Global Governance

Building on the civil society agenda

Edited by
Álvaro de Vasconcelos

Contributors:

Françoise Bouchet-Saulnier
Radha Kumar
Raffaele Marchetti
Luis Peral
Catherine Wihtol de Wenden
Zhu Liqun

In January 2002 the **Institute for Security Studies (EUISS)** became an autonomous Paris-based agency of the European Union. Following an EU Council Joint Action of 20 July 2001, modified by the Joint Action of 21 December 2006, it is now an integral part of the new structures that will support the further development of the CFSP/CSDP. The Institute's core mission is to provide analyses and recommendations that can be of use and relevance to the formulation of the European security and defence policy. In carrying out that mission, it also acts as an interface between European experts and decision-makers at all levels.

The European Union Institute for Security Studies . Paris

Published by the EU Institute for Security Studies and printed in Condé-sur-Noireau (France) by Corlet Imprimeur, Graphic design by Hanno Ranck.

Global Governance – Building on the civil society agenda

Françoise Bouchet-Saulnier, Radha Kumar, Raffaele Marchetti, Luis Peral, Catherine Wihtol de Wenden, Zhu Liqun

Edited by Álvaro de Vasconcelos

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to all the authors who have contributed to this volume. Some of the chapters in this book were originally drafted as reports based on discussions that took place at the various preliminary seminars that preceded last year's EUISS Annual Conference, 'Building on the civil society agenda', which was held in Paris on 21-22 October 2010. These reports were presented in the Working Groups at the conference, and have been revised and updated since. I would particularly like to thank my research assistant Any Freitas and the EUISS publications department for their work on this project.

Álvaro de Vasconcelos

Paris, November 2011

Institute for Security Studies
European Union
43 avenue du Président Wilson
75775 Paris cedex 16
tel.: +33 (0)1 56 89 19 30
fax: +33 (0)1 56 89 19 31
e-mail: info@iss.europa.eu
www.iss.europa.eu
Director : Álvaro de Vasconcelos

ISBN 978-92-9198-194-6
QN-32-11-946-EN-C
doi:10.2815/25825

Contents

Introduction: Civil society and the global public sphere

Álvaro de Vasconcelos

Civil society organisations have today acquired a new prominence as international actors. Civil society organisations (CSOs), by virtue of their links to citizens and due to the increasingly global nature of their networks, can now claim to give a voice to international public opinion. Because of their unique position they are indispensable partners in multilateral initiatives and are able, to a certain albeit limited extent, to contribute to overcome the democratic deficit of global governance. This democratic deficit is perceived more and more as being reflected in government inattention to the demands of global public opinion. As Raffaele Marchetti argues in his chapter in this volume, civil society plays 'a key role in democracy promotion through the affirmation of human rights' and keeps the political system 'under the pressure of accountability'. However, the reality is more complex, with civil society organisations feeling that the gap between global governance initiatives and international public opinion is widening and with it the democratic deficit.

The creation of a global public sphere is underway and it is becoming increasingly clear that citizens of different countries are developing a sense of belonging to a common humanity. This sense of shared concerns and values is, in the view of many, a demonstration of the existence of a global public opinion. This is of course first and foremost the consequence of the problems that citizens face collectively in a globalised world: the impact of the global economic crisis, rising inequalities, corruption and unfettered financial speculation. It can also be argued that the emergence of this global public opinion can be attributed to the information revolution with the spread of global media and in particular of the internet throughout the planet. This phenomenon has been identified by Jürgen Habermas, who has developed the theory of a global public sphere,[1] which has been fur-

1. The public sphere is defined by Habermas in his book *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* (p.176). In its ideal form, the public sphere generates shared (public) opinions and attitudes which may either support or challenge the management of the state. The 'global public sphere' is the result of an effort to conceptualise a 'public sphere' independent from (or at least not limited to) states and states' structures. See Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1994); 'A Short Reply', *Ratio Juris* no. 12, December 1999, pp. 445–53; *The Post-National Constellation*, edited and translated by Max Pensky (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2001).

ther elaborated by other thinkers[2] in the context of global governance. In this context, what is the role of CSOs in bringing us closer to citizens in order that, through dialogue, they can 'articulate the needs of society'[3] at national but also at international level?

The wave of democratic uprisings that has swept the Arab world this year is a good example of the emergence of a global public sphere where political debates and the quest for solutions are no longer national but global. The impact of the democratic revolution in Tunisia resonated all over the world, first and foremost in North Africa and the Middle East. Young (and indeed older) activists shared their grievances and exchanged views and information in cyberspace, extending the political debate to the entire region. In Cairo the revolution was fuelled by the conversations and interaction of young Egyptians with activists in Tunisia facilitated by the new social media. These conversations spread well beyond North Africa to Sub-Saharan Africa, contributing to the spread of the movement to Europe with the emergence of the *indignados*, but also to China and India. As in Egypt or Tunisia, the same sense of indignation was shared and articulated by young social activists through Facebook, Twitter or Weibo, the Chinese micro blog. The demands aired by these activists are similar and very close to those put forward by CSOs over the years. This is certainly the case with the human rights organisations in the Arab world and the various networks they have created. Some of these networks have a pan-Arab or Mediterranean dimension, and in some cases a Euro-Mediterranean dimension as for example the Euro-Med human rights network or the Euro-Med Civil Society Platform, or the Ligue des droits de l'homme which played a critical role in the Tunisian revolution. There have been a growing number of initiatives across the Arab world bringing together human right activists over the past decade. In 2006 in Meknes in Morocco a seminar on civil society and human rights, organised with the support of the European Commission, brought together activists from CSOs all over the Arab world including from the fiercely repressive regimes of Tunisia and Syria. This was an indication of the extent to which civil society activists were losing fear and contributing to the formation of a pan-Arab democratic public opinion, which regimes were no longer able to suppress.

Civil society organisations are thus contributing to the global dialogue on key issues. This global dialogue is shaping a global public sphere able to consensually forge common answers to global problems not just in the domain of democratic rights but also with regard to a number of other global issues.

---

2. See, for example, Manuel Castells, 'The New Public Sphere: Global Civil Society, Communication Networks, and Global Governance', *Annals*, American Academy of Political and Social Science, vol. 616, no.1, March 2008, pp 78-93; Patrizia Nanz and Jens Steffek, 'Global Governance, Participation and the Public Sphere', *Government and Opposition*, vol. 39, no. 2, 2004, pp 314-35; James Bohman, 'International Regimes and Democratic Governance: Political Equality and Influence in Global Institutions', *International Affairs*, vol. 75, no. 3, July 1999, pp. 499–513.

3. See Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, op. cit. in note 1.

The conversation conducted within international civil society and through social networks takes place in parallel to that conducted among governments and officials at the bilateral and multilateral level, but the two increasingly intersect and networks of civil servants also contribute in their way to an emerging public space. The key question is what is the impact of the delegation of state functions to non-state actors on the independence and autonomy of CSOs?

The role of civil society as a counterweight to the state is challenged by the interdependence between civil society and governments as well as by the fact that civil society organisations are increasingly assuming the roles traditionally performed by the state as part of the trend towards the diffusion of power from state to non-state actors accompanied by increasing privatisation. A consequence of this is the fact that CSOs may lose their autonomy, due to their dependence on grants and subsidies provided by governments and international institutions. As Raffaele Marchetti points out, 'there is a danger that some CSOs may find themselves being used instrumentally to facilitate top-down representation of specific interests or for service delivery of specific goods.'

There is today a growing recognition of the crucial importance of non-state actors in dealing with global challenges, as demonstrated for example by the role of the Gates Foundation on health and other development issues. Such actors are today the indispensable interlocutors of global governance initiatives such as the G20.[4]

CSOs today perform a critical role in delivering services where there is a governance gap, whether at national or global level. This is certainly the case in the areas of humanitarian assistance and peacebuilding. These two areas where international CSOs act as contributors of public goods also illustrate the dilemmas they face and the dangers of co-optation. CSOs often undertake humanitarian relief activities in very difficult circumstances where maintaining the autonomy and independence of civil society organisations is essential and the effectiveness of their action may be undermined by their association with foreign powers that are perceived negatively in some regions. This has even more detrimental repercussions if they are perceived as part of a hostile strategy with a military dimension. As Françoise Bouchet-Saulnier points out in her chapter, the danger in such situations is that 'humanitarian action is integrated into broader measures for winning back territory, stabilisation and reconstruction. Humanitarian action is no longer an aim in itself; it is a tool used to achieve a different goal ... These integrated intervention systems are problematic because they can be perceived as breaching the principle of impartiality or neutrality'. The inherent risk in such situations, where the state integrates

4. See *Innovation with Impact: Financing 21st Century Development*, A report by Bill Gates to G-20 leaders, Cannes, November 2011. Available at: http://www.thegatesnotes.com/Topics/Development/G20-Report-Innovation-with-Impact.

military operations with humanitarian aid, is that the latter is no longer seen as neutral by the affected community. Such integration makes the acceptance of humanitarian action by the local community more difficult.

Civil society organisations, as the Brazilian sociologist Renato Janine Ribeiro has written, are 'institutions which owe their legitimacy to their activities. If they benefit the groups for whose good they work, they will be respected – and legitimate. If they do not do so, they will not be respected. But above all they do not have to be authorised by the state. Their authority derives from their actions. These must have a strong moral content.'[5]

However the effectiveness of civil society organisations in a number of fields depends on interaction with officials mainly at the international level and this is particularly the case in relation to peacebuilding. As in many cases the lack of communication between governments and civil society is one of the reasons for the lack of effective preventive strategies; improved interaction between governments and CSOs can certainly lead to a better understanding of the causes of a conflict and the identification of better ways to deal with it. Partnerships between national governments and civil society are often very difficult in situations of conflict. In consequence, as Radha Kumar highlights in her chapter, 'partnerships between governments and civil society are stronger at the international and/or regional level than at the national level. Paradoxically, many peace missions find it easier to establish cooperation with local civil society than with national governments, leading to further fragmentation of political and delivery mechanisms. In effect, state-building remains the key to effective civil society participation.'

The dilemma of the needs of autonomy and of cooperation is particularly acute in the context of humanitarian operations in countries at war, as in the case of Afghanistan, when the legitimacy of the foreign military intervention is challenged by large sectors of the population. In this context the creation of local civil society is, as Luis Peral argues in his chapter, clearly needed in post-conflict situations, but this cannot be done by external actors and it often take years to develop. Furthermore, tensions between local actors often hinder the process. As Peral points out, 'the trend of international and local civil society organisations filling gaps in governance does not help build state institutions and may in fact contribute to prolonging or even perpetuating the weakness of the state in the aftermath of the conflict.'

A new challenge to the autonomy of civil society is the fact that the power of civil society organisations is today considered to be part of the influence of states and therefore as an intrinsic component of what is called 'soft power' or, to use the new American diplomacy

5. Renato Janine Ribeiro, 'Brazil: society is a many-splendored thing', unpublished paper, EUISS, November 2011.

formula, 'smart power'. In China the debate on the role of civil society in the nation's soft power is growing and may shape the functions and freedom of manoeuvre of Chinese civil society actors in the future.

In both China and India, the two rising powers that will be at the centre of the global economy and international politics in the coming decades, the question of civil society organisations is also becoming an important issue with the emergence of a very large middle class eager to participate in public life and to contribute to the creation of a national public sphere. However, as yet civil society organisations in China and India make little impact in the wider international arena. In China the rising middle class that has emerged as a consequence of China's economic growth is becoming more powerful and more vocal, in particular on environmental issues. As Zhu Liqun writes, however, 'Chinese CSOs are far from sufficiently developed in terms of density, financial strength and autonomy', adding that their development 'is also far from mature in terms of depth and degree of participation, diversification and availability of resources for the CSOs ... Even when these resources are plentiful, often they are not channeled towards CSOs'.

In India civil society is being integrated into the government's strategic thinking, in particular in relation to peacebuilding; according to Radha Kumar, this is the case in Afghanistan, with a focus on 'human resource development and civil society institution building (media, women's self-employment)'.

In Brazil, in contrast, civil society organisations are very active not just at the national but also at the international level, in particular in relation to the issue of proposing alternative approaches to development. The World Social Forum at Porto Alegre is an example of the activism of the Brazilian civil society and of its global outreach.[6] It is also an example of a successful cooperation between CSOs and officials in developing not only an initiative but also a new vision of globalisation which they call a 'counter hegemonic' perspective.

CSOs play a critical role in some important social areas, and this is certainly the case with regard to migration issues where they have developed their own autonomous perspective even if they have been assuming functions that governments should fulfil. Ac-

6. The first World Social Forum was held from 25 January to 30 January 2001 in Porto Alegre, Brazil, organised by several CSOs from Brazil and abroad, and sponsored by the city of Porto Alegre which is governed by the Brazilian Worker's Party (PT). While this first WSF was focused on gathering 'anti-globalisation' institutions from all over the world and make them come together for the first time, subsequent meetings have rather focused on specific mechanisms to 'counter neoliberalism'. The WSF have been considered by many specialists as a 'physical manifestation' of global civil society, since it brings together non-governmental organisations, advocacy campaigns as well as formal and informal social movements seeking international solidarity.

cording to Catherine Wihtol de Wenden, international migration is one of the biggest challenges of the twenty-first century: 240 million people migrate between countries every year. This phenomenon will increase, given that the causes of migration, such as development inequalities and political crises, are not likely to disappear. Furthermore, new factors encouraging migration have emerged: a key element is global warming and its attendant environmental risks; climate experts estimate that up to 150 million people will migrate for environmental reasons before 2050. In different parts of the world, CSOs have been assuming an increasingly important role in the area, often acting as a 'counter power' to states' restrictive policies and political orientations. On many occasions, more than simply counter-balancing the state, civil society organisations have actually become *de facto* substitutes of the state, particularly in areas in which governmental action and institutions have proved either poor or inexistent. The provision of health care, education and housing, as well as different services related to migrants' integration, are good examples of the fields in which NGOs have been particularly active – either in cooperation with or totally replacing the state. Civil society institutions have moreover a crucial *advocacy role*, lobbying for both policy improvements and normative changes. Acting as 'pressure groups', these non-governmental structures have thus been trying to influence the formulation and implementation of 'fairer' immigration and integration policies. At a more symbolic level, they have also been pushing for a change in the way in which migrants are perceived, stressing, for instance, the positive impact of migration on host societies.[7]

There is a clear need to define the place and role of civil society in the public sphere and assure its independence: only by preserving their autonomy can CSOs aspire to be the voice of global public opinion and make an effective contribution to overcome the global and national government deficit. The concept of European civil society is today well-established, as are the notions of pluralism and autonomy. [8] Other global players should make a similar commitment to preserving the independence of CSOs and at the same time take steps towards building the necessary partnerships. Such a recognition of the dangers of co-optation is a pre-condition for a more open and fruitful dialogue between CSOs and international organisations on global governance issues.

As Frédéric Roussel emphasised at the 2010 EUISS Annual Conference, [9] there is a need for a strategic dialogue between the European Union and CSOs in order to better shape

7. See Any Correia Freitas, *Redefining Nations: Nationhood and Immigration in Italy and Spain*, Ph.D thesis, European University Institute, Florence, July 2010.

8. See Sabine Saurugger, '"Organised civil society" as a legitimate partner in the European Union', CERI, Paris, May 2007. Available at: http://www.ceri-sciencespo.com/archive/mai07/art_ss.pdf.

9. Frédéric Roussel, Development Director and co-founder, ACTED, intervention during the 2020 EUISS Annual Conference, 'Building on the civil society agenda', Paris, October 2010.

the priorities of the Union in most of its spheres of activity. In a world where civil society is bound to play an even greater role in the years to come, the European Union is well-placed to encourage global initiatives like the G20 to establish a dialogue with civil society organisations, as a component of the EU's stated objective of finding effective multilateral solutions to global challenges.

Part I
The multiple roles of civil society

1. The role of civil society in global governance

Raffaele Marchetti

This chapter is based on a report originally derived from the joint seminar on 'Civil Society's Role in Global Governance', which was held in Brussels on 1 October 2010 and organised by the EUISS, the European Commission/DG Research and UNU-CRIS.

The conditions for the presence of civil society in the global system

It is now widely recognised that global or transnational civil society plays a significant role in global governance. In the last 30 years, and especially after the end of the Cold War, the presence of civil society organisations (CSOs) in international affairs has become increasingly relevant. They have played a role in agenda setting, international law-making and governance, transnational diplomacy (tracks II and III), and the implementation and monitoring of a number of crucial global issues ranging from trade to development and poverty reduction, from democratic governance to human rights, from peace to the environment, and from security to the information society. CSOs have thus been significant international actors as advocates for policy solutions, service providers, knowledge brokers, or simply watchdogs and monitors of state and intergovernmental actions.

This global activism has taken place within a particular political constellation produced by the combination of institutional backing, socio-economic processes, technological innovation and the dominance of a specific political ideology among other elements.

A number of international organisations have supported the inclusion of civil society actors within international decision-making. The UN has actively promoted cooperation with civil society in global governance, especially in relation to the world summits which have provided a forum for global civil encounters to occur. The European Union has followed a similar approach by integrating different types of civil society organisations within its governance mechanisms.

The globalisation process has generated a sense of common purpose among civil society actors, and has thus been a trigger for both internal unification, increasing the sense of

solidarity among civil society organisations, and for contestation of the socio-economic consequences of globalisation. The ascendancy of neo-liberal socio-economic policies over the past two decades has provoked a strong political response from very different sectors of civil society, especially in the wake of the global financial crisis. For the first time, a number of *ad hoc* coalitions and campaigns have been organised on a trans-ideological basis, going beyond the traditional political barriers of previous forms of mobilisation, and targeting a number of controversial (mainly economic) aspects of globalisation.

The technological innovations in the IT field have revolutionised the organisational patterns within civil society. Through the internet, groups from different parts of the world have been able to familiarise themselves with other political realities, like-minded organisations and alternative forms of action. In this way, they have been able to increase their political know-how and their ability to join forces trans-nationally in addressing common targets.

Finally, the wider international system, based as it is primarily on liberal Western principles, has offered a conducive environment for these kinds of activities to develop. The widespread recognition of the transnational value of human rights, civic participation, accountability, social empowerment and gender equality have enhanced the possibilities for civil society organisations to gain space and legitimacy in the international system beyond the traditional framework of state-based representation.

In sum, the recent increased presence of civil society in international affairs can be seen to be characterised by two main aspects. First, civil society organisations have played a key role in democracy promotion through the affirmation of human rights. In line with the liberal assumption according to which a truly democratic system can only come about through the involvement of an effective and lively public opinion, which provides input into the political system and keeps it under the pressure of accountability, civil society actors have provided an increasingly recognised bottom-up contribution to the legitimacy of the international system. Second, civil society organisations have also played a role in service delivery. In the last few decades states have played a diminishing role as service providers both domestically and internationally, leading to the 'privatisation' of world politics. Within this context, seemingly 'technical' and 'apolitical' civil society organisations have flourished both locally and trans-nationally.

The specific political constellation that has facilitated the growth and consolidation of civil activism at the international level may help in understanding not only the origins of this phenomenon, but also in deciphering the contours of any future development of global civil society's role. If the support of international institutions diminishes, if

the globalisation process becomes constrained by nationalistic policies, if technological innovations remain compartmentalised, and finally if the international system turns towards rigid state-centrism and evolves into a *realpolitik*-dominated multipolar system (thereby including forms of regionalisation), then the conditions for the transnational flourishing of civil society may fade away, and activists may find themselves under pressure to find alternative forms of political action that are more suitable to this new scenario.

