective, accountable, and inclusive institutions” and “ensuring responsive, inclusive, participatory, and representative decision-making at all levels.”*

International Treaties

1. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1996) - *an international right to political participation is rooted in a strong legal framework agreed to by more than 160 states which are party to the ICCPR. Article 25 enshrines a right “to vote and to be elected at genuine periodic elections ... guaranteeing the free expression of the will of the electors.” The UN Human Rights Committee, delegated to interpret the ICCPR, clarified in its General Comment 25 that this provision requires, inter alia, access to a free press, freedom of association, the right to form political parties, and access to judicial review.*

Academic Literature

1. Francis Fukuyama. “What is Governance?” Governance. Volume 26 Issue 3 (2013) - *This commentary by the author of “The End of History” highlights the conceptual challenge of defining governance, for which there is very little agreement and for which there exists few empirical measures. It proposes a two-dimensional framework of using capacity and autonomy as a measure of executive branch quality. This framework explains the conundrum of why low-income countries are advised to reduce bureaucratic autonomy while high-income ones seek to increase it.*

2. Sina Odugbemi and Thomas Jacobson. Governance Reform Under Real-World Conditions : Citizens, Stakeholders, and Voice. World Bank. Washington DC (2008) – *This book offers a range of approaches for dealing with the most important nontechnical challenges that prevent many governance reform efforts from being successful or sustainable. It argues that the development community is not lacking the tools needed for technical solutions to governance challenges, but rather difficulties arise when attempts are made to apply what are often excellent technical solutions under real-world conditions. In the real world, reforms will not succeed, and they will certainly not be sustained, without the correct alignment of citizens, stakeholders, and voice.*

3. Pippa Norris. *Making Democratic Governance Work: How Regimes Shape Prosperity, Welfare, and Peace*. Cambridge University Press (2012) – Attempting to combine different theories of governance and development (government-run vs. people-centered), this book advances the argument that both liberal democracy and state capacity need to be strengthened in parallel to ensure effective development, within the constraints posed by structural conditions. Governance capacity is predicted to play a vital role in advancing human security, so that states have the capacity to respond effectively to citizen's demands. The argument is demonstrated using systematic evidence gathered from countries worldwide during recent decades and selected cases.

4. Thomas Carothers. "Democracy Assistance: Political vs. Developmental?" *The Journal of Democracy*. Volume 20, Number 1 (2009) – This short article explains how democracy aid providers are moving away from one-size-fits-all strategies and are adapting their programs to diverse political contexts. Two distinct overall approaches have emerged in response: the "developmental" approach (adopted by Europeans and the UN) focuses on slow, iterative reforms and processes of change centered around improving governance, accountability, and citizen participation, while the "political" approach (adopted principally by the US) focuses on landmark political events such as elections and contestation such as supporting democracy activists.

5. Thomas Carothers and Saskia Brechenmacher. "Accountability, Transparency, Participation, and Inclusion: A New Development Consensus?" *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace* (2014) – This report challenges the increasing use of these four principles by explaining that there is in fact no consensus on their meaning, and that the aid community remains divided over the intrinsic case for incorporating these principles and under what circumstances it should do so. Concepts such as participation and transparency evoke powerful notions of citizen empowerment, yet in practice they are often reduced to consultation mechanisms or exercises in information dissemination that fail to seriously challenge structural inequities in the distribution of power.

6. Gregory H. Fox and Brad Roth. *Democratic Governance and International Law*. Cambridge University Press. June 2000 – In this volume, leading international legal scholars assess this change in international law and ask whether a commitment to democratic governance is consistent with the structure and rules of the United Nations and the international legal system. This book considers how the post-Cold War democratic revolution has affected international law, which traditionally said little about the way in which governments were chosen but is now deployed to encourage transitions to democracy.

7. Ed Connerley and Kent Eaton and Paul Smoke, eds. *Making Decentralization Work: Democracy, Development and Security*, Lynne Rienner Publishers. Boulder, Colorado (2010) – This collection of essays analyzes whether decentralization has actually worked to help a country to deepen

democratic governance, promote economic development, or enhance public security. It asks under what conditions does the mantra of decentralization justify the enthusiasm of those who have pushed so successfully for its adoption?

8. Peter Evans, ed. *State-Society Synergy: Government and Social Capital in Development*. (Berkeley, CA: University of California-Berkeley, 1997) – *The articles in this book attempt to bring two disparate traditions together – the theory that economic success is based on people and “social capital” versus the theory that government and central institutions are drivers of development. It examines the potentially positive role of relations which join state and civil society in shared developmental projects.*

www.icm2016.org