Challenges and opportunities for civil society in global governance

Both the service-delivery and democracy-enhancing functions of civil society at the international level are politically significant. However in what follows the focus is on the latter, since it arguably prefigures political innovation of greater significance.

In the age of global transformation, traditional intergovernmental institutions have struggled to provide effective and legitimate responses to global issues such as: climate change, financial instability, disease epidemics, intercultural violence, arbitrary inequalities, etc. As a response to these shortcomings, forms of multi-level, stakeholder governance have been recently established, in which a combination of public and private actors is present. While this has increased the effectiveness of such civil society actors, their degree of legitimacy is still questioned.

Civil society action at the international level is predominantly focused on building a new conceptual and political framework within which the democratic accountability of decision-making processes, within global governance arrangements, can be legitimately demanded. This is ultimately due to the simple fact that accountability can only exist after a framework for it has been built.

At present most global governance bodies arguably suffer from accountability deficits. These agencies lack the traditional formal mechanisms of democratic accountability that are found in nation-states, such as popularly elected leaders, parliamentary oversight, and non-partisan courts. Instead, the executive councils of global regulatory bodies are mainly composed of bureaucrats who are far removed from the situations that are directly affected by the decisions they take. People in peripheral geographical areas and in marginalised strata of society are especially deprived of recognition, voice and influence in most contexts of global governance as it is currently practised. An apt depiction of such an international system is to describe it as one centred on the idea of 'transnational exclusion'.

One possible response to this exclusionary situation characterised by poor forms of accountability is to promote civil society engagement in global governance. Indeed, in recent decades most global regulatory bodies have begun to develop closer relations with civil society organisations (see, for instance, the European Economic and Social Committee of the EU or, more recently, the newly established Committee on World Food Security within the Food and Agriculture Organisation). While the role of civil society organisations in these contexts remains predominantly based on a consultative status, they still allow for the exercise of various forms of 'soft power' by CSOs. The emerging context of global governance has thus provided a number of new opportunities for civil society. Given that they need to balance their deeper impact on societies with greater legitimacy, global governance institutions have been under pressure to be more inclusive and attentive to the political demands coming from below. Thanks to such dynamics, civil society actors have managed to have increased access to international agenda-setting, decision-making, monitoring and implementation of global issues.

At the same time, the challenge to the inclusion of civil society actors in global governance mechanisms is never-ending. New institutional structures are continuously emerging and the challenge in terms of integration is accordingly constantly being renewed. New institutional filters are created and civil society actors need to constantly re-focus and adapt to new circumstances. An example is provided by the recent shift from the G-8 to the G-20 format. Here it can be noted that civil society activists are lagging behind. While activism around the G-8 was intense, the meetings of the G-20 have only recently attracted increasing attention from civil society actors.

Main features of transnational activism

In the last two decades, civil society has been an increasingly active player in global issues. Its role – long confined to a national dimension – has expanded through growing cross-border activism, the rise of permanent transnational networks and global 'epistemic communities', leading to major campaigns that have often influenced the outcomes of decision-making on global issues.

Within global activism, transnational networks are crucial political actors. Transnational networks play a major role in terms of the aggregation of social forces and the development of common identities. While embedded in global social movements, they provide political innovation in terms of conceptualisation, organisational forms, communication, political skills and concrete projects to the broad archipelago of activism.

In the last two decades, cross-border networks of civil society organisations have been the most typical actor promoting political and economic change on global issues. Typical examples of transnational networks active on global justice issues include Our World Is Not for Sale (OWINFS), which has a global reach on trade issues; Via Campesina, with a global, South-based perspective on agricultural issues; Attac, a global network of national associations addressing finance and economic policy; Jubilee 2000 and Jubilee South constituting global networks on debt issues; the various women's networks active on human rights issues. People's Global Action (PGA), an informal network of grassroots activists, but also the International Committee that organises the World Social Forum (WSF) can be considered as a global network engaged in making the largest gathering of global social movements possible every year. Similar transnational networks have emerged in the fields of human rights (such as the campaign to create the International Criminal Court), human security and disarmament (from landmines to small arms), environmental issues, and many other global themes.

Transnational networks are usually characterised by their advocacy of the promotion of normative change in politics, which they pursue through the use of transnational campaigns. Many of these campaigns have had some success in influencing policy on global issues. Major examples are the efforts for the establishment of the International Criminal Court (ICC) (1995), which led to the approval of the Rome statute (1998); the Jubilee campaign on Third World debt (1996), which induced creditor governments and the International Monetary Fund to take some steps toward debt relief for highly indebted poor countries; the international campaigns to ban landmines (1992), which led to the intergovernmental conference in Ottawa where the Mine Ban Treaty was signed (1997). Beyond campaigns, however, transnational networks may also conduct alternative practices – such as solidarity actions or fair trade – that are largely separated from the spheres of global politics and the global economy.

While ultimately converging on almost universal values, the ongoing debates regarding principles (often indeed leading to tensions) within transnational civil society organisations, and especially networks, is crucial in defining their identity. In particular, the normative component of these kinds of organisations illustrates a dual and reciprocal dynamics, in which universal principles encounter values and norms generated from below, resulting in an unpredictable and creative normative combination. Transnational networks foster a number of fundamental principles which, despite having originated in a specific cultural context, can be shared by culturally diverse actors. These principles typically include equality, justice, peace, human rights, autonomy and environmental protection. Alongside these fundamental principles, value pluralism is expressed by the differing norms emerging from below, from grassroots movements,

which serve as sources of credibility for the project of normative persuasion advanced by transnational networks.

At the core of the dynamics leading to the emergence and operation of transnational activism resides the perception of the possibility of change in one specific global issue area. This possibility might be due either to the 'discovery' of a new issue as significant, or to the re-interpretation of a long-standing issue in a different way. Ultimately a key component of transnational activism in global governance lies exactly in its stubborn attempt to influence the normative battle on the right and legitimate interpretation of key global issues. In this perspective, CSOs should be seen not only as traditionally problem solvers (providing solutions which governments are less suited to delivering), but also as 'problem generators' (imposing new problematic issues on the international agenda). While the perception of an unjust situation necessarily constitutes a precondition for action, it is only when the actor recognises the possibility of having a positive impact on such a situation that mobilisation may start. Two elements are necessary for such mobilisation: conceptualisation and political commitment.

Transnational mobilisation on global issues should be interpreted as the result of several steps. A crucial challenge for any transnational network is the ability to present the issue at stake in such a way that it is perceived as problematic, urgent and yet soluble. The first step in cross-border mobilisations is therefore the production of knowledge and the creation of frames through which the issue at stake can be correctly interpreted.

A second step consists in the external dissemination and strategic use of such knowledge. This is the crucial stage for it is here that information acquires a fully public dimension, thus a political significance. Global public opinion needs to be attracted and its imagination captured for framing the terms of the conflict in such a way that the issue at stake becomes the focus of a general interest which requires a public engagement. Often, when networks become active players in the 'epistemic communities' of experts on global issues, they tend to be perceived by public opinion as credible sources of information and this increases their influence on policy-making.

However, in order to promote change a third step is necessary in terms of the acquisition of legitimate representation of the general interests at stake. Contrasting the situation of international affairs in which states monopolise power and social actors are structurally excluded, the task consists here in the appropriation of a recognised role in the public sphere, as rightful advocates of general interests.

Political circumstances facilitating transnational civil mobilisation

The global political opportunity structure within which transnational activism operates is complex and multilayered. While the issues that motivate the mobilisation can be ultimately global (though very often mediated by national or local dimensions), the successful outcome of mobilisations is rooted in overlapping national and transnational domains of political action. While success necessarily depends on international circumstances, national conditions often play an important role in the rise of global social movements.

In national contexts, civil society organisations are rooted in a thick web of social relations and common identities, have access to important resources (human, financial, etc.), but operate in highly formalised political systems that shape and constrain their mobilisation and impact through a number of political filters. While democratic countries tend to leave more space for activism, in countries ruled by other kinds of regimes activists' room for manoeuvre may be severely limited, consequently affecting their ability to take an active part in global or transnational mobilisations.

Conversely, at the global transnational level the lack of a rigid, well-defined institutional setting similar to the national one and the failure to address global problems widens the options for political action. In different ways, international organisations such as the United Nations or the European Union may provide opportunities for creating political spaces and mobilising resources to the advantage of transnational networks and national activism. This notwithstanding a number of major obstacles that activists face in building up cross-border relationships among organisations with different cultures and languages, and with limited resources.

In fact, transnational networks may contribute to expand the political opportunities that are present in national contexts; they often serve as facilitators for providing space to actors who are usually voiceless and excluded. Transnational networks can also amplify local voices through global 'bridges' and 'boomerangs', setting them in the context of global issues and policies, and in this way provide greater strength to local or national activism. At the global level, transnational networks can provide 'discursive representation' to global interests that remain unrepresented in the political system.

In the more fluid space of global politics, the wider opportunities for political action may lead to transnational networks deploying a variety of strategies. When there is a low degree of conflict and institutional alliances are possible, 'vertical, cross-cutting coalitions'

on selected global issues may emerge. In these, civil society organisations may cooperate, or at least establish a dialogue, with particular supranational organisations and with some 'progressive' governments or regional bodies (as in the cases of the International Criminal Court, landmines, child labour, or the Cancun WTO conference). When conflict is strong, on the other hand, it can be easily directed to the highest level, to the core of global decision-making (as in the case of G-8 protests), with a highly visible and effective challenge. In both cases, the results are greater opportunities for transnational networks to emerge as a legitimate and authoritative voice for global interests, extending their impact on public opinion and on civil society organisations interested in joining transnational networks and mobilisations.

The global unevenness of civil society

The past few decades have witnessed, as argued above, a robust development of civil societies across the whole globe, not only at the local and national levels, but also at the transnational level. This process, nevertheless, is far from homogenous, as civil society's development is inescapably intertwined with such local factors as the socio-economic *status quo*, history, tradition and ideology. For this very reason, the development of civil societies across the globe is not only uneven, but also multifaceted and diverse, in that the *modus operandi* of civil society's development may not be easily replicable across national, regional or cultural boundaries.

The spread of civil society and its active participation in global or transnational forms of mobilisation is thus still uneven. In the last few decades, most transnational activism has come from Western organisations, with significant exceptions in Latin America and south-east Asia. If we look at a map of transnational activism, we may easily note that the Western civil society organisations are intensely and transnationally linked among each other, with significant linkages to organisations in Latin America and a few countries in south-east Asia. Other parts of the world, however, are still socially disconnected. Russia, China, most of Africa, and the Arab world constitute islands which remain relatively isolated from the overall trend of growth of transnational civil society (This remains true also with reference to the Arab Spring, which was notably characterised by a lack of transnational civil networks able to cross the borders of the Muslim world). While this also accounts for the quality and quantity of the results yielded by transnational activism (e.g., not all constituencies have been affected in the same way), this uneven participation damages the credibility of such activism as a genuinely global movement that is able to champion in an inclusive way the real needs of all communities in the world.

The validity of the very concept of civil society is also contested. Some argue that the concept of civil society as a sphere distinct from the family, state and market remains a Western concept that does not apply easily to a non-Western context where the boundaries of these spheres are more blurred. Moreover, the high degree of value pluralism and political visions in the civil domain, and particularly the tension between universalistic approaches and grassroots mobilisation, is sometimes taken as an almost insurmountable barrier to genuine global mobilisation. Following on from this recognition, some even argue that when we discuss civil society in a transnational context we may be referring substantially to different phenomena. While on the surface we may use the same term, 'civil society', socially and politically speaking we might ultimately be referring to very different entities depending on the respective national and cultural contexts. Also, when a single reading of civil society and a single, universalistic approach prevails, then this is inevitably, in the view of some, the product of an hegemonic (mainly Western) position within the world of civil society. When this relativistic and critical stance is adopted, a suggestion is usually advanced in terms of a tolerant attitude of listening, as the most favorable way of facilitating cultural and political encounters on a genuinely egalitarian basis.

Legitimacy in-between autonomy and cooptation

The long-standing dispute on the legitimacy of civil actors constitutes a major issue in transnational activism. While it is clear that civil society organisations cannot aim at substituting the traditional channels of political representation, it is also recognised that they often play a key role in 'broadcasting' needs and aspirations that struggle to be included in the political agenda.

From the activist perspective the issue of political representation should not be interpreted as an answer to the question of *who* they represent, but rather *what* they aim to represent. The issues they tackle and the values they seek to uphold are crucial from their perspective, possibly more than their 'constituencies'. Civil society organisations usually claim to advance the public interest. While it is evidently not clear what the public interest is with regard to many specific global issues, the ambition of civil society is, as argued above, to contribute, within the normative battlefield of global public opinion, to the right interpretation of what constitutes the public interest.

The contribution of civil society actors in terms of legitimacy enhancement at the international level is increasingly recognised. Following a broad liberal paradigm, international organisations, national states and the wider society tend to assume that an increased participation of civil society and stakeholder actors at large in global governance helps to increase its legitimacy. This result is *de facto* better achieved when the autonomy of civil

society is preserved and an effective channel for communicating the grassroots political claims is established through these actors. Here a distinction should be made between two types of civil society organisations that have a very different attitude towards political institutions. On the one hand, there are the international, professional NGOs that tend to favour institution-related activities such as lobbying or public advocacy. These CSOs aim to improve the legitimacy of the global governance organisations through a reformist approach. On the other there are the more locally rooted CSOs or social movement organisations that might coalesce through transnational networks and tend to prefer more direct forms of action and contestation. These CSOs aims to radically contest and change the nature and form of the international institutional system through a contentious approach. For these reasons, these two kinds of civil society organisations do not always mobilise in unison.

Two negative aspects of international activism should, however, be noted: cooptation and 'ostracisation', as examples respectively of full inclusion/integration into or full exclusion from the political system. On the one hand, the risk of cooptation by the institutional system is always high for civil society organisations. They need financial resources, public recognition and political support, all of which are usually provided or facilitated by the political system. At the same time, the political system may take advantage of the fragmentation and proliferation of CSOs by picking and choosing on the basis of political convenience those groups who are most inclined to cooperate by adopting the current political agenda. In this way, there is a danger that some CSOs may find themselves being used instrumentally to facilitate top-down representation of specific interests or for service delivery of specific goods. The frequently discussed case of government-owned NGOs (GONGOs) illustrates here the extreme situation of full cooptation and integration into the political system. On the other hand, the issue of violence and resistance at large to the overall political system remains a controversial point, which heavily depends on the political interpretations of such attitudes. From radical antagonism to radical nationalism (not to mention criminal groups), those who have taken an oppositional stand to institutional politics have often being criminalised and marginalised from the political system.

The impact of civil society in terms of the democratic accountability of global governance

Ultimately the role of civil society in global governance has to be assessed, as for any other political actor, with reference to its impact. More specifically in relation to the focus of this report, the dimension of this impact under scrutiny is the ability to promote the democratic accountability of global governance institutions.

Over recent decades civil society activities have, arguably, generated a number of important contributions in terms of increased accountability in the global governance arena. While this is still far from constituting a decisive move towards a comprehensive democratisation of world politics, these incremental steps should not be underestimated.

At least two kinds of impact can be identified. On the one hand, CSOs have managed to influence political decision-makers by giving voice to the voiceless and framing new issues. On the other, CSOs have also managed to pressurise global governance institutions so that today the overall level of transparency, consultation, outside evaluation, efficiency and probity is definitely higher than it was two decades ago. Such results cannot be attributed solely to civil society, but they have been achieved undoubtedly in part thanks to civil mobilisations. Accordingly, CSOs have had a significant impact on world public opinion (e.g. the Iraq war) and the framing of global issues (e.g. the Tobin tax, the financial crisis), and an influence on deliberative processes (e.g. climate change) and innovative policy actions/tools (e.g. in relation to AIDS, women's issues). At times, they have managed to have an impact though governmental action (e.g. the ICC, landmines, cluster bombs), and more rarely they have impacted directly on the global business community (e.g. blood diamonds, corruption). This said, we need to acknowledge that in absolute terms the impact has been modest and uneven. As much as CSOs are unevenly concentrated in the global North (although a degree of rebalancing has been noticeable in recent years), they have also achieved political results that mirror this geo-political imbalance. The gains achieved by political activism have been mostly in line with the agendas framed in the north and to the benefit of the northern constituencies.

Why is civil society more effective on some issues than on others? Recent studies have shown that greater effectiveness in transnational civil society action is achieved when the following conditions are met:

- the creation of transnational coalitions and networks on specific global issues, with the participation of CSOs from different domains of action, as well as the scientific community and the business world

- the simultaneous use of various forms of actions (public awareness campaigns, protest, lobbying, alternative policies and practices)

- the deployment of a multilayered strategy (i.e., local, national, regional, and global) which parallels the multilevel structure of global governance

- the creation of 'vertical alliances' with UN agencies, like-minded governments, and business actors
- the presence of leadership with charisma, passion, acumen, determination and reflexivity
- the availability of resources in terms of funds, staff, information etc
- the absence (or limited presence) of explicit or implicit institutional obstacles and filters.

Case study I: Civil society and the MDGs

In the negotiations on the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) the recognition and role of civil society has increased over the years both in terms of global public policy formulation and of service delivery at the country level. The new transnational and horizontal organisational formats of civil society actors have challenged the traditional dominance of vertical, intergovernmental politics. This has been possible because a process took place within which states slowly accepted the presence of civil society organisations within the MDG negotiations, a sign that progress was being made towards 'inclusive multilateralism' as forms of intergovernmental decision-making processes that include also non-governmental actors. While in the Millennium Declaration their acceptance was tentative and based on their capacity to realize the UN's goals and programmes, today their presence is taken as a given not only in terms of their service delivery function but also as a full political actor whose partnership is deemed crucial. Such a change in attitude towards civil society has been due to the widespread acknowledgment that multi-stakeholder consultation and participation is key for effective and accountable progress in development through the MDGs. For instance, in the late 1990s former UNSG Kofi Annan called for new 'coalitions for change', constituted by both civil society and private actors and centred on the focal point of the UN.

Despite this, limitations and challenges remain. Just to list a few: civil society participation is still seen as a specific, distinct domain by many UN officials. The increased voice acquired by civil society has not automatically translated into greater accountability. The growth in number of recognised civil society actors within the UN has not necessarily strengthened their capacity to have an impact. The unevenness of the civil society field is problematic, as demonstrated by the fact that well-resourced international NGOs have at times unintentionally marginalised or silenced local voices. The internal accountability of civil society organisations still remains a disputed issue. Finally, the link between the

global level and the country-specific conditions is still too weak and characterised by a top-down approach.

Case study II: Civil society from landmines to global zero

The domain of security challenges has been for some time underestimated as an arena in which civil society can have an influence, in comparison with other fields such as environmental challenges or human rights. And yet there have been impressive successes by civil society actors in the field of security too. While action on Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW), biological weapons, the Geneva Declaration on Armed Violence and Development, and perhaps the 'global zero' anti-nuclear campaign have had a limited influence on global politics, other campaigns such as the campaign to ban anti-personnel landmines, the cluster munitions campaign, and the current work on the Arms Trade Treaty prove that civil society action is indeed able to have a significant impact in this domain too. In such cases, civil society, or rather more specifically NGOs, have been able to exert an effective influence on policy-making at the international level.

In this field, a few factors can be identified as facilitating effective engagement from civil society actors. First, policy uncertainty provides an opportunity for civil society to influence the identification of the scope of the problem and the most promising initiatives. More in general, it gives civil society a chance to frame the issue in a different, innovative way, if not to 'generate' the issue itself by linking it to well-established principles. Second, financial resources are crucial in order to produce effective mobilisation. But these resources are usually provided by a small handful of states. Hence, the third factor – effective partnership with political entrepreneurs – remains crucial, which almost by default excludes the possibility of oppositional or radical campaigns. Fourth, the convergence of a number of activist groups on a single, easy-to-communicate goal remains important, though this might mean that complex, regionally diversified, long-term and important issues will have difficulty emerging as a focal point in global public opinion. The fifth factor is the ability to create cross-cutting coalitions with members active in different fields of action.

Case study III: Civil society and the ecological debt

The environmental field provides another example of civil society success in influencing the agenda and decision-making at the international level. This has been done firstly by generating new ideas, by interpreting reality from a different perspective, and by highlighting issues which were previously overlooked. The issue of the ecological debt provides a good example of this kind of political dynamics activated by a civil mobilisation in partnership with the scientific community.

As a response to the 'accumulation by dispossession', environmental justice organisations (EJOs) have been campaigning for the acknowledgement of the ecological debt since at least 1991. At the 2009 Copenhagen conference of the parties to the Framework Convention on Climate Change, the new world Climate Justice network played a prominent role in the Klima Forum and new crosscutting alliances were equally visible; notably the 'Via Campesina' platform on climate change, arguing that 'sustainable peasant agriculture cools down the Earth'. While we are still far from full acceptance of such a principle, in Copenhagen at least twenty Heads of State or ministers (mainly from southern countries) made explicit reference to such a concept. Some even went as far as to claim the right to receive ecological reparations via compensations. The controversy lies today in the discrepancy between admitting a role in polluting the atmosphere and being assigned with responsibility or even culpability for such an action. Common but differentiated responsibility is an increasingly recognised principle in this regard. It has been calculated that the climate debt owed by Northern to Southern countries amounts to USD 75 billion per year, while the accumulated ecological debt from North to South would be over USD 2 trillion. It is evident that any recognition of historical liability would have significant consequences.

Beyond the specific case of the ecological debt, the overall topic of the environment has turned out to be a crucial issue that today features prominently on the international agenda. Some of the reasons for this increasing impact are related to the nature of environmental issues. On the one hand environmental issues are closely related to energy provision and industrial development, thus closely connected with the core of economic development, and on the other hand the environment is a phenomenon that impacts on the population at large, thus affecting indiscriminately both rich and poor, Northern and Southern citizens. EJOs have successfully managed to place the environmental issue high on the political agenda.

Case study IV: Civil society and human rights

Human rights promotion has traditionally been a key field of action for civil society organisations. Not only has it constituted a specific arena of direct action in the implementation of humanitarian policies, but it has also offered an overarching normative framework for most of the CSOs active at the international and national level. The term 'civil' itself has often been interpreted with reference precisely to the defence of human rights. Human rights activists have played a significant role in both 'human rights delivery' on the ground and human rights advocacy at the institutional and public opinion level. Through independent action and through projects commissioned by national and international organisations, CSOs have managed to secure an effective implementation of human rights policies (from civil and political rights to socio-economic and cultural rights) in many

parts of the world. At the same time, CSOs have had a key impact in the agenda setting of both international and national institutions through their advocacy and promotion of the human rights discourse. A more nuanced approach is however needed when assessing the human rights discourse in world politics. It can also be observed that the space for civil society organisations working on human rights is shrinking in some contexts with restrictive laws being issued or various forms of 'silencing' being practised.

The human rights discourse has steadily evolved and spread all around the world in parallel to the increasingly widespread recognition of the United Nations system and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It is a discourse that historically derives from the West and as such non-Western CSOs have at times been critical of it. Its universalist character has accordingly been criticised for being insufficiently conscious of cultural differences and for contributing to a modernising/Westernising agenda. Moreover, the human rights discourse has at times been interpreted not so much as a genuine political stance, but rather as a mere instrument of propaganda for supporting differing political objectives and as such has been fiercely opposed. This has happened for example in the peacebuilding domain, where controversy relating to the promotion of the human rights agenda has sometimes been fuelled by CSOs. In civil conflict the adoption of the human rights discourse is increasingly frequent, in that it contributes to legitimise the political party that holds it. The trend is such that it is not uncommon to find the apparently paradoxical situation in which two opposing civil organisations deploy the same kind of human rights rhetoric in upholding two conflicting political objectives. Especially in the context of ethno-political conflicts, the instrumental use of the human rights discourse is considered an important political weapon that may have a wide variety of consequences, including conflict securitisation. It is in cases such as these that the politicised nature of human rights emerges with clarity, together with the crucial role of CSOs as actors that decisively contribute to the normative battle for the specific, context-related interpretation of the overall ideal of human rights.

Recommendations

Below are presented a number of recommendations for global governance institutions on how to strengthen civil society participation (likewise, similar recommendations could be formulated for CSOs).

Reforms at the individual level:

- promote charismatic leadership by global governance officials both via people who are driven by passion and long-term commitment and via creative tacticians who

can plot ways through the many institutional and deeper structural hindrances to achieve democratic accountability

- bolster a self-critical reflexivity that keeps global governance officials alert to including groups and perspectives that otherwise tend to be marginalised.

Reforms at the institutional level:

- envisage permanent, easier, and more inclusive structures and mechanisms for civil society participation in institutional decision-making
- counter the tendency to perceive civil society interaction with global governance institutions as a peripheral 'extracurricular' activity
- allocate more funds for relations with CSOs
- develop larger and better-maintained databases of relevant CSOs
- increase the number, quality and seniority of specialist staff for CSO liaison
- give officials greater guidance and training on relations with CSOs
- offer staff clearer and more substantial incentives to engage with civil society
- provide a stronger lead from management to promote relations with CSOs
- cultivate positive institutional attitudes towards civil society
- encourage the participation of small and local CSOs
- differentiate CSOs from other kind of organisations such as business lobbies or consultants.

2. Peacebuilding and the security-development nexus: towards a new role for civil society?

Luis Peral

This chapter derives from a report partly based on discussions held at a seminar on 'Peacebuilding and the Security-Development Nexus' organised by the EUISS in cooperation with the EU delegation to the United Nations and with the support of the Finnish Permanent Representation to the UN in New York in April 2010.

Introduction

Peacebuilding and development are terms that feature recurrently on the contemporary international agenda. Civil society has undeniably played a major role in bringing both concepts to the forefront of international debate, alongside the indispensable contribution of academic work and UN literature. Development aid has been a well-established feature of international cooperation at least since the Marshall Plan was launched by the US in the aftermath of the Second World War, with the number of donors expanding beyond Western countries particularly in the last ten years, and civil society having an increasingly prominent role. Local civil society is particularly crucial in giving content to the principle of national ownership, which – partly thanks to the work of international civil society – has become the primary rule of peacebuilding and thus of development.

The notion of peacebuilding has more recently been highlighted in discussions among international organisations and governments, mainly as a *bridge* between security-humanitarian and development actors in the aftermath of conflict. This perspective allows for understanding the role of local and international civil society in the context of both development and collective security action, in spite of some terminological confusion.[1] Moreover, the UN has developed multi-dimensional integrated operations, and the New Horizons reform agenda

1. As noted by M. Barnett *et al*, the term 'peacebuilding' is being replaced in certain instances with other terms that may or may not have a different meaning in each case, such as '[the civilian dimension of] crisis management', (a term favoured by the EU), 'conflict prevention and management', 'rehabilitation and reconstruction', 'post-conflict recovery', 'stabilisation' (terms used according to the mandates and organisational interests and perceptions of each actor). The US and the UK tend to use the term 'stabilisation' to refer, at least theoretically, to a range of activities that do not differ from those labelled as peacebuilding by the UN. See Michael Barnett, Hunjoon Kim, Madalene O'Donnell and Laura Sitea, 'Peacebuilding: what is in a name?' in *Global Governance*, vol. 13, no. 1, January-March 2007, pp. 35-58.

further elaborates this approach of widening the scope of UN mandates and merging and aligning different components of international operations.[2] As a consequence, the differences between peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding are becoming blurred.

The process has also entailed a realisation of the security dimensions of peacebuilding and, by extension, of development. The current debate on development is concentrated on diminishing contributions of donors, the limited effectiveness of aid as compared to trade or technology transfer, the dilemma of conditionality versus predictability, and the impact on the climate and the environment of the prevailing model of development as it extends to developing and emergent countries. In this context, international civil society has indeed emphasised the interconnections between development and conflict prevention and thus security, as well as between peacebuilding and stability and security, and even between development and the prevention of migration, in order to keep peacebuilding and development high on the agenda.

The fact that in North Africa for example democratic conditionality was not applied before the recent democratic wave due to political and security considerations, particularly in the case of the EU, has been interpreted as lending support to authoritarian regimes in exchange for reducing migratory flows and other security-driven demands. There are good examples of such undesired consequences as well in the realm of peacebuilding, such as those of Bosnia, Sri Lanka and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Energy security or the prevention of migration, which are security concerns of Western and non-Western donors, are often contemplated as covert or even open objectives of development policies, and in the case of Libya also played a role in the launching of the military operation that was nevertheless justified under the principle of the Responsibility to Protect.[3]

The trend towards securitisation in both the peacebuilding and development domains cannot therefore be underestimated. The task of reversing this trend is perhaps the major one facing international civil society after its success in incorporating peacebuilding and development into the international agenda. Today, the risk of civil society organisations being instrumentalised by governments and international security institutions remains high.

2. See main reports of the process at: http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/operations/newhorizon.shtml; see also the 1992 UNSG Report 'An Agenda for Peace: Preventive diplomacy, peacemaking and peace-keeping' and its 1995 'Supplement to an Agenda for Peace'.

3. It should be noted that legitimacy as to the launching of the operation (*ius ad bellum*) does not exclude illegal actions being committed by intervening states during the course of operations (*ius in bello*).

Civil society and the security-development nexus: the risk of securitising peacebuilding

It is peoples and communities, not state-related political actors, who are key to sustaining peace. Civil society is in fact the only sustainable framework within which peoples and communities organise themselves in order to meet this and other challenges, since it incarnates the possibility of genuine participation of the community in governance at the local level. This is in turn a prerequisite for sustainable peace in the aftermath of a conflict and in the process leading to sustainable development.

International civil society is, however, a more restricted concept relating to non-profit groups who are able to develop institutionalised or informal cooperation networks with global governance institutions, or to influence the agenda and policies of these institutions. This sort of 'third UN' – the first and second referring respectively to UN member states as represented by governments and to civil servants working in the UN bureaucracy – is regularly invited today by public actors to express opinions and views, and may successfully introduce certain topics into the global agenda. However, with few exceptions, it can only act in accordance with policies decided by states who are members of international institutions. Despite the trend towards CSOs having a greater voice within the UN system, interaction between states and international NGOs is generic and episodic, as demonstrated by thoughtful analysis of relevant decision-making processes.[4]

In general terms, the recent emphasis on peacebuilding, including participation of local civil society as the crucial dimension of national ownership, as well as on the nexus between security and development, reflects an ongoing demand of international CSOs. It also responds, however, to the realisation by governments and international organisations that (sustainable) peace can ultimately only be achieved by affected communities; i.e., by local civil society. Peacebuilding and development are thus becoming crucially relevant from a security perspective.

As already stated by the President of the UNSC in 2001: 'peacebuilding is aimed at preventing the outbreak, the recurrence or the continuation of armed conflict and therefore encompasses a wide range of political, development, humanitarian and human rights programmes and mechanisms. This requires short and long-term actions tailored to address the particular needs of societies sliding into conflict or emerging from it.'[5] More recently, the Security Council has acknowledged that political stability and security can

4. Nora McKeon, *The United Nations and Civil Society: Legitimating Global Governance –Whose Voice?* (United Nations Research Institute for Social Development/Zed Books, 2009).

5. UN Security Council Presidential Statement, UN doc. S/PRST/2001/5, 20 February 2001.

only be pursued alongside socio-economic development and social inclusion. [6] This entails that security action must be centred on the protection of individuals and groups. It can thus be argued that putting a halt to exclusionary policies or discrimination against minority groups is directly connected to security, which may in turn allow for specific approaches to peacebuilding as the core element/component of international responses to crisis situations. The nexus between security and development appears as a variant of the well-established nexus between security and human rights, now with an emphasis on the socio-economic dimension of rights which also connects with the need for external aid.

International views on peacebuilding have hence evolved in parallel with, and contributed to, an expanded notion of collective security, which is normally referred to as *human security*, and includes economic, political, environmental as well as health-related and other issues as they impact on communities caught in war and conflict situations. This concept of peacebuilding/human security derives from the analysis of the root-causes of conflict and the inter-connections between poverty and conflict or relapse of conflict, and thus corresponds to international civil society actors' insistence that what is needed is a departure from the traditional narrow concept of security. But comprehensive concepts, even if more satisfactory in theory, are not less problematic in practical terms. They are in fact extremely hard to implement, since they entail aligning the views of very heterogeneous local and international actors from the security, humanitarian and development communities as they intervene in crisis situations or influence peacebuilding.

In as much as it aspires to reflect the perspectives of all these different actors, the concept of peacebuilding is necessarily vague and even confusing, while the challenge of operationalising peacebuilding with the participation of all these actors is clearly a daunting one. But, more importantly, considering the primary role of the UN Security Council, the risk of securitisation of international and local civilian activities is high. Critics have warned that the trend towards merging security and development, even more so in the case of peacebuilding, entails a danger of development being instrumentalised and in fact adds a problematic dimension to the relationship between security and development. One of the main questions in this regard is, of course, who is in fact leading the 'comprehensive' operation?

6. UN Security Council Presidential Statement, UN doc S/PRST/2010/7, 16 April 2010, where paragraph 6 reads as follows: 'The Security Council recognizes the importance of pursuing political stability and security, alongside socio-economic development for the consolidation of peace. The Council stresses the importance of delivering early peace dividends, including the provision of basic services, in order to help instil confidence and commitment to the peace process. The Council recognizes that the reintegration of refugees, internally displaced persons and former combatants in coordination with security sector reform and disarmament, demobilization and reintegration should not be seen in isolation, but should be carried out in the context of a broader search for peace, stability and development, with special emphasis on the revival of economic activities. The Council notes, in this regard, that high levels of youth unemployment can be a major challenge to sustainable peacebuilding.' See also Statement of the President of the Security Council, doc. S/PRST/2011/4, 11 February 2011.

In Afghanistan, military leadership of peacebuilding and development activities has in fact overshadowed their human security dimension and thereby jeopardised an integrated approach, which ultimately requires exclusive civilian leadership. As an example, the revelation that areas in which the population was presumably fighting the Taliban would receive more development aid – a departure from the principle that aid should be based on needs – has created grievances in other provinces, and even had negative consequences by leading local authorities in some regions to actually welcome some insurgent activity in order to attract funds. In a more general sense, Western democracies' obsession with stability has also confirmed the security-development nexus by emphasising conflict prevention in different forms.

The prevailing mantra is that it is necessary to help build viable states that respect human rights in order to prevent renewed conflict in the future, as well as mass violence and thus mass exodus. But this approach fails to address the root causes of the problems; – indeed, the emphasis on the end goal (preventing renewed conflict) might be interpreted as a sign of conflict aversion rather than commitment. If a traditional interpretation of security prevails when applying an integrated approach, the mantra will be seen as compatible with supporting those authoritarian regimes that supposedly guarantee 'stability' or prevent 'radicalisation' and terrorism, as we have seen in the Mediterranean during the last few decades.

Peacebuilding and development thus require putting local civil society at the forefront, since its success entirely depends on its direct participation in the process. The challenge for all actors involved, particularly the international ones, is to guarantee and channel such participation while not jeopardising encompassing efforts to build democratic institutions.

Range of activities and the core principle of peacebuilding and development

Peacebuilding is often used as a new label to designate activities that are in fact not so new, all of them related to creating the conditions for peace and development to be sustainable. International organisations, starting with the UN, have given this name to a broad set of activities they have undertaken in the aftermath of internal conflicts over the last three decades, such as implementation of peace agreements, promotion of economic recovery and law enforcement, monitoring elections, reforming and strengthening governmental institutions and security forces in particular, demobilisation and reintegration of ex-combatants, repatriation of refugees, and human rights protection. The latter, obviously, should always be given priority and should initially focus on reversing

exclusionary and discriminatory policies. Such activities very often need to be preceded by a peace agreement, which may include an intermediate power-sharing formula. As the country moves towards sustainable development, emphasis is placed on project-based programmes for fostering economic activity, in spite of the fact that traditional aid models are presently being questioned.

Even more so than in the case of development, the label *peacebuilding* represents a consolidation of the expanding mandates of UN-led and other international operations in line with the liberal – some would say *post-Westphalian* and others *interventionist* – principles of international action. As stated above, the idea of entrenching peace after a conflict with international support has permeated UN activities since its endorsement by Boutros Boutros-Ghali's *Agenda for Peace* in 1992, and has drawn the Security Council's attention as from 2001, partly due to a consistent campaign by international civil society organisations. This approach also allows for incorporating a conflict-prevention dimension in post-conflict action from the outset, since the assumption is that conflict will resume should structural reforms not be undertaken. The question is, however, whose concerns should prevail, those of international actors or of local civil society, and who is ultimately leading and implementing peacebuilding activities. Even if it was originally conceived as a way of legitimising international action, the shift towards national ownership in peacebuilding may help clarify a natural distribution of tasks.

As J. P. Lederach has put it, peacebuilding, or *conflict transformation*, is an ongoing process of change from negative to positive relations, behaviour, attitudes and structures, meant to manage a conflict in all its phases, which should be oriented towards the building of relationships between the actual or potential parties to the conflict. In his analysis, the author proposes a comprehensive framework for peacebuilding, encompassing three sets of activities and corresponding levels of leadership: (i) negotiation, mediation and preventive diplomacy with the participation of elites; (ii) national reconciliation processes, which also entail the establishment of rule of law and legitimate government institutions, and (iii) trauma healing, reconciliation and dispute resolution at the community level, led by civil society including through problem-solving workshops and local peace commissions. [7]

This three-pronged concept of peacebuilding acknowledges the need to restore relationships within society at all different levels, but does not entirely rely on local civil society organisations. It embraces the principle of national ownership, which has emerged as the core principle of peacebuilding and development as a consequence of the failure of exter-

7. John Paul Lederach, *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies* (Washington D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1997).

nally dictated models, but it allows for a certain degree of participation of international actors in each of the three levels, ranging from quite intense in high-level negotiations to practically non-existent at the grassroots level. National ownership is not however a panacea. Effective participation of local populations in peacebuilding is usually under the control of elites, and there is normally no agreement among local actors on the degree of transformation or on the level of international support necessary to ensure that this 'endogenous transformation' takes place. The key here lies in not preventing fundamental change from taking place for the sake of stability, but regrettably the reverse approach has in fact been taken by some if not the majority of international actors in connivance with local elites when designing the process at the negotiating table.

Whereas the imposition of whatever values from the outside is highly unlikely to succeed, much less if militarily imposed, power-sharing mechanisms among local elites are also insufficient. Conflict is transformative and should unleash transformation in a way that limits discrimination and inequalities if prevention of future conflicts is to prevail. A *status quo* approach may in fact serve the interests of those representing a failed social and political model. This is of course connected to the degree of international coalescence with local (generally not democratic) elites, and, ultimately, to who in fact leads the international efforts in favour of a given country. Few external actors are ready to understand that genuine conflict prevention often entails challenging the *status quo*, with the aftermath of conflict offering the opportunity for establishing a more participatory political system and a more just social order under local democratic leadership.

But merely giving prevalence to civil society organisations over the creation of public structures may also be detrimental to sustainable peace. National ownership entails that peacebuilding can only be built by the affected society and will not work if imposed from the outside. The reality is, however, that neither the international community nor the local authorities in the aftermath of conflict are well equipped for ensuring its implementation; and the recourse to civil society in this context may even be counter-productive. The trend of international and local civil society organisations filling gaps in governance does not help build state institutions and may in fact contribute to prolonging or even perpetuating the weakness of the state in the aftermath of the conflict.

Operationalising peacebuilding and development: what role for local civil society?

The solution to the dilemma requires that all actors work simultaneously and harmoniously as close as possible to the level that naturally corresponds to their own sphere, with

the international community temporarily providing those fundamental public services and decisions that cannot be delivered by local authorities, particularly regarding respect of the human rights of all citizens. It is of course possible that peacemaking and humanitarian action can be undertaken by international actors alone for a few weeks or even months, although this should not be the case in the area of peacebuilding and development under any circumstances. The dilemma may be resolved at the early stages of the process only if capable local CSOs contribute to revive local public institutions. In cases of state failure or post-conflict situations in which virtually no state exists, the only alternative is to rely on international and regional institutions and, if at all possible, local civil society actors as a complement of parallel efforts to create public institutions.

It is only very recently that the international community has tried to fill the gaps in the process roughly described above by providing an integrated approach to post-conflict situations. Until 2005 when the UN World Summit created the Peacebuilding Commission, no single institution was mandated with improving international capacity to support transitions towards sustainable peace and link them up to development processes.[8] However, the assessment of its first five years of work is certainly far from satisfactory, as acknowledged in the *Review of the United Nations Peacebuilding Architecture*.[9] The Peacebuilding Commission has neither found a place within the UN system yet nor has it met the expectations of the stakeholders outside the UN system. The *ad hoc* high-level political accompaniment of just a handful of peacebuilding processes that the Commission offers has perhaps been too *ad hoc* and too high-level. In particular, the participation of civil society in its work is limited and formalised, with members of the PBC free to object to certain civil society representatives, and does not entail 'negotiations' of any kind.[10] The current *Roadmap for Actions in 2011*, which is in line with the recommendations of the Review, addresses the problem and advocates a true engagement at the local level.[11]

8. In 2005, in the context of major organisational reform, the UN created the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), comprised of 31 countries selected according to different criteria and quotas, the Peacebuilding Fund, and the Peacebuilding Support Office (joint UNSC and UNGA resolutions 1645 and 60/180). The mandate of the PBC is that of helping to provide an integrated approach to post-conflict situations through facilitating dialogue among key actors, mainly by assisting the affected country in its dialogue with other governments, but not just donors, and international financial institutions. The PBC works in country-specific formations at ambassadorial level – currently on Burundi, Sierra Leone, Guinea-Bissau, the Central African Republic and Liberia – as a peer body offering advice on issues ranging from economic recovery to internal political dialogue in particular cases. Inevitably, the countries under consideration of the Commission have experienced a relative increment of international attention according to UN officials, which may be even considered unfair as regards countries not under its consideration.

9. See: http://www.un.org/ga/president/64/issues/pbc/PBCReport.pdf.

10. See United Nations Peacebuilding Commission, 'Provisional guidelines for the participation of civil society in meetings of the Peacebuilding Commission, submitted by the Chairperson on the basis of informal consultations', UN doc PBC/1/OC/12, 4 June 2007.

11. UN member states seem to be mainly concerned with the relationship between the PBC and the Security Council. A significant group of them claimed during the September 2010 UNGA session that this relationship is clarified and strengthened, while simply avoiding referring to other much more important aspects of the PBC mandate. Although it is evident that the strength of the PBC ultimately depends on how it interacts with other UN bodies and other stakeholders, it should not just end up being a New-York based advisory body to the Security Council. This reductionist approach may further contribute to the securitisation of peacebuilding.

Conversely, local civil society can only play its role in an adequate manner by engaging civilian authorities committed to fulfil the goals of peacebuilding and to the principle of non-discrimination. There is thus a need to establish a civilian public administration, which should be provided or complemented by international actors should local actors not be in a position to set it up. Although regional institutions may be preferred, they often lack resources precisely where needs are most acute. Taking Africa as a case in point, the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) and the African Union have developed frameworks for post-conflict reconstruction and development, including institutionalised mediation, but they still lack the necessary resources. The OSCE is well-positioned to temporarily guarantee or complement local administrations, but only in cases where peacemaking has brought about a high degree of stability and recovery.

The examples of temporary international civilian administrations established in Kosovo – with the participation of the EU and the OSCE – and East Timor in 1999 are still the most complete attempts to temporarily substitute for local authorities unwilling or unable to guarantee basic services and basic international principles. International and local civil society cannot play such a role and should not assume it even on a temporary basis. The lack of a concerted international effort to enhance the capacity to temporarily substitute for or to complement the local civilian administration is in fact jeopardising a more decisive participation of local civil society in peacebuilding processes.

The challenge in this sense is twofold: international actors should progressively give way to local actors as soon as the latter are able to create conditions for reconciliation and recovery; and the balance between local public authorities and local civil society participation should be maintained throughout the process. The decisive involvement of all actors in the sequencing, prioritisation and timing is crucial, which again is dependent on the existence of viable and legitimate local or international civilian authorities who can orchestrate a participatory process. The fact that prevailing concepts of peacebuilding and sustainable development are comprehensive and multi-level does not preclude the need to take decisions on which comes first, not only due to the fact that resources are limited, but sometimes also as a principled position – i.e. comprehensive peace agreements anticipate and are often followed immediately by constitutions that have not been properly debated.

Moreover, the dilemma of reconciling scarcity of resources and the prevailing comprehensive approach to peacebuilding, which would allow for any measure not opposing human rights to be adopted, can only be solved by flexible prioritisation. According to most practitioners, planning is necessary but it should never trump the capacity of international actors to deliver, for which flexibility is crucial. An appropriate but supple divi-

sion of labour needs to be established without jeopardising accountability and evaluation, funding mechanisms need to be adapted in order to match mandates and resources, and local authorities should effectively lead the peacebuilding process with full participation of civil society organisations.

The reality is, however, that the consensus on the centrality of local civil society actors has not yet facilitated their involvement in the process. First, the tension between the role of civil society and that of state actors is not resolved, since the former are normally disregarded by the latter including in cases of extreme fragility – the balance is in this case very difficult to strike, and problems can only be exacerbated by the trend whereby civil society organisations increasingly take over functions normally assumed by the state. Second, local civil society is neither neutral nor homogeneous, and reconciling the views of different civil society actors in the aftermath of conflict may prove unfeasible. And, third, in the best case scenario genuine local actors normally lack standardised management and reporting mechanisms, and even basic communication skills with international actors, which makes it very difficult for them to obtain the support that they need in order to influence local authorities.

Conclusions and recommendations

- Peacebuilding is primarily a national challenge and responsibility, but the UN and regional organisations have a critical role to play in triggering, coordinating and channelling international support to the national agenda particularly when there is no capacity at the local level. The peace and security, human rights and humanitarian and development pillars of the UN need to work on the basis of a common vision that privileges national ownership of peacebuilding processes. This also requires that donors commit to multilateralism and further strengthen international and regional capabilities for supporting local actors in the affected countries.

- The fact that the UN Security Council acknowledges that security and stability, including conflict prevention, depend on peacebuilding and sound socio-economic policies does not broaden the concept of security, nor does it widen the UNSC's own mandate. This recognition by the UNSC of linkages between security and peacebuilding in fact calls for strengthening the leading civilian role of the UN in post-conflict situations while providing concerted support to endogenous reconciliation processes with the active participation of local civil society. It should lead, as a first step, to the strengthening of the UN Peacebuilding Commission and its role both within the UN system and on the ground, including the possibility of a field-based country configuration (as opposed to present ambassadorial-level configurations in New York) in all

relevant situations – and not just in a handful of them as it is presently the case. More technical and less political and diplomatic work is needed in this regard, with local actors taking the lead in establishing priorities.

- However, as the case of Libya has again starkly demonstrated, no consistent international and regional efforts are underway to strengthen the civilian dimension of crisis management, which represents a major obstacle to the civilian leadership of international responses to conflict situations. As the differences between peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding are becoming blurred in the new UN doctrine, it seems anomalous that NATO virtually if not entirely leads operations taking place in Afghanistan or Libya. The fact that states seem unwilling to develop international civilian capabilities for crisis management also results in a complete marginalisation of civil society while preventing any meaningful implementation of the principle of national ownership. In the absence of effective civilian authority from the outset, the possibilities of civil society progressively contributing to peacebuilding and development are extremely low.

- The challenge of global governance in this respect is to develop mechanisms so that adequate decisions for sustainable peace and sustainable development can be adopted and implemented in each case while respecting the priorities of the country concerned. The international community should draw from successful experiences and work towards the formulation of flexible and effective models for post-conflict stabilisation and transition, with particular emphasis on non-discriminatory policies – including positive discrimination in favour of fragile communities and compensation for past abuses – in all areas of public action, ranging from access to education to a fair monitored system of exploiting and trading natural resources.

- In the search for a comprehensive, coherent approach to peacebuilding, all national actors should be involved from the outset. Efforts to strengthen, or even create, national administrations are essential, but success in fact depends on civil society, the private sector and local political actors being fully involved in a reconciliation process. The post-crisis period should also constitute an opportunity to address fragility and should allow for establishing the basis for sustainable and equitable socio-economic development. Violent conflict is likely to recur if institution building and reconstruction policies fail to facilitate social cohesion and reconciliation. Genuine peacebuilding in this sense constitutes the most powerful conflict prevention tool.

- The set of activities generally included under the label of peacebuilding should not only be applied in the aftermath of a conflict, but in any situation of fragility char-

acterised by social and political tension, lack of accountability and transparency or control by the military, and particularly in situations where minorities are victims of discrimination. Already in 1976, J. Galtung, in his *Three Approaches to Peace: Peacekeeping, Peacemaking and Peacebuilding*, argued for the creation of structures that 'remove the causes of war and offer alternatives to war in situations where wars might occur.'[12] Only by anticipating peacebuilding – applying peacebuilding techniques designed for post-conflict situations to situations of potential conflict – is it possible to give a more concrete, and perhaps viable, content to the concept of conflict prevention.

- Under no circumstances should nation-building fall under the mandate of the international community, and especially not in situations where international leadership is exercised by military actors. It should be grounded on international human rights and in particular on the principle of non-discrimination against individuals and groups, which entails inclusiveness and social cohesion. The principle of national ownership is however extremely difficult to apply in post-conflict situations. The problem is not only that civil society cannot be 'created' by external actors, or that it takes years for it to develop even when local conditions are favourable. Local actors are normally divided in the aftermath of conflict, and tend to keep grievances and tensions alive. It is thus crucial to work at all levels, not only at the official level, so that reconciliation and sustainable peace can be achieved. The creation of mediation capacities among local civil society organisations in fragile countries may help prevent conflict or its resumption. But this is also an inadequate response: without social policies effectively creating equal conditions for all citizens, groups and communities, conflict and violence will tend to persist and even to amplify.

12. Johan Galtung, 'Three Approaches to Peace: Peacekeeping, Peacemaking, and Peacebuilding', in Johan Galtung (ed.), *Peace, War, and Defense: Essays in Peace Research*, Volume II (Copenhagen: Christian Ejlers 1976), pp. 282-304.

3. Humanitarian crises and international responsibility

Françoise Bouchet-Saulnier

This chapter derives from a report based on discussions that took place during the seminar entitled 'Current Challenges to Humanitarian Action in Conflict Situations' organised by the EUISS in cooperation with the International Committee of the Red Cross in Paris in June 2010.

Introduction

There is often great pressure for consensus in taking concerted action to deal with humanitarian crises, reflecting the seriousness of the stakes at hand. But often such consensus is merely apparent and sometimes masks acute divergences of opinion concerning the differences between private and state humanitarian action, or civil and militarised humanitarian action.

The role of public opinion and civil society performs a powerful rallying function in modern communities characterised by strong social traditions of solidarity and compassion, with injunctions to take action often prompted by media coverage of humanitarian crises and ensuing public outcry. But it should be remembered that the 'do something syndrome' can be counter-productive and even harmful if it does not take account of the complexity of a given situation and proposed intervention and examine the intentions underlying such an intervention. We should not believe, nor lead others to believe, that the good intentions behind an intervention are enough to ensure good results. This is a very important point since 60 percent of aid delivered in the world comes from the European Union which is the major donor in the international community. Of course, securing the support of public opinion is essential in order to be able to respond effectively to humanitarian crises. But it should be noted that both at the political level and collectively the European Union has created unrealistic expectations regarding the provision of aid. Humanitarian aid is often presented in public discourse as extremely straightforward, which it is not..

Right now the expectation of the public is that, if there is an earthquake in a country like Haiti, the EU and NGOs can be there within 24 hours. If there is a conflict, the international humanitarian community can stop the war within three months and rebuild the

country. But in reality of course things are not so simple. There is an urgent need to take a critical look at the overly simplistic content of messages that are communicated by governments and public institutions regarding humanitarian actions. The 'do something syndrome' should not supersede the ethical principle of 'do no harm' when planning and implementing humanitarian action. Upholding this principle is crucial if humanitarian actors are to find the best operational way to balance the imperative of needs with the complex reality of local context.

What is meant by humanitarian crises? The concept of crisis is in a sense not always very clear. Emphasis on crisis enables us to concentrate exclusively on the scale of the needs without judging their cause. Yet analysing the cause is crucial to finding an acceptable and effective way of addressing the needs of populations in crisis situations.

Is the humanitarian crisis a natural disaster situation in which there are only victims, no-one is responsible and a show of support and solidarity by the international community is enough? Or is it a conflict situation whereby actions of solidarity mean working via, through or alongside those responsible for the crisis?

International responsibility can apply to a number of scenarios. Depending on the situation, it can imply:

- responsibility to show solidarity with the government authorities
- responsibility to show solidarity with the victims
- responsibility to defend the international public order, but this may mean going against the government authorities of the country concerned. In such cases, how far should this responsibility extend? Where should it end?

The mass atrocities that occurred in the 1990s are evidence that raising these questions is not a purely intellectual exercise. Consider the genocide in Rwanda and the conflicts in the Former Yugoslavia, Somalia, Iraq, Afghanistan and the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC).

Mass violence and massive food shortages produce regional instability, cross-border population displacements and the insidious spread of armed conflict. In such crisis situations it is therefore important to protect the international public order and to avoid threats to peace and international security by providing relief in conflict zones. This may be done by deploying international armed forces with missions ranging from reducing the intensity of the fighting to observing and fostering peace agreements, limiting the

impact of the conflict on the populations, preparing the way for the arrival of relief, but also, as has happened more recently, deterring and preventing mass crimes and human rights violations.

Concepts such as the Duty to Intervene or the Responsibility to Protect, reinforced in recent times by the appearance of international tribunals, represent attempts to provide a framework and content for a new, deliberately interventionist international diplomacy that is now evident in the humanitarian, military and judicial fields.

There has always been a 'democratic deficit' in the foreign policy of governments and inter-governmental organisations. Now that the opinions of NGOs and Western civil society are solicited on the formulation of these policies, the forum for debate must be opened more widely. This will ensure that public opinion and European civil society rally around sound ethical and humanitarian values rather than disguised power games, vacuous slogans, or worse – cynicism or indifference.

There is still much confusion between the concepts of independent, coordinated, integrated or militarised humanitarian action and this undermines the way humanitarian aid is perceived in the non-Western world.

To sum up, we could say that the United Nations promotes coordinated, streamlined humanitarian action through its 'clusters' mechanism. This mechanism lists a number of key issues or spheres of activity (e.g. water, food, shelter, health, protection) and entrusts the leadership and coordination for each cluster to a different organisation. The primary aim is to make sure that all different needs are taken into consideration and prioritised according to the situation. The second aim is increase the efficiency of international response through clarification of leadership and responsibility. In theory, these clusters ensure better allocation of financial resources and a less arbitrary response by the different relief operators to the populations' needs for assistance and protection.

Some governments and military organisations or coalitions support humanitarian action that is part of a broader agenda of stabilisation, normalisation and regaining control over territory.

The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and a number of other humanitarian organisations insist that humanitarian action should remain independent, impartial and neutral in the face of any political, economic, military or judicial constraints.

In the midst of all these clear-cut positions, civil society, public opinion and a large

number of NGOs are, on the grounds of pragmatism, querying these issues which are set to make or break the future of humanitarian action and determine the new face of conflict management.

The concept of integrated humanitarian action

This has developed within the United Nations, but is mainly employed by governments or organisations as part of an international intervention such as the one currently underway in Afghanistan or, on a smaller scale, in Columbia. Humanitarian action is integrated into broader measures for winning back territory, stabilisation and reconstruction. Humanitarian action is no longer an aim in itself; it is a tool used to achieve a different goal.

These integrated intervention systems are problematic because they can be perceived as breaching the principle of impartiality or neutrality. The ICRC and independent humanitarian organisations criticise this system for engendering a confusion of roles that can undermine the way humanitarian organisations are accepted in the field. This problem has also been acknowledged within the United Nations system, and is the reason why the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) has decided to withdraw from the United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan (UNAMA) and the UN General Secretary has decided not to include humanitarian aid in the mandate of the African Union-United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur (UNAMID).

The strategy of deploying humanitarian action alongside military intervention is controversial and there is a widely-shared consensus on the danger of integrated actions. This integration debate acquired a new urgency 15/20 years ago as changes in the nature of conflict, mass violence and consequent large-scale displacement of populations took place in various parts of the world. The events in the former Yugoslavia in particular recalled the mass displacement of refugees and the horrors that Europe witnessed during the Second World War. Military intervention was widely advocated as the most efficient response to such crises. But the question remains whether or not humanitarian action should be conducted in tandem with military and diplomatic international intervention. The question is recognised as a crucial one and the lessons learned from the experiences of various interventions have led to a broad consensus which can be summarised as follows: humanitarian organisations that rigorously adhere to the principle of independence are able to reach people more effectively than those that have recourse to military support, and should therefore retain this independence and autonomy. Drawing lessons from various well or lesser-known contexts such as Kashmir, it appears that when humanitarian assistance is associated with diplomatic or military activities, that aid is seen as partisan. When the state has integrated the military operations with the development

initiatives, since the civil administration has collapsed, this development aid has not been seen as neutral by those at whom it is targeted. Such integration does not solve but rather worsens problems of security and acceptance of humanitarian action and actors by the local community.

On the European side, the Directorate General of the European Commission's Humanitarian Aid Office (ECHO) maintains that humanitarian action should not be a crisis management tool, nor should it be an instrument of foreign policy. On a number of occasions, the kidnapping or murder of aid workers has been seen to be due to too close a proximity between the humanitarian agenda and the foreign policy agenda. In spite of this stance by ECHO, there is still a long way to go before most Member States are convinced. It is obviously important that the European Commission remains neutral regarding humanitarian aid. For this reason a EU Consensus on Humanitarian Aid was adopted on 18 December 2007. This document states clearly that humanitarian action cannot be subordinated to a political agenda. The fact that it was signed by the presidents of the three main European institutions – the President of the Commission, the President of the Council and the President of the Parliament –is good news for the European consensus. It means that it was widely negotiated and debated. The bad news however is that this document is not legally binding.

What is of even more concern is the fact that the key sentence of the EU Consensus on Humanitarian Aid is in contradiction with most mainstream political discourses we hear today as well as with the Lisbon Treaty: 'EU humanitarian aid is not a crisis management tool'[1]: i.e., it is not there to manage crisis but to respond to it. It took three negotiation sessions to produce this sentence thus clearly formulated. It was necessary to highlight this essential point in order to underline the specificity of humanitarian aid among the other mandates of the European Commission, which is obviously a political organisation; the Vice President of the Commission is also the High Representative for European foreign affairs and security policy. The Lisbon Treaty seeks to improve efficiency in the EU foreign policy sphere by fostering more coordination, consistency and coherence. But it is unclear how it will observe the EU Humanitarian Consensus commitment that humanitarian action should remain clearly outside the foreign policy domain, so that it cannot be confused with the EU's geopolitical strategy in various parts of the world.

In fact, since the adoption of the Treaty of Lisbon, humanitarian aid features as one of

1. The European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid, Joint Statement by the Council and the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States meeting within the Council, the European Parliament and the European Commission, *Official Journal of the European Union*, C 25/1, 30 January 2008.

the 42 components of the European Union's external action. Article 214 of the Treaty of Lisbon makes no reference to the principle of independence, despite the fact that all the organisations concerned are currently attempting to stress the importance of this principle.

The independence of humanitarian aid as a condition of acceptance

There is general acknowledgement that respect for humanitarian principles is necessary for securing access to victims in situations of crisis and providing them with the assistance and protection they need. But this is jeopardised when humanitarian principles are instrumentalised in integrated actions.

The promotion of the principles of impartiality, neutrality and independence, whether by aid operators or the authorities, populations and civil society of the countries concerned, is hindered by a number of factors, such as the amateurism of certain organisations with regard to these principles and to humanitarian law. The designation 'humanitarian organisation' often seems to be more of a label used for communication purposes than a guarantee of stringent operating procedures and ethical impartiality.

It is obvious that the principles of the EU Consensus on Humanitarian Aid must be disseminated. But the problem lies also in the lack of verification mechanisms because there are many organisations that claim to abide by these principles but who in practice act very differently and thus jeopardise their acceptance by the local communities and therefore their access to populations.

In Haiti for instance more than a thousand so-called humanitarian NGOs arrived in the country after the earthquake in January 2010. This meant that the already severely weakened Haitian government had to work with thousands of humanitarian actors representing the whole spectrum from the World Food Programme to the Church of Scientology 'volunteer ministers'. All of them of course claimed to be humanitarian organisations. The EU managed to circumvent the problem by working only with humanitarian organisations selected in advance by the EU for their emergency capacities to make sure that their professionalism was guaranteed.

It is clear that humanitarian action has to be neutral, impartial and independent. Even if organisations receive government funding, independence must remain a *modus operandi*, meaning that analysis and choices are not made by donors. For example if the ICRC were to take sides in Afghanistan, they would not have access to all sectors of the community

there and all territories under control of various contested authorities.

It seems important and urgent to donors to be able to guarantee the professionalism and integrity of NGOs and to find a mechanism to ensure that only professional NGOs that are able to understand and abide by humanitarian principles can get public money.

It also seems important to find ways to inform public opinion about the real competence and capacities of those NGOs. Most of them claim to respect humanitarian principles but often they only pay lip service to those principles and have no capacity to effectively implement them in their field operations. It is, moreover, extremely difficult to adhere to these principles in real field operations. In Afghanistan it takes the ICRC a year to get access to territories controlled by Taliban authorities and this requires huge professionalism. But it is the only way to genuinely observe (rather than pay lip service to) the principle of neutrality and impartiality.

Promoting these principles is also hampered by a lack of commitment on the part of international political stakeholders to securing compliance. Thus, in Sri Lanka, Gaza or Kirghizstan, the members of the UN Security Council have refused to clearly affirm the imperative nature of the right of victims of conflict to receive humanitarian assistance from impartial organisations in respect of humanitarian principles.

It is important for new actors such as India, China, Brazil or Turkey to take part in these debates, so that they may be encouraged to distinguish between power stakes and a commitment to respecting the principles of humanitarian law.

Coordinated approaches: coordination to increase effectiveness

The clusters approach promoted by the United Nations (OCHA) aims to improve needs planning by offering a single interface for governments and donors. The evaluation of the clusters system carried out in 2009 showed a reduction in the duplication of activities, improved accountability and strengthened partnerships.

However, many questions have yet to be resolved if the system is to be prevented from focusing on processes rather than on the quality and effectiveness of the action, and on duplication rather than on stimulating action when the humanitarian response is weak, particularly in complicated emergency situations, whether highlighted in the media or not. Opening the clusters up to national and local state and non-state actors provides an opportunity to broaden the range of operators available, but may also result in differences in quality and in approaches that are difficult to reconcile. The leaders of cluster

coordinations should be chosen on the basis of their experience and proven ability to assert their 'authority' with the other organisations involved.

Whether or not it takes the form of clusters, NGOs recognise that some form of coordination is desirable, as long as this does not result in humanitarian action being subordinated or instrumentalised for other purposes, or subsumed into other diplomatic agendas.

This issue may resurface with the participation of certain types of actors in the clusters, such as state or inter-governmental actors with multiple mandates, political non-state actors, certain private actors or diaspora communities. The Afghan experience is an example of a situation where there is a very real danger of humanitarian action being instrumentalised by Member States.

Another hindrance to coordination is apparent in the need to respect the distinctiveness of approaches based, on the one hand, on humanitarian principles, and approaches focusing on the quest for justice (in all their diversity) on the other. Although they are complementary, these two approaches apply operational principles that must remain distinct.

The ICRC, despite its independence, recognises the need for coordination, but only to the extent that its impartiality, neutrality and independence – and the way these operational criteria are perceived by others – are not compromised. It has therefore decided only to participate in the clusters as an observer or when specifically invited.

Coordination within clusters is not enough to resolve the potential problem of competition between humanitarian organisations, especially for their private financing. Indeed, the difference between humanitarian aid and development stakeholders in terms of their approach and actual nature is deliberately masked when competing for funds, as the objectives and discourse of humanitarian aid are considered to be more politically attractive and 'saleable' than those of the development sector.

New forms of coordination are at risk of engendering a two-tiered global civil society in which NGOs in industrialised countries outsource the action to those in developing countries while maintaining control over strategies and advocacy activities.

In the light of this, there needs to be a focus on the different potential forms of dialogue and interaction with civil society organisations. A lot more work needs to be done on how national organisations embody or express humanitarian values within their own society from a religious or cultural perspective rather than function as clones or opera-

tional partners of international institutions or NGOs. An important question is how international community and humanitarian organisations build bridges with them so as to persuade the national civil or religious organisation to uphold and reinforce humanitarian values, thereby ensuring that the operation concerned is not seen only as a Western action. Respecting the principle of independence, neutrality and impartiality does not mean that humanitarian actors must remain impervious to the society in which they provide assistance. More legitimacy, acceptance, common ownership and protection of humanitarian action could derive from this better integration of values.

Civilian-military relationships or militarised humanitarian action?

There is a degree of consensus on the 'natural' relationship between civilians and the military in humanitarian action, primarily in terms of the extent to which both groups operate in the same area. The difficulty in the relationship lies in the distinction in their roles depending on the situation, the impact on the ground of a military presence on humanitarian workers, and in external perceptions of the relationship between civilians and the military.

The necessity of working side by side in certain situations requires detailed understanding and mutual respect. It is essential to keep communication channels open through clearly identified individuals.

Fundamentally, however, it is their different mandates and the clear demarcation between humanitarian and military action that needs to be maintained in order to avoid tension and misunderstandings in the relationship on the ground. EUFOR's experience in Chad has been chosen as an example because of its leaders' decision to avoid any confusion between military and humanitarian mandates and missions, while at the same time keeping the communication channels between the two missions open.

The principle of preserving a distinction between the two forms of action becomes all the more important when it comes to assessing the relevance and risk of certain exceptional situations, such as armed escorts.

- Protecting aid or providing armed escorts for humanitarian workers involve processes that can be dangerous: on many occasions, aid protection/militarisation has brought with it an increased risk of aid operations and workers becoming military targets. Non-militarisation/protection of aid makes it easier to access the most contentious areas. The use of armed escorts also contributes to blurring the humani-

tarian nature of the aid worker. EUFOR-Chad only provided escorts at the specific request of certain NGOs.

- In conflict situations, the military always has a minimum duty of care towards the populations under its control, particularly if the population is completely deprived of resources essential to its survival. This can only be a last resort, however, not a standard form of humanitarian assistance. Indeed this kind of assistance by a foreign armed force will always be synonymous with occupation and the subordination of the civilian population to a foreign army of occupation. This runs the risk of creating serious consequences for the safety of such populations.

  This issue should be examined in more detail by the European Union's newly established 'battle groups' or tactical groupings, which have been designed to be able to carry out humanitarian assistance missions as well. The 'comprehensive' or 'integrated' approach defended by the EU, however, is not based on any definitive text or doctrine as such but is reflected in the creation of the Crisis Management and Planning Directorate (CMPD) and its Integrated (civilian and military) Strategic Planning Unit.

- Interdependence in terms of logistics is also seen as an area where the relationship between civilians and the military and the protection of humanitarian space need to be constantly renegotiated.

Interactions between civilians and the military are high-risk processes that need to be planned for and developed to suit the particular context in order to avoid any negative effects. In spite of having been a conclusive experiment in this regard, the experience of EUFOR-Chad should not be used as a model for other situations. It did, however, demonstrate the need to adopt a doctrine of civilian-military relationships for European armed forces.

Another important aspect is identifying the situations where the need for military assets, logistics or intervention is really imperative versus situations where militarisation may be more dangerous than efficient.

Humanitarian intervention is today primarily a Western 'business', although other countries might develop such capacities in the future. Humanitarian intervention can be a way of portraying the Western powers as 'the good guys' in a conflict or crisis situation. But it can be seen as patronising in many southern countries. It can also assume peculiarly paradoxical forms, for example in the case of Pakistan in 2010 when Western coun-

tries involved in aerial bombing in the north came to offer assistance during the worst flooding catastrophe that the country ever experienced.

There are some limited situations were only the military can act but such intervention should always be deployed as a last resort. The presence of uniformed personnel will never be considered as neutral, and inevitably undermines the pacific nature of humanitarian action.

The current global financial crisis seems to play a paradoxical role. More and more EU Member States now find themselves obliged to drastically cut their budgets. One question that is frequently raised is how can an expensive defence budget be justified if the country concerned is surrounded by friendly states? This is where we witness the development of military involvement in humanitarian aid and intervention. The problem is that military involvement in humanitarian relief activities is very expensive. Rather than being marketed as efficient and professional, military involvement should be reserved for very specific situations and as a very last resort. Cost is an important factor to consider before resorting to the use of military capacities. Budgets for humanitarian action are also very tight and the European Commission is short of funds, particularly in the current financial climate.

The consequences of the blurring of lines and confusion at field level between military and humanitarian activities also need to be put in geographic and time perspectives. Decisions to use military transport and logistics should bear in mind the impact that such deployments will have on the status and image of the humanitarian organisation involved after the departure of the military. This is of great importance, especially in view of the fact that is it widely admitted than in 90 percent of cases humanitarian actors are present in humanitarian crises before the military arrives and remain after they have left.

Regarding the efficiency of international humanitarian action in crisis situations, strong emphasis must be put on the scope for improvement in the non-military field. Concrete diagnosis of problems habitually encountered in crisis or natural catastrophe situations include stories of planes stuck at airports or food supplies blocked in warehouses. All this is often the result of bureaucratic tax procedures, phyto-sanitary measures and cumbersome administrative processes. Few efforts have been made to help countries anticipate and pass legislation on what measures they will take to lighten normal administrative procedures and facilitate the engagement of the international community if a catastrophe strikes. The ICRC has taken an initiative in this regard to make countries pass legislation on such administrative and legal issues. Concerted efforts should be invested in

developing and implementing an international disaster response law that would help countries to be prepared to react.

Armed conflicts and population displacements: ensuring aid retains its humanitarian aims

There are now more than 27 million internally displaced persons in the world[2] and not only in Africa (other examples include the Balkans and the Caucasus). Armed conflicts remain the main cause of this major humanitarian crisis. In the light of this situation, humanitarian aid must address issues around the protection of civilians, humanitarian responsibility and operational viability. Internal and international displacements of populations are a challenge for all societies, insofar as they indicate a failure of local measures to protect civilians.

The scale of such population movements illustrates the fact that these populations are often the direct victims of attacks targeting civilians. Such violence against civilians means dealing with this issue 'upstream' – i.e. before their actual displacement. This is a big challenge. The most challenging aspect is managing to convince non-state and government parties not to engage in reprisals or impede the aid being provided – and, more elementarily, not to attack civilians or their property (all commitments inscribed in the 2009 Kampala Convention on the Protection and Assistance of Internally Displaced Persons in Africa). It is essential that humanitarian organisations are seen as impartial during the phase of overt violence.

Providing aid to displaced persons' camps may seem easier but nonetheless raises numerous questions. In theory, the camps are a solution of last resort. They can be seen as an easy way out for humanitarian organisations, insofar as they enable needs and resources to be concentrated and provide a high level of media visibility. But there is also a risk of marginalising victims who do not make it to the camps.

Setting up and managing camps also raises questions of reintegration and planning for the return of displaced persons. Camps can be the right strategy for protecting refugees, but this is less true for displaced persons, insofar as it can make it harder for them to reintegrate society. What is good for civil society organisations (media visibility, funding) is not necessarily so positive for those most directly involved.

2. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 'Internally Displaced People: On the Run in Their Own Land', 2009. Available at: http://www.unhcr.org/pages/49c3646c146.html; Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC), 'Internal Displacement: Global Overview of Trends and Developments in 2010', March 2011. Available at: http://www.internal-displacement.org/publications/global-overview-2010.pdf.

Sudan is a good illustration of the dependency effects of aid that can be created after five or six years, and which then contribute to extending the life of the camps into the longer term. In the case of the EUFOR-Chad operation, for example, it is estimated that two years after it ended, only 10 percent of those who were displaced have returned home. Changing the types of assistance offered to reduce dependency of this kind remains a challenge, provided humanitarian actors are present both in the camps and the places to which people need to return.

Assistance to internally displaced persons should also incorporate help for the host populations. But this is not systematically the case; different criteria are used in each situation by the DG ECHO (Pakistan, Guinée Forestière, Yemen), which creates unfair competition between the various populations.

Faced with those who it classifies as migrants, the EU's procedures remain lengthy and flawed – in particular for minors. The FRONTEX system concerning illegal migrants has entered into an agreement with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and more recently with the Agency for Fundamental Rights, but further progress is needed, particularly in terms of taking into consideration the human and humanitarian dimensions of the imposed procedures. EU legislation must be harmonised on this point if procedures are to be improved. It is regrettable that this process of harmonisation is currently only the result of applying international agreements and not of decisions by the European Union itself. Preliminary interpretations of the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) will no doubt clarify thinking in this area.

In conclusion, it would be useful to get away from certain forms of fruitless indecision on political subjects of such importance and be able to either approve or reject certain guidelines and make their implementation intelligible. The following recommendations are proposed:

- Ensure a separation between humanitarian action and international crisis management and take steps to ensure they are seen as distinct

- Provide diplomatic support at a European and international level for the principles of independent humanitarian action

- Avoid confusion and maintain a clear distinction between intergovernmental interventionism and universal principles of humanitarian action based on acceptance

- Help civil societies in the developing and industrialised countries to support the principles of independent, impartial humanitarian commitment

- Support the emergence of 'independent humanitarian NGOs' and 'solidarity and development NGO' status
- Open the debate on the Responsibility to Protect to involve major emerging diplomatic powers
- Debate on whether the various military doctrines and actions fulfil their promises of Responsibility to Protect or not: the protection of civilians in the event of mass crime, the demilitarisation of refugee or displaced persons' camps, etc.
- Promote commitment to and constancy in humanist and humanitarian values in Europe.

Convergence appears as a key word that may help to overcome the problems of coordination and integration while strengthening the efficiency of humanitarian activities in the context of the European Union humanitarian and political framework. Reinforcing strategic discussion between ECHO and NGOs could help to bridge the gap between neutral and independent humanitarian action and other types of humanitarian action targeting root causes of crisis situations through advocacy or other empowering initiatives and activities conducted over the long term.

4. Enjeux autour des flux migratoires dans les décennies à venir

Catherine Wihtol de Wenden

En ce début de XXe siècle, les migrations internationales se sont intensifiées, au point de se mondialiser et de devenir l'un des grands enjeux de la planète. On dénombrait 120 millions de migrants internationaux à la fin des années 1990, 150 millions au début des années 2000. Il y a aujourd'hui 214 millions de migrants dans le monde, soit trois fois plus qu'il y a quarante ans. Nous serions entrés, selon certains, dans la deuxième grande vague de migrations entre 1980 et aujourd'hui, la première se situant entre 1880 et 1914. Celles-ci se répartissent entre des migrations sud-nord (62 millions de personnes), sud-sud (61 millions), nord-nord (53 millions), nord-sud (14 millions), le reste étant constitué par des migrations est-ouest et, plus rarement, ouest-est. Ces migrations internationales s'inscrivent dans une tendance à la mondialisation des formes de mobilité, puisque le monde entier est aujourd'hui traversé par les migrations, que presque tous les pays du monde sont concernés, que ce soit par le départ, l'accueil ou le transit, et que les migrations internes au sein des États concernent 740 millions de personnes, dont 240 millions en Chine : un milliard d'êtres humains sont en mouvement sur la planète.

Les migrations internationales contribuent au « rapprochement du monde dans le monde ». Le rapport 2009 du programme des Nations unies pour le développement souligne que les migrations sont devenues un facteur essentiel du développement humain et qu'il convient donc de « lever les barrières » plutôt que de les fermer. Tous les travaux montrent en effet que le développement et le mécanisme des migrations fonctionnent de pair, l'un ne constituant pas une alternative à l'autre. Mais les migrations s'inscrivent également dans le processus complexe des globalisations contradictoires, où des objectifs politiques s'affrontent contre des impératifs économiques, sociaux et culturels. Elles font partie de la texture sociale des relations internationales tant leurs dimensions économique, sociale, politique et culturelle remettent en question les cadres classiques de l'espace international. Devant la nécessité d'« humaniser la mondialisation », la mobilité est devenue pour certains l'un des grands chantiers des droits de l'homme, pour d'autres un bien public mondial à gérer grâce à une gouvernance mondiale et multilatérale des acteurs, pour d'autres encore un mal à combattre face aux incertitudes de l'intégration.

De leur côté, les sans-papiers et leurs soutiens font figure de mouvement social mondial en recomposition autour du droit à la mobilité, du statut de ceux qui circulent par rapport à ceux qui sont sédentaires, de la nécessité de vivre ensemble sans exclusion, remettant en question les notions de frontières, de souveraineté, de citoyenneté. De nouveaux clivages est-ouest, sud-nord, sud-sud apparaissent, dessinant des fractures géopolitiques régionales et mondiales.

Dans ce monde marqué par des crises politiques durables et des risques de sécession sociale, la crise économique est venue apporter une nouvelle donne. La mobilité des hommes a souvent accompagné les épisodes de chaos pour atténuer les grandes lignes de fracture du monde : réfugiés, apatrides, femmes et mineurs isolés, migrants économiques, élites, à tel point que les catégories classiques des migrations s'en trouvent brouillées car nombre d'entre eux appartiennent à plusieurs catégories simultanément ou tout au long de leur existence avec des profils peu différenciés entre eux. La distinction entre pays d'accueil, de départ et de transit est aussi devenue plus floue car beaucoup de pays sont devenus l'un et l'autre à la fois. La crise financière mondiale de l'été 2008 a-t-elle modifié la donne ? L'impact qu'elle a eu sur les flux migratoires est encore difficile à analyser dans son ensemble. Certaines évolutions peuvent néanmoins être observées : le déclin des migrations irrégulières aux fins d'emploi vers des destinations comme le Mexique, l'Espagne, l'Italie et la Malaisie ; la diminution des transferts de fonds (328 milliards de dollars en 2008, 337 milliards en 2007), à l'origine de difficultés pour les familles et les communautés qui sont devenues dépendantes à l'égard de ceux-ci (Afrique de l'Ouest, Philippines) ; la poursuite, voire l'accélération des politiques d'expulsion et de reconduction à la frontière, particulièrement pour les sans-papiers ; l'affaiblissement des droits des migrants et des efforts pour conquérir de nouveaux droits ; enfin, le renversement à long terme des politiques mondialisées et le retour aux politiques nationales protectionnistes, bien que certains prédisent une nouvelle vague de mondialisation une fois la récession passée.

De nouvelles problématiques sont apparues, comme les déplacés environnementaux ou les migrations intérieures chinoises. Des contradictions sont intervenues récemment dans les politiques migratoires, qui prennent une orientation plus restrictive, mais prennent en compte la nécessité d'entrouvrir les frontières dans les pays les plus concernés par le vieillissement et les transformations spécifiques à certaines régions du monde ou à certains groupes de migrants. Tous ces éléments sont porteurs de pistes pour analyser les flux de personnes dans les décennies à venir.

L'enjeu démographique

Premier constat : la démographie qui, hier, intervenait peu dans les facteurs de décision concernant les politiques migratoires est, aujourd'hui, devenue un élément incontournable. Le rapport 2000 du Département de la population des Nations unies sur les migrations de remplacement a fait prendre conscience du fait que le monde, notamment l'Europe, la Russie et le Japon, vieillit. Cette nouvelle donne a mis fin en Europe au dogme de l'« immigration zéro » comme objectif à atteindre pour les États. La division de la population du département des affaires économiques et sociales des Nations unies a également construit divers scénarios quant à la dimension de la population mondiale d'ici 2050, fondés sur les diverses hypothèses relatives aux taux de fécondité et à d'autres facteurs qui influencent la croissance démographique. Dans le scénario « basse variation », d'ici 2050, la terre sera peuplée d'environ 8 milliards de personnes (très exactement 7,959), ce qui présuppose un taux de fécondité de 1,54 enfant par femme, soit beaucoup moins que le taux de fécondité de substitution (2,1). Aujourd'hui, le taux de fécondité mondiale est de 2,56. Selon le scénario de « variation moyenne », avec 9,150 milliards d'habitants en 2050 et une fécondité de 2,02, la fécondité des régions les moins développées passera de 2,73 enfants par femme (2005-2010) à 2,05 dans la période 2045-2050. Pour arriver à de tels résultats, la division de la population estime qu'il est essentiel d'augmenter l'accès aux services de planification familiale volontaire, notamment dans les pays les moins développés. Selon un rapport du Secrétariat général des Nations unies sur la population mondiale et le programme d'action de la Conférence du Caire sur la population de 1994, 106 millions de femmes mariées dans les pays en développement ont un besoin non satisfait de planification familiale. Enfin, le scénario de « variation élevée » prévoit quant à lui 10,461 milliards d'habitants en 2050, avec un taux de fécondité de 2,51 enfants par femme.

Mais ces variations vont avoir des conséquences variables selon la région du monde concernée : l'Afrique devrait atteindre un milliard d'habitants en 2050, deux milliards à la fin du siècle ; l'Inde, avec 1,6 milliard d'habitants en 2050, dépassera la Chine, qui est aujourd'hui la plus peuplée (1,3 milliard) et dont la population commencera à vieillir à cause de la politique de l'enfant unique. L'Europe vieillit, de même que le Japon et la Russie, et, en 2050, la population de ces régions sera plus faible qu'aujourd'hui, alors que les États-Unis se maintiendront grâce à l'immigration et que le sud connaît une transition démographique (moins de naissances et mortalité en baisse). Sans l'immigration, les pays européens verraient leur population diminuer à l'horizon 2025 par rapport aux chiffres actuels.

Un autre phénomène lié à cette évolution est la progression du monde urbain par rapport au monde rural. On assiste à un mouvement d'urbanisation généralisé, y compris dans des régions marquées par le monde rural, comme l'Afrique, dont la population sera

urbaine à 70% entre 2050 et la fin du siècle, alors qu'elle était rurale à 70% il y a cinquante ans. Les villes de plus de dix millions d'habitants se situent majoritairement en Asie, le plus grand réservoir démographique de la planète (Tokyo, Séoul, Shanghai, Bombay, Delhi, Jakarta, Osaka, Manille, Calcutta, Dacca, Téhéran, Karachi, Pékin). Mais les Amériques comptent aussi de nombreuses mégapoles (Mexico, New York, São Paulo, Los Angeles, Buenos Aires, Rio de Janeiro), alors que l'Europe (avec Londres, Moscou, Paris, Istanbul) et l'Afrique (le Caire, Lagos) sont encore peu représentées. Ces villes constituent un pôle pour les migrations internes, puis internationales présentes et futures dans les pays du sud et l'explosion rapide de certaines d'entre elles a un impact sur le réchauffement climatique.

Les risques environnementaux

Le réchauffement climatique est global et les hommes en sont la cause principale par leur consommation d'énergie. Si les températures continuent d'augmenter et que leur hausse atteint 6,4 degrés d'ici 2100, les conséquences seront les plus graves dans les pays du sud pour les plus pauvres du monde car c'est là que se situe l'essentiel des risques environnementaux : élévation du niveau des mers comme à Tuvalu ou aux Maldives, inondations dans les zones se trouvant au-dessous du niveau de la mer comme au Bangladesh, cyclones, tornades, tremblements de terre, éruptions volcaniques, désertification. D'autres conséquences liées au réchauffement comme le dégel et la fonte des glaciers affecteront aussi bien le grand nord que le sud (Himalaya).

Les préoccupations mondiales sur le changement climatique se sont précisées, qu'il s'agisse de mettre fin à l'émission de gaz à effet de serre d'ici 2015 ou de reboiser. De nombreuses villes sont situées dans les basses zones côtières et sont ainsi menacées par les inondations des deltas des fleuves ou la montée des eaux de la mer : Izmir, Jérusalem, Jedda, Aden, Karachi, Colombo, Chennai, Calcutta, Bangkok, Kuala Lumpur, Ho Chi Minh ville, Singapour, Jakarta, Taipei, Séoul, Tokyo, Sapporo.

Les experts du climat (GIEC) prévoient que les flux migratoires liés aux mutations environnementales atteindront les chiffres de l'ensemble des migrations internationales actuelles d'ici la fin du siècle (plus de 200 millions) et 50 à 150 millions de déplacés environnementaux d'ici 2050. Ils soulignent néanmoins que ces flux ne seront pas tous liés à la responsabilité humaine : si la déforestation a un impact direct sur la désertification, en revanche, les tremblements de terre, les éruptions volcaniques et les inondations sont aussi vieux que la mémoire humaine et se sont produits à toutes les époques. Walter Kälin, représentant du Secrétariat général des Nations unies pour les droits de l'homme des déplacés, a identifié cinq scénarios de changement climatique ayant un effet sur les dé-

placements humains : désastres hydro-météorologiques, dégradation de l'environnement, perte du territoire national (îles), identification de zones « à haut risque », violences et conflits ethniques entraînant le manque et la diminution des ressources naturelles.

Les inégalités du développement humain

Le PNUD (Programme des Nations unies pour le développement) mesure par trois critères principaux les inégalités du développement humain : la longévité, le niveau d'éducation et le niveau de vie. Combinés, ces indicateurs permettent de mesurer les inégalités de la planète. Si l'on en dresse une carte du monde, l'Afrique sub-saharienne est la plus mal placée (avec une indice de développement humain [IDH] de 0,3 à 0,4) face à l'Europe, aux États-Unis, à l'Australie et au Japon (IDH de 0,9 à 1). Les progrès de l'information, de l'éducation et des transports, la transnationalisation des réseaux migratoires fabriquent des imaginaires migratoires faisant une large place à l'atteinte d'eldorados où la vie est meilleure, souvent au prix de périlleuses odyssées. Les vagues migratoires sont les plus fortes le long des grandes lignes de fracture du monde (Méditerranée, frontière américano-mexicaine) et continueront à être attirées par les régions les plus riches. D'après le rapport de 2009 de la division de la population des Nations unies, le continent africain abritait cette année-là 19 millions de migrants internationaux, l'Asie 61,3 millions, l'Europe 69,8 millions, l'Amérique latine et les Caraïbes 7,4 millions, l'Amérique du Nord 50 millions, l'Océanie 6 millions. Les BRIC (Brésil, Russie, Inde, Chine) commencent à attirer les migrants et le Golfe est l'un des principaux pôles de migration sud-sud. Par ordre décroissant, les pays qui, en 2010, attiraient le plus grand nombre de migrants internationaux sont les États-Unis, la Fédération de Russie, l'Allemagne, l'Arabie saoudite, le Canada, la France, le Royaume-Uni, l'Espagne, l'Inde et l'Ukraine. Ceux qui comptent le plus haut pourcentage de migrants internationaux dans leur population sont, par ordre décroissant, le Qatar, les Émirats arabes unis, le Koweit, la Jordanie, les territoires palestiniens, Singapour, Israël, la Chine (y compris Hong Kong), Oman et l'Arabie saoudite. Tout porte à penser que ces tendances vont se poursuivre dans les années à venir, bien que les pays du Golfe ne se prêtent pas à une immigration d'installation et que d'autres pays, comme l'Ukraine, connaissent des migrations pendulaires, les Ukrainiens eux-mêmes allant travailler en Europe de l'Ouest et en Pologne.

Crises politiques et violences

Enfin, les crises politiques et les violences, faites aux femmes notamment sont également à l'origine de migrations, tant internes, dans les pays en crise pour les plus démunis, qu'internationales. Concernant les migrations internes (740 millions de personnes), une partie est formée par les déplacements forcés, dont ceux liés à des pays en guerre ou confrontés à de très graves crises internes (Darfour). En 2007, le Haut Commissariat

aux Réfugiés des Nations unies dénombrait 40 millions de déplacements forcés dont 17 millions de réfugiés (la plupart non statutaires). Le Proche et le Moyen-Orient, avec 6 millions de départs d'Afghanistan depuis la fin des années 1970 et 4 millions d'Irak depuis 2002, sont à la source du plus grand nombre de demandeurs d'asile au monde. L'Afrique des Grands lacs, les Balkans, les régions kurdes, le conflit israélo-palestinien, le Sri Lanka ont aussi produit beaucoup de réfugiés internes et internationaux. De la résolution de ces conflits dépend la diminution du nombre de demandeurs d'asile (l'*Atlas des crises et des conflits* de l'IRIS de 2009 en identifie une trentaine). Après les États-Unis, c'est la France qui a connu le plus grand nombre de demandeurs ces dernières années, avec 42 000 demandes en 2009 (et 47 000 si l'on inclut les réexamens). Mais l'Europe, avec 246 200 demandes en 2009, soit 3% de plus qu'en 2008, est devant les États-Unis et tend à devenir la plus grande région d'accueil de demandeurs d'asile au monde, même si, du fait de politiques très restrictives, moins du quart obtient le statut de réfugié. Il y a vingt ans, au lendemain de la chute du mur de Berlin, l'Europe recevait 500 000 demandes d'asile par an, dont notamment l'Allemagne (438 000 demandes en 1992), premier pays d'immigration en Europe et premier pays d'accueil des demandeurs d'asile depuis 1945 jusqu'aux années 2000. Les pays européens qui seront les plus touchés par les nouvelles demandes sont ceux qui ont des liens linguistiques, coloniaux, transnationaux (migrations de travail et familles déjà existantes) avec les foyers de crises. La politique du HCR (Haut Commissariat des Nations unies pour les réfugiés) tendant à encourager la protection interne à proximité des zones en crise (asile interne) atténue néanmoins l'attraction exercée par l'Europe, les États-Unis et le Canada.

Les violences faites aux femmes et aux enfants provoquent également des migrations, internes et internationales proches ou non des réfugiés. La féminisation des migrations, le développement du phénomène des mineurs non accompagnés sont autant de conséquences de ce mal être dans les pays pauvres, une situation appelée à prendre plus d'ampleur dans les années à venir car leur cause commence à être entendue.

La circulation migratoire comme mode de vie

Enfin, parmi les tendances qui se sont dessinées au cours de ces dix dernières années, les migrations pendulaires d'allers et retours, l'installation dans la mobilité comme mode de vie semblent attirer tous ceux qui veulent vire « ici » et « là-bas » lorsque le statut (double nationalité, titres de long séjour, visas à entrées multiples) le permet et que des activités économiques transnationales soutiennent ce projet de vie. D'une rive à l'autre de la Méditerranée, en Europe d'est en ouest mais aussi du nord au sud (métiers qui peuvent s'exercer à distance), se développe une multitude d'activités qui permettent des formes de migrations multiples : saisonnières (allers et retours) ou définitives pour la retraite

comme prolongement du tourisme. Beaucoup de ces circulants ne s'installent pas définitivement dans le pays d'accueil, certains vivent en permanence dans l'entre deux, dans un espace double ou triple autour d'un lien migratoire construit par les échanges transnationaux économiques, culturels, familiaux. On assiste à un développement depuis une vingtaine d'années de ces circulations migratoires, un mode de vie qui semble tenter une population jeune et active et qui est appelé à se développer compte tenu du différentiel d'opportunités dans certains secteurs peu délocalisables (« care drain » pour les personnes âgées, bâtiment, agriculture, commerces et entreprises transfrontaliers).

Vivre ensemble

S'agissant de la question migratoire, les flux ne sont pas nécessairement l'enjeu essentiel, surtout si les politiques migratoires permettent une plus grande fluidité de circulation, comme l'appellent l'ONU à travers les Forums mondiaux migration et développement depuis 2007, le HCR, l'OIT (Organisation internationale du travail), l'OIM (Organisation internationale des migrations) et de nombreuses ONG (associations de défense des droits de l'homme) qui cherchent, à travers la définition d'une gouvernance mondiale des migrations, multilatérale et associant les États d'accueil et de départ et la société civile, à faire de la mobilité un bien public mondial.

La question des stocks, c'est à dire la gestion des populations installées dans un vivre ensemble harmonieux va devenir à l'horizon 2020 un enjeu essentiel : évolution de la définition de la citoyenneté dans le sens de la pluralité des allégeances, incluant éventuellement une citoyenneté compatible avec la mobilité, développement de la double nationalité et du droit du sol, l'une et l'autre déjà en hausse, lutte contre les discriminations, l'ethnicisation des inégalités sociales et les violences urbaines, encouragement de la vie associative. Les questions de l'apatridie (13 millions environ, notamment au Bangladesh et au Myanmar) et des sans-papiers vont aussi être sur le devant de la scène, de même que l'encouragement aux naissances dans les pays les plus touchés par le vieillissement comme la Russie et le Japon. Dans les pays d'émigration du sud récemment devenus également pays d'immigration, les politiques d'intégration sont inexistantes. Un grand chantier s'ouvre donc à l'horizon 2020.

Conclusion

Les migrations internationales, dans la diversité de leurs formes et des populations qu'elles entraînent, sont appelées à se poursuivre, car les facteurs qui en sont la cause ne sont pas près de disparaître à l'horizon 2020 ou 2050. De nouvelles causes de migration, comme l'environnement, se sont fait jour, tandis que la prise de conscience que la mo-

bilité peut offrir de meilleures opportunités qu'en restant chez soi s'est répandue dans les pays pauvres où la population n'accepte plus la fatalité d'être né dans un pays pauvre et/ou mal gouverné. Il est à penser qu'avec les progrès de l'éducation, de l'information et l'extension de l'urbanisation, la décision de migrer va concerner de plus larges couches de population jusque là moins mobiles comme les malades, les femmes et les enfants ainsi que les catégories plus pauvres auparavant peu enclines à bouger.

Eléments de bibliographie

Pascal Boniface, Hubert Védrine, *Atlas des crises et des conflits*. Paris, Armand Colin/Fayard, 2009

Fonds des Nations Unies pour la Population, *L'état de la population dans le monde, 2009. Un monde qui change, femmes, population et climat*, UNFPA, 2009

UNHCR, *Les réfugiés dans le monde*, Genève, 2009

Nations Unies, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division, *International Migration 2009*

Gilles Pison, *Atlas de la population mondiale*, Paris, Autrement, 2009

Catherine Wihtol de Wenden, *Atlas mondial des migrations*, Paris, Autrement, 2009

Catherine Wihtol de Wenden, *La Globalisation humaine*, Paris, PUF, 2009

Part II
Regional perspectives: China and India

5. Civil society and governance: the Chinese experience

Zhu Liqun

Introduction

It is widely recognised that in recent years civil society has been playing an increasingly important role in global governance, in terms of setting agendas, spreading norms, making rules and helping implement and enforce these norms and rules. Civil society organisations (CSOs), when initiating activities beyond national borders, are becoming international actors and exert transnational influence on both regional and global arrangements.

CSOs in China have flourished and undergone an unprecedented development due to the fundamental changes that have taken place in Chinese society since the adoption of the reform and opening-up policy in the late 1970s. Currently they have limited capacities to get involved in global governance and take on international responsibilities,[1] except in a few areas,[2] but their involvement in China's internal governance is becoming a salient phenomenon in the process of China's modernisation. This chapter aims to focus on the development of Chinese CSOs in recent decades, highlighting three questions. What are the current features of civil society in China and how is it perceived by the Chinese? What are the challenges that civil society faces in China? And what is the agenda for its further development in China?

Current features and Chinese perceptions of civil society

In the last three decades, the market-oriented reform programme has not only accelerated urbanisation and social stratification in China, but also promoted the development

1. In China, only 1.1 percent of the CSOs have sufficient capacities and resources to get involved in activities beyond one or two provinces within China. See Yu Keping, 'Gaishan Woguo Gongmin Shehui Zhidu Huanjing de Ruogan Sikao'[Some Thoughts on How to Improve Our Institutional Environment for Development of Civil Society], in *Dangdai Shijie yu Shehui Zhuyi [Contemporary World and Socialism]*, no. 1, 2006, p.9; see also Zhu Liqun and Huang Chao, 'Zhongguo Canyu Guoji Tixi de Pinggu Zhibiao he Xiangguan Fenxi' ['Evaluating diameters and concerning analysis on the level of China's involvement in the international system'], in *JianghaiXuekan [Jianghai Academic Journal]*, no.5, 2009, p.167.

2. The environmental area is an exception, since Chinese CSOs has been actively involved in networking among domestic and international CSOs, advocating their opinions and participating in international negotiations on the climate change issue. See Lai Yulin, 'Zhengfu Changyi Lianmeng yu Guoji Tanpan: Zhongguo Feizhengfu Zuzhi Yingdui Gebenhagen Dahui de Zhuzhang yu Huodong' ['Advocacy Coalitions and International Negotiations: Chinese NGOs' Position and Activities in Response to COP15'], *Waijiao Pinglun [Foreign Affairs Review]*, vol. 28, no. 3, 2011.

of Chinese civil society. The number of Chinese CSOs has grown rapidly even though there is no consensus on statistics. According to the official estimation of the Ministry of Civil Affairs, the number of registered CSOs had already reached 289,476 in 2004,[3] which grew to 354,393 in 2006[4] and rapidly rose to 414,000 in 2008.[5] Experts on CSO studies have disagreed with the official statistics and estimated that the number should be at least between 2-2.7 million.[6] Others have even put forward the astonishing figure of more than 8.31 million,[7] taking into account non-registered and grassroots organisations that exist in China.[8]

Civil society is defined in China, as it is many other countries, as 'the third sector' alongside the market and the government as the first and second sectors respectively. CSOs are mainly non-profit-making, non-governmental, independent and voluntarily-formed organisations that carry out activities aiming at realising the common interests of their group members. The above four characteristics have been developed since China opened up to the outside world and moved closer to international norms in terms of the conception and functioning of civil society. This new development represents a new era for the status of CSOs in China compared to the way in which CSOs were perceived and treated before the end of the 1970s. During the period between the founding of the People's Republic of China in 1949 and the start of the Cultural Revolution in 1966, numerous CSOs were set up for political purposes, such as the Youth Federation, Women's Federation and the Federation of Industry and Commerce: these were all government-founded organisations with financial support from the central government. From 1966 to 1978, a period that exactly paralleled that of China's Cultural Revolution, there were hardly any CSO activities in China due to the upheavals taking place both in the political sphere and in society at large, and the Cultural Revolution brought almost all progress in this domain to a standstill.

3. The Chinese Ministry of Civil Affairs. See: http://www.chinanpo.gov.cn/web/showBulltetin.do?id=20153&dictionid=2202.

4. The Ministry of Civil Affairs. See: http://www.chinanpo.gov.cn/web/listTitle.do?dictionid=2202.

5. The Ministry of Civil Affairs. See: '2008nian Minzheng Shiye Fazhan Tongji Baogao'['The Statistical Report on the Development of Civil Affairs in 2008'], http://cws.mca.gov.cn/article/tjbg/200906/20090600031762.shtml.

6. Wang Ming, Liu Guohan and He Jianyu, *Zhongguo Shetuan Gaige: Cong Zhengfu Xuanze dao Shehui Xuanze [China's Reform on Social Organizations from the Government Choice to the Society Choice]*, (Beijing: Social Sciences Academic Press, 2002), p. 105.

7. Wang Shaoguang and He Jianyu, 'Associational Revolution in China: Mapping the Landscapes', in *Korea Observer*, vol. 35, no. 3, 2004, pp.485-533; see also He Zengke, 'Zhongguo Gongmin Shehui Zhidu Huanjing Yaosu Fenxi' ['Analysis on Factors of Institutional Environment on China's Civil Society'] in Yu Keping (ed.) *Zhongguo Gongmin Shehui Zhidu Huanjing [Institutional Environment for Development of Civil Society in China]*, (Beijing: Beijing University Press, 2006), p. 122.

8. Wang Shaoguang and He Jianyu divided Chinese CSOs into four categories: people's associations which are mainly established by the Chinese government after the founding of the People's Republic of China; quasi-governmental organisations that have a unique position and strong connection with the government; registered organisations and grass-roots organisations, the latter two are more independent and autonomous in nature and have attracted more attention in studies of civil society in China. See He Jianyu and Wang Shaoguang, 'Zhongguoshi de Shetuan Geming: Dui Shetuan Quanjingtu de Dingliang Miaoshu' ['Chinese Associational Revolution: a Quantitative Mapping of Associational Landscapes'], in Gao Bingzhong & Yuan Ruijun (eds.), *Zhongguo Gongmin Shehui Fazhan Lanpishu [Blue Book on Civil Society Development in China]*, (Beijing: Peking University Press, 2008), p.133-63.

Since the end of 1978, economic reforms have reduced governmental control over the private sector and local authorities. A 'small government, big society' strategy has been adopted, aiming at shifting some governmental responsibility to the private sector, detaching enterprises from governmental control and generally downsizing the role of the government.[9] Such have been the long-term efforts by the government to undertake a comprehensive reform of the administrative system. The policy has encouraged social organisations to gradually loosen their links with the government and become independent, especially in terms of their finance and funding. It has also led to the reorganisation of the economic, political, social and cultural functions of CSOs that were previously held by the government. In the same vein, the Chinese government has expressed its commitment to nurturing social brokers and organisations, and pledged that the autonomy of civil society should be enhanced.[10]

The development of civil society in China can also be attributed to the dramatic release of energy and creativity in Chinese society that has taken place over the past couple of decades. Before the reform and opening-up policy was adopted, almost all Chinese considered public affairs as entirely the government's responsibility. Things began to change after the adoption of the new policy. Domestic reforms brought about a great change in Chinese people's attitudes to their role in society and provided individuals with more opportunities to assume social responsibilities. Business success and achievements in their careers enhanced people's self-esteem and self-confidence. At the same time, dissatisfaction with bureaucratic inefficiency and torpor further incentivised them to take on a more active social role. Thus, the CSOs in China gradually made their voice heard and their influence felt, especially in areas such as poverty relief, disaster management, environmental protection, rural education and minority rights protection.

A case in point that illustrates the independent role that CSOs have begun to play in the public policy-making process in China is the Nujiang River Dams project. This was proposed by the local authorities to stimulate the local economy in 2003, was a plan to build 13 hydroelectric dams along the river that runs through southwest China's Yunnan Province. Critics and environmentalists argued the dams would cause enormous ecological damage to the river, endanger rare plants and animals living in the area, and involve the relocation of at least 50,000 people from the areas to be submerged. Several environmental CSOs embarked on a campaign with the aim of mobilising public support for cancelling the project. Due to the extensive efforts by the CSOs and the public

9. *Guanyu Guowuyuan Jigou Gaige Fangan de Jueding [Decision on the Planning of the State Council's Institutional Reform]*, approved by the first plenary meeting of the Eighth Chinese People's Congress, 22 March, 1993.

10. Luo Gan, 'Guanyu Guowuyuan Jigou Gaige Fangan' [On the planning of the State Council's Institutional Reform], *Renmin Ribao[People's Daily]*, 18 March 1993.

concerned, in February 2004 the project was ordered to undergo further and thorough assessments before being given the go-ahead and was finally withdrawn by the local government. This episode was widely regarded as 'an important turning point in that NGOs managed to influence the government's public policy-making process.'[11]

Another major event that happened in 2008 also highlights the important role that CSOs have played in China. On 12 May 2008, a strong earthquake, whose epicentre was located in Wenchuan, in the Sichuan province of southwest China, claimed 87,149 lives and injured tens of thousands of local people. After the earthquake, many Chinese volunteers and 263 CSOs took an active part in emergency relief work. 76.22 billion Chinese yuan were donated to fund reconstruction.[12] Over three million volunteers from both within and outside China poured into the quake-stricken areas and more than 10 million volunteers participated in relief work in the rest of the country.[13] The CSOs played a key role in rescuing victims of the earthquake, administering first aid, delivering goods and equipment, providing shelter and accommodation and in performing many other valuable services. The Joint Declaration of Earthquake Rescue Action of Chinese civil society[14] was issued by several CSOs located in Beijing and an office for joint efforts was established. The joint action of volunteers and the CSOs in disaster relief and management demonstrated the strength of Chinese civil society.[15]

Clearly, civil society has come to play an increasingly important role in China. CSOs are becoming more active in heightening public awareness of human rights, anti-corruption, environmental protection, companies' social responsibility, empowering people with information, education, service and capacity building through training and learning, and influencing the public and social policies of the government both at the local and central levels by initiating swift responses to social and environmental problems and acquiring a high profile in this field. By promoting values like equality, justice, poverty relief, environmental protection and energy saving, the CSOs have already become key actors in the process of China's modernisation.

---

11. Li Fei, 'NGO's getting more prominence', *China Daily*, 22 April 2005, p. 6.

12. Wang Ming, *Wenchuang Dizhen: Gongmin Xingdong Baogao [Reports on the Civil Society Action in Wenchuan Earthquake: China NGOs in Emergency Rescue]*, (Beijing: Social Sciences Academy Press, 2009), p.1.

13. The Information Office of the State Council, *China's Actions for Disaster Prevention and Reduction*, 11 May 2009. See: http://www.gov.cn/english/official/2009-05/11/content_1310629.htm.

14. Zeng Liming, 'Zhongguo Minjian Zuzhi Faqi Canyu Wenchuan Dizhen Jiuzai Xingdong Lianhe Shengming' ['China's CSOs advocating joint efforts needed for rescue action in Wenchuan earthquake']. See China CSOs website: http://www.chinanpo.gov.cn/web/showBulltetin.do?id=30143&dictionid=1940&catid.

15. Volunteer work is an important aspect of civil society in China. 1.7 million volunteers provided more than 200 million hours of high-quality service in the Olympic Games in Beijing in 2008. Without the volunteers, the Beijing Olympic Games could not have been staged successfully. See Zhu Liqun, Lin Minwang et al, *Aoyunhui yu Beijing Guojihua: Guifan Shehuihua de Shijiao [Olympic Games and Beijing's Internationalization: A Study of Norm Socialization]*, (World Knowledge Press, 2010), p. 257.

Challenges facing Chinese CSOs

CSOs are becoming an important emerging force in China, not only in terms of their rapidly increasing number but also in terms of the activities they are undertaking. Since China is still in the throes of modernisation with its development at the preliminary stage,[16] the development of its civil society, representing just one aspect of the social changes underway, is likely to undergo further transformation in the years to come. However, the growth of CSOs and their influence on Chinese society are still far from optimal.

Chinese CSOs are far from sufficiently developed in terms of density, financial strength and autonomy. As to how many CSOs there are for every 10,000 Chinese people, there are different statistics due to different approaches based on different categorisations. A survey conducted in 2000 showed that there were merely 1.45 CSOs for every 10,000 Chinese, a ratio that is far lower than that in developed countries (for instance there are 110.45 CSOs per every 10, 000 French citizens in France and the corresponding number is 51.79 in the US).[17] Chinese CSOs are also fewer in number than those in developing countries such as India and Brazil (there are 10.21 and 12.66 CSOs for every 10,000 people in these two countries respectively).[18] The average annual expenditure for each Chinese CSO stood at 199,700 renmimbi in 1998, and the entire expenditure of Chinese CSOs accounted for only 0.46 percent of the country's GDP, while the figure was more than 10 percent in the Netherlands and Israel, and over 5 percent in the United States and Australia.[19] Another survey, conducted in 2004, argues that there were 62.6 CSOs per every 10,000 Chinese, which would imply that the density of CSOs in China is not lower than that in developed countries.[20] According to research done by Wang Shaoguang and He Jianyu, the discrepancy is not due to the matter of density, but to the nature of Chinese CSOs in general. Very often Chinese CSOs nurture close relations with the government, often in the hope of obtaining more resources, and thus they are often not fully independent. According to these studies, among all CSOs in China, 62.7 percent belong to the category of people's associations, while 20.9 percent are quasi-governmental organisations: both of these are strongly subsidised by the government and benefit from institutional arrangements whereby they have administrative branches at both central and

16. Wen Jiabao, 'Guanyu Shehui Zhuyi Chuji Jieduan de Lishi Renwu he Woguo Duiwai Zhengce de Jige' [Our historical tasks at the primary stage of socialism and several issues concerning China's foreign policy], 2007. See: http://news.xinhuanet.com/politics/2007-02/26/content_5775212.htm.

17. Wang Ming, Liu Guohan and He Jianyu, *Zhongguo Shetuan Gaige: Cong Zhengfu Xuanze dao Shehui Xuanze [China's Reform on Social Organizations from the Government Choice to the Society Choice]*, (Beijing: Social Sciences Academic Press, 2002), p. 105.

18. Ibid.

19. 'China has too few NGOs helping vulnerable groups: survey', *Beijing Times*, 8 January 2004. See: http://english.people.com.cn/200401/08/eng20040108_132070.

20. Wang Shaoguang and He Jianyu, 'Associational Revolution in China: Mapping the Landscapes', in *Korea Observer*, vol. 35, no. 3, 2004, pp.485-533.

county level, which means the network of associations can extend all over China.[21] These studies also argue that registered CSOs are rapidly increasing in number and many of these organisations are seeking closer links with the government.[22] The grassroots CSOs mainly operate at local or county level and address issues closely related to the needs of people's daily lives. They represent pure non-governmental, non-profit, independent and voluntarily-formed organisations. Even though there are successful cases where CSOs make the headlines of the newspapers, the activities of many grassroots CSOs, especially community or countryside-based ones, go unnoticed and fail to exert impact at a wider level in society. Besides, the different categories of CSOs have resulted in different statistical estimations of the number of CSOs and their proportion per every 10,000 people, which makes the issue difficult to analyse.

The development of CSOs in China is also far from mature in terms of depth and degree of participation, diversification and availability of resources for the CSOs. For most Chinese, their engagement in philanthropic and voluntary activities still mainly takes place on an occasional and optional basis, and is far from regular. Furthermore CSOs are much more common in big cities and coastal areas; fewer exist in the countryside and in the poorer western areas of China. For example, the CSOs in Hainan, Ningxia and Qinghai provinces, all of which are less developed areas, account for less than 1 percent of the total number of CSOs in China.[23] People in coastal and urban areas are much more involved in civil society activities than those in remote and underdeveloped areas. Not only have CSOs in China developed in an unbalanced way, but networking is also poorly performed due to the scarcity of human, capital and technical resources.[24] Even when these resources are plentiful, often they are not channeled towards CSOs. A lack of professionalism is another major problem that Chinese CSOs encounter since people who work for the CSOs are generally lower-paid due to limited capital resources. Sometimes conditions for CSOs' fundraising are adversely affected by individual cases of power abuse or illicit profit-making activities that some CSOs have been revealed to have engaged in from time to time under the cover of their classification as social organisations. Such incidents have tarnished the collective image and credibility of CSOs and diminished public trust in them. This in turn makes it difficult for CSOs to recruit highly-qualified professionals and to attract sufficient funding.

21. He Jianyu and Wang Shaoguang, 'Zhongguoshi de Shetuan Geming: Dui Shetuan Quanjingtu de Dingliang Miaoshu' [Chinese Associational Revolution: a Quantitative mapping of Associational Landscapes], in Gao Bingzhong and Yuan Ruijun (eds.), *Zhongguo Gongmin Shehui Fazhan Lanpishu [Blue Book on Civil Society Development in China]*, (Beijing: Peking University Press, 2008), p.162.

22. Ibid.

23. Jia Xijing, 'Zhongguo Gongmin Shehui Zhishu Baogao' [Report on China's Civil Society Index], in Gao Bingzhong & Yuan Ruijun (eds.), *Zhongguo Gongmin Shehui Fazhan Lanpishu* [*Blue Book on Civil Society Development in China*], (Beijing: Peking University Press, 2008), p.170.

24. Ibid, pp.170-171.

Unfortunately this kind of vicious circle has negative consequences, especially for the grassroots organisations.

The macro-environment for the development of CSOs in China has contradictory aspects.[25] On the one hand, a strong state with generally stable economic and social development, which is a prominent feature of modern China, provides a better environment for the advancement of civil society. After more than 30 years' of the reform and opening-up policy, principles such as the rule of law, democracy and human rights and the practice of political debate and participation in politics have taken root in Chinese society, along with the great improvement in economic opportunities and enhancement of living standards. On the other hand, the nature of the Chinese polity as a strong state has also entailed difficulties in establishing a balanced relationship between the government and civil society and between the private sector and civil society. The lack of autonomy is one of the major consequences of the fact that the government remains in a dominant position in Chinese society. Ordinary people in China still believe that the government should bear responsibility for almost everything in their daily lives and they trust the government more than the CSOs. Those areas where the CSOs are perceived as having a role to play correspond to vacuums or areas that the government has ignored. The lack of stable institutionalised dialogues with and support from the government is another factor that hinders the further development of Chinese CSOs. 'In China, the relationship between civil society and the state is in a dilemma. The CSOs want to free themselves from interference from the state while at the same time they try to rely on the government. They hope to stand on an equal footing to have dialogues, only to find that not many mechanisms exist for their continual communication with the government.'[26]

The institutional environment is also important for the development of civil society. The current institutional set-up is characterised by a dual administrative system, which in practice hampers the development of CSOs and is inadequate to help solve the above-mentioned problems.[27] Under current regulations, besides being registered with the Ministry of Civil Affairs, any CSO, if it is to be officially recognised, must also register with the relevant industrial authority. An AIDS-prevention CSO, for example, must register both with the governing body concerning health-related issues and with the civil affairs agency. An environmental CSO must register both with the governing body of environ-

25. Jia Xijing, 'Zhongguo Gongmin Shehui Zhishu Baogao' [Report on China's Civil Society Index], in Gao Bingzhong & Yuan Ruijun (eds.), *Zhongguo Gongmin Shehui Fazhan Lanpishu [Blue Book on Civil Society Development in China]*, (Beijing: Peking University Press, 2008), pp.172-73.

26. Ibid, p.173.

27. Tian Kai, 'Zhongguo Feiyingli Zuzhi Zhili Jiegou de Yanbian' [Evolutionary Change for the Governing Structure of the Non-profit Organizations in China], in Gao Bingzhong and Yuan Ruijun (eds.), *Zhongguo Gongmin Shehui Fazhan Lanpishu* [*Blue Book on Civil Society Development in China*], (Beijing: Peking University Press, 2008), pp.186-87. See also Tian Kai, *Fei Xietiao Yueshu yu Zuzhi Yunzuo* [*Non-coordinated Restraint and Institutional Operation*], (Beijing: Shangwu Press, 2004), p.224-25.

mental protection and with the civil affairs agency in order to be officially recognised and to operate legally. Such requirements have meant that many CSOs have found themselves unable to be officially endorsed simply because they cannot identify the two parallel regulators under whose administrative remit they fall. As a result, many grassroots CSOs, especially community or countryside-based ones, fail to be formally registered. The Global Village of Beijing, one of China's most famous environmental CSOs founded in 1995, has not been officially registered as a fully-fledged NGO simply because it has failed to find the relevant industrial authority or regulator with which it is required to register. As a solution, it was finally registered as a business entity in the business and commercial administration category, although it is in fact an environmental CSO. But being classified as such would have meant, according to the founder of the Village, that it was unable to get preferential tax treatment from the government, making it hard to get sponsorships from domestic companies because it was not entitled to tax exemption.[28] In order to get out of this difficult situation, the founder registered the Village, under the name of a school, as a private non-enterprise entity in 2004, an identity still lacking the full status of a CSO in that it cannot expand its membership. So there is now a campaign to abolish or at least substantially amend the existing dual-management system, which came into force in 1998. Responding to this advocacy, the Ministry of Civil Affairs has recently decided to integrate the dual-track system into a one-track system, whereby the CSOs which focus on public and philanthropic services, social welfare and social services can be registered solely with relevant civil affairs agencies at various levels.[29] This is a new development that has been achieved due to the extensive efforts made to reform the way in which civil affairs have been regulated in the past decade.

The agenda for further development of civil society in China

With these challenges confronting civil society in China, there is a lot to be done not only in order to create a better environment for the development of CSOs but also to improve their performance and efficiency.

The emergence of a better environment for the development of civil society is dependent on the further transformation of China through continual commitment to the reform and opening-up policy. Currently, the sound handling of domestic affairs still retains priority on the Chinese government's agenda. Over the past three decades, China's economy has grown at a rate of nearly 9.6 percent on average. In 2010, China overtook Japan to

28. Zong He, 'Helping NGOs develop Strength', *China Daily* , 28 May 2005, p. 4.

29. Li Liguo (Minister of Civil Affairs), 'Zai 'Shierwu Plan'kaiju Zhinian Chuanzao Minzheng Baozhang he Jiaqiang Shehui Guanli Xinchengji'['Making Progress in Ensuring a Better Life of the People and Enhancing Capacity of Social Management']. See: http://www.mca.gov.cn/article/zxgx/201107/20110700164891.shtml.

become the second-largest world economy in terms of GDP at current exchange rates. In 2009, China's exports reached USD 1.2 trillion, making China the largest world exporter, with its imports totalling USD 1 trillion, thus making it the second-largest importer in the world. In the same year alone, China attracted foreign investments of USD 90 billion, ranking second in the world in this regard. Since 1978, hundreds of millions of Chinese have been lifted out of poverty. Rapid urbanisation has brought millions of farmers into cities, with the urban population accounting for 49.68 percent in 2010.[30] In the same year, nearly 57.39 million Chinese people travelled abroad, representing a year-on-year increase of about 20 percent.[31] The market-oriented reforms have transformed China from a planned economy to a market economy, from a closed country to an open one, from a poor country to a country that aspires to a better life for its 1.3 billion people.

The rapid economic growth, however, has been achieved at the high price of an imbalance between economic and social development, unequal development between regions, a growing gap between urban and rural areas, acute income disparity and environmental deterioration. The economic growth that China has achieved in the past three decades has relied too much on external trade and fixed asset investment, resulting in an unbalanced economic structure, social problems and conflicts, and a low level of internal consumption. After 30 years of efforts, there are still more than 150 million Chinese people living on the equivalent of just one dollar a day, 90 percent of whom live in the countryside.[32] Social construction lags far behind economic development, leaving millions of Chinese people still without access to better health care, education and pensions. Many social institutions still reflect the planned economy of the Mao era, like the ID registration system and the dual system of urban and rural public service policies and structures. As Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao has stated in an article: 'China's socialist market economy and its democracy and legal system are not yet fully developed. Social unfairness, graft and corruption still exist. The socialist system is not yet mature. Therefore, China still has a long way to go before it can move to a stage higher than the primary stage of socialism.'[33] Chinese people are urged to unswervingly adhere to the orientation and direction of the reform and opening up policy 'for the next 100 years and persist in carrying out reform and innovation to ensure enduring vigour and vitality for socialism

30. National Bureau of Statistics of China: *Communiqué of the National Bureau of Statistics of People's Republic of China on Major Figures of the 2010 Population Census(N0.1)*, 28 April 2011. See: http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/china/2011-04/28/content_12415526.htm.

31. '57 Million Jobs Created in China over 2006-2010 Period: MHRSS'. See: http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/bizchina/2010-12/30/content_11778776.htm.

32. Lecture given by Ambassador Zhang Jun, Embassy of the People's Republic of China in the Kingdom of the Netherlands, on the future development of China at Comenius Course, 8 April 2011. See: http://www.chinaembassy.nl/eng/xwdt/t814606.htm.

33. Wen Jiabao, 'Our historical tasks at the primary stage of socialism and several issues concerning China's foreign policy', 2007. See: http://news.xinhuanet.com/politics/2007-02/26/content_5775212.htm.

with Chinese characteristics.'[34] This is a clear elucidation of China's development objectives as articulated by high-level Chinese officials.

In the process of transformation, social tensions and conflicts occur quite frequently. Examples are the much-publicised events that happened respectively in Tibet in March 2008, and in Xinjiang in July 2009, which gave rise to renewed concern about how to strike the balance of development between regions in China. For China, these events are not only social problems that emerge in the form of crises, but also issues that pose a serious challenge to China's sovereignty in the light of the separatist political activities of the Dalai Lama and Rebiya Kadeer together with the Eastern Turkestan Movement. They are, therefore, regarded as issues concerning national unity and sovereignty. So it is a daunting task for China to maintain a balance between its economic and social development, and harmony between individual citizens, which is the basis of healthy civil society building and of long-lasting nation-building.

Under such circumstances, it has become a priority for China to manage its social problems as efficiently as possible and cultivate a coordinated relationship between the government and civil society for the purpose of building a harmonious society, for which CSOs are now recognised as key players among many others. In order to build a coordinated relationship between the government and CSOs, substantial efforts need to be made both in the areas of institutional and regulatory reform on the part of the government, and in capacity building and fundraising on the part of CSOs, as well as in cultural and ideational adaptation on the part of Chinese society as a whole.

Public consciousness of citizenship should be continually fostered and promoted with a clear definition of citizens' rights and responsibilities. On the one hand, centuries of deeply ingrained cultural norms and values still exert extensive influence on Chinese society. The authority of the government is greatly honoured and respected. Chinese intellectuals and ordinary people are taught to have the responsibility of assisting the government in maintaining social order and stability so that people's interests can be better protected. The teachings and precepts of great thinkers are deeply embedded in the minds of Chinese people: for example 'to put the world in order, we must first put the nation in order; to put the nation in order, we must put the family in order; to put the family in order, we must cultivate our personal life; and to cultivate our personal life, we must first set our hearts right.'[35] Thus, the relationship between individuals and the state is perceived to be closely intertwined. The creation of peace and order in a state starts with self-cultivation on the part of its people and the mastery of five virtues, one

34. Ibid.

35. Remarks by neo-Confucian philosopher Zhu Xi (Chu Hsi 1130-1200), *Writings of Zhu Xi*, segment 76.

of which is loyalty to the family and to the government. This is the traditional school of thought concerning the relationship between the government and society. Given this cultural context, most Chinese CSOs still see non-governmental behaviour as a citizen's responsibility in collaboration with the government, and their role as a helper and assistant to the government, even though their own achievements may be far more important and independent than they have claimed. This has been the foundation for the current relationship between the state and society in China. This tacitly understood relationship between state and society is an asset for China when it comes to managing social affairs and social problems.

On the other hand, Chinese society has been transformed into a much more pluralised society through the development of its market economy and its involvement in international affairs. The age of globalisation and information technology has created more scope and opportunities for CSOs to grow and more roles for them to play. The way in which socio-economic issues are envisioned has accordingly altered and such issues need to be tackled in new ways and with new ideas. How to create new institutions, norms and rules and how to develop a stronger interaction between the government, enterprises and society constitutes a daunting task for China in the years ahead. It needs first of all to set clear boundaries, define the scope of interests and responsibilities of the government and society, and then remedy the social trust deficit, cultivate citizenship and develop a 'win-win situation'. Transnational networking, contacts and activities around the world should be encouraged so that Chinese CSOs can participate in global governance, facilitate inter-state cooperation and coordination, and contribute to world peace and prosperity.

Conclusion

All in all, the combined impact of economic reforms and social changes in the past three decades in China has created great momentum for changing the way in which Chinese society is governed. For the first time since the founding of the People's Republic of China (PRC), the government has begun to recognise the need for more non-governmental initiatives and involvement in social affairs. Equally importantly, economic reform and development has revitalised Chinese people's civic awareness and created diversified interests and demands. CSOs have emerged and boomed in China at a critical point in time when a broad range of social problems need to be addressed by multiple channels and solutions instead of being handled only by the government.

China still has a long way to go in building a coordinated relationship between the state and society. As China enters into a new phase of its development, new challenges will occur along with the ongoing urbanisation and industrialisation processes which have already created many problems such as unemployment, migration-related issues, environmental degradation, the widening gap between the rich and the poor, and imbalanced development between different regions. That is why President Hu Jintao has solemnly vowed to build a harmonious society by establishing a creative model of social governance in order to address social problems in more effective ways. Difficult as the task is, China is confident and firmly committed to achieving better management of its social affairs and creating an active and more sophisticated form of civil society in the years to come.

6. The development agenda and peacebuilding: an Indian perspective

Radha Kumar

Introduction

The truism that 'there is no peace without development and there is no development without peace' is often voiced, but it has its flaws. Violent conflict can often occur in relatively developed countries (for example, the former Yugoslavia), and underdeveloped or developing countries can often be relatively peaceful and/or escape the scourge of war.

Nevertheless, development and conflict are closely interrelated when it comes to countries emerging from war, and especially so in cases where the international community is engaged in peace operations designed to pave the way for ending violent conflict or cementing its end. In this context there are multiple connections between development and conflict resolution which have never been as fully recognised as in the present era, when peacebuilding holds high priority in actions undertaken by the international community.

Though countries like India had long argued that development was an integral component of sustainable peace, the issue was overshadowed by the ideological conflict and attendant theories of containment and management that dominated the Cold War. We often forget that the Cold War era began just as the second great wave of decolonisation took place (the first wave was after World War I), pushing the discussion of post-colonial state building and economic recovery into cold storage. An unanticipated outcome of the demise of the Cold War was to bring this discussion back to the table, this time in the context of post-conflict reconstruction and the prevention of any recurrence of conflict.

Recognising development as integral to peace

The significance of development in peace operations was first spotlighted in the immediate aftermath of the end of the Cold War, when two influential UN reports – *An Agenda for Peace* (1992) and *An Agenda for Development* (1994) – emphasised the close connection between peace and development in terms of causes and consequences of conflict, as well as strategies for post-conflict recovery. The *Agenda for Development*, in particular made a

magisterial survey of the relationship. It began with an analysis of the impact of conflict on development:

> The absence of peace is a pervasive reality in many parts of the world. Most peoples must strive to achieve their development against a background of past, present or threatened conflict. Many carry the burden of recent devastation and continuing ethnic strife. None can avoid the realities of a world of ongoing arms proliferation, regional war and the possibility of a return to potentially antagonistic spheres of influence. To the categorisation of countries by level of development should be added the categorisation of countries in conflict.[1]

And went on to make the following points:

(1) Militarisation, a development deficit and the outbreak of conflict are correlated.

Firstly, countries with high military budgets or security dilemmas often suffer from underinvestment in development, creating the potential for an escalating spiral in which a development deficit leads to a re-emphasis on security leading in turn to an increased development deficit, and so on, until conflict becomes a more viable proposition than growth. Secondly, the flow of light weapons to nations and non-state actors that accompanied the end of the Cold War fuelled conflicts in faraway countries. Thirdly, and 'paradoxically, those expressing great concern over the rising stocks of arms worldwide are also the source of that phenomenon. The five permanent members of the Security Council account for 86 percent of the arms supplies now flowing to the countries of the world.'

(2) Development programmes can both cement post-conflict peace and pave the way for an end to conflict.

While development programmes might have the best chance of success after the end of violent conflict, they can also provide the underpinning for a peace process to end the conflict. In these situations, the *Agenda for Development* stated, development activities should start prior to the end of hostilities. The tasks would entail combining provision of emergency relief with capacity building (including special attention to the conditions of women); for example, 'as food is provided there must be concentration on restoring food production capacities. In conjunction with the delivery of relief supplies, attention should be given to road construction, restoration and improvement of port facilities and establishment of regional stocks and distribution centers.'

1. United Nations, *An Agenda for Development*, Report of the Secretary-General, A/48/935, 6 May 1994.

(3) When it is part of peacebuilding, the scope of development expands, intersecting at times with military functions.

Though the *Agenda for Peace* introduced the concept of peacebuilding as an essential complement to peacemaking and peacekeeping, the *Agenda for Development* tied peace building to the establishment of 'institutions, social, political and judicial, that can give impetus to development. Land reform and other measures of social justice can be undertaken. Countries in transition can use peacebuilding measures as a chance to put their national systems on the path of sustainable development.'

Thus, as a component of peacebuilding, mine clearance was a means of bringing large tracts of land back to agricultural use; the reintegration of combatants through micro-credit programmes acted as a means of social stabilisation; the reinforcement of judicial systems and governance mechanisms helped to generate revenue, stimulate private enterprise and protect human rights.

(4) Development programmes can help prevent the recurrence of conflict.

High expectations of a peace dividend frequently accompany peace settlements, and the failure to meet expectations has often led to the recurrence of conflict. Well-crafted and funded development programmes, such as 'land reform, water-sharing schemes, common economic enterprise zones, joint tourism projects and cultural exchanges' could have the impact of creating constituencies that invest in peace rather than war; while stimulating growth in employment opportunities could be 'a strong inducement to the young to abandon the vocation of war.'

Tying development to peacebuilding

Many of these points were incorporated into the Dayton Peace Agreement of 1995, and the post-conflict reconstruction programmes that followed. Initially, these comprised aid for economic recovery, rebuilding infrastructure and cross-border development programmes aimed at ethnic reintegration, but in the ensuing years the tasks of post-conflict reconstruction in the Balkans grew to include state-building, regional trade and economic integration, tackling the illegal war economies, encouraging small-scale entrepreneurship through micro-credit and bringing war criminals to justice.

The Millennium Summit of 2000 took such initiatives one step further by adding in the concepts of equal opportunity, respect for nature and shared responsibility for peace,

security and disarmament,[2] and by 2001 the UNSC had begun to back the creation of a peacebuilding unit at the UN, with the UNSC President stating that: 'peace building is aimed at preventing the outbreak, the recurrence or the continuation of armed conflict and therefore encompasses a wide range of political, development, humanitarian and human rights programs and mechanisms.'[3]

More than a decade after the emerging doctrine of peacebuilding was introduced in the UNSG's 1992 *Agenda for Peace*, the UNSG's 2004 Report of the High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change (*A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility*) and the 2005 Report *In Larger Freedom: Towards Development, Security and Human Rights for All*, brought development to the core of security.[4]

In his letter presenting the 2005 report, the UNSG stressed its:

> emphasis on *development as the indispensable foundation* of a new collective security. Extreme poverty and infectious diseases are threats in themselves, but they also create environments which make more likely the emergence of other threats, including civil conflict. If we are to succeed in better protecting the security of our citizens, *it is essential that due attention and necessary resources be devoted to achieving the Millennium Development Goals*.

While this emphasis validated the link between 'freedom from want' and 'freedom from fear', it also located it within the concept of human security which was developed by the Independent Commission on Human Security that had been established to follow up on the Millennium Summit declaration. Its 2003 report *Human Security Now* stated:

> This understanding of human security does not replace the security of the state with the security of people. It sees the two aspects as mutually dependent. Security between states remains a necessary condition for the security of people, but national security is not sufficient to guarantee peoples' security. For that, the state must provide various protections to its citizens. But individuals also require protection from the arbitrary power of the state, through the rule of law and emphasis on civil and political rights as well as socio-economic rights.
>
> But, of course, this does not mean an end to the debate about the role of the state in security management. Rather, it reinforces the point that without popular participation in shaping

2. United Nations Millennium Declaration, Resolution adopted by the General Assembly, A/55/L.2 (55/2), 18 September 2000.

3. UN Security Council Presidential Statement, S/PRST/2001/5, 20 February 2001.

4. *A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility*, Report of the High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change, A/59/565, 2 December 2004, and *Follow-up to the Outcome of the Millennium Summit*, Report of the Secretary-General, Addendum Peacebuilding Commission, Explanatory note by the Secretary-General, A/59/2005/Add.2, UNDOC/GEN/N05/356/07/PDF/N0535607, May 2005.

> agendas on security, political and economic elites will go it alone in a process that will further marginalise and impoverish the people ... Rethinking security in ways that place people and their participation at the center is an imperative for the 21st century.[5]

The UNSG's Addendum on Peacebuilding laid down seven action areas for a UN Peacebuilding Commission:

(1) *In the immediate aftermath of war, to provide necessary information to the Security Council and focus attention on development and institution-building efforts necessary for recovery.*

(2) *Help to ensure predictable financing for early recovery activities, in part by providing an overview of assessed, voluntary and standing funding mechanisms.*

(3) *Periodically review progress towards medium-term recovery goals.*

(4) *Ensure sustained financing of recovery and development activities and extend the period of political attention to post-conflict recovery.*

(5) *Prevention.*

(6) *Develop best practice on cross-cutting peacebuilding issues.*

(7) *Improve the coordination of the United Nations funds, programmes and agencies*. [6]

It also suggested creating a Standing Fund for Peacebuilding, so that immediate tasks would not be held up while mustering resources, and emphasised the 'critical links between the ongoing process of stabilisation at the military/political level and the underlying process of recovery at the economic/financial/institutional level.'[7]

At the same time, and to the disappointment of civil society supporters of peace building, the UNSG clarified that the proposed Commission should not have an early-warning function. Other UN units and regional organisations, not the Peacebuilding Commission, would deal with 'operational prevention' through initiatives such as mediation and preventive peacekeeping.

---

5. Frene Ginwala, 'Rethinking security: An imperative for Africa?', in *Human Security Now*, Report of the Independent Commission on Human Security (New York: 2003). See: http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/91BAEEDBA50C6907C1256D19006A9353-chs-security-may03.pdf.

6. *Follow-up to the Outcome of the Millennium Summit*, op. cit. in note 4.

7. Ibid.

Finally, in December 2005, the UN Peacebuilding Commission was established by resolutions 60/180 and 1645 (2005) of the General Assembly and the Security Council with the mandate to 'bring together all relevant actors to marshal resources and to advise on the proposed integrated strategies for post-conflict peacebuilding and recovery; help ensure predictable financing for early recovery activities and sustained financial investment over the medium to long-term; and develop best practices on issues in collaboration with political, security, humanitarian and development actors.'[8]

Bringing financial and development organisations in

By 2005, therefore, an essential gap in the UN's policy and structure, which had first been highlighted during the debates on post-colonial transitions, was filled. Peacebuilding would undertake the non-military tasks of post-conflict stabilisation and reconstruction, from state building to economic recovery to civil society empowerment. Civil and military programmes would be coordinated, so that each supported the other. The Peacebuilding Commission would work closely with financial, development, refugee and human rights organisations to plan and implement programmes that would segue from immediate to medium-term and thence to long-term activities in order to entrench sustainable peace and development.

The Peacebuilding Commission's partners include the UNDP, UNIDO, UN Women, UNHCR, and the UN Development Group (formed to achieve fulfilment of the Millennium Development Goals). Its major financial partner was the World Bank, which had expanded its policies of assistance to countries in transition to include assistance in post-conflict reconstruction over the same decades of the 1990s to 2010s.

The World Bank extended its mandate to peacebuilding aid on the grounds that violent conflict adversely affected the Bank's core mission of poverty reduction:

> The Bank recognises that economic and social stability and human security are pre-conditions for sustainable development. Violent conflict, within or between countries, results in loss of life and destruction of assets, contributes to social and economic disintegration, and reverses the gains of development, thereby adversely affecting the Bank's core mission of poverty reduction. Such conflict not only affects the country or countries of the combatants, but also may spill over to other countries and have regional implications.[9]

8. United Nations Peacebuilding Commission. See: http://www.un.org/peace/peacebuilding/pbcagenda.shtml.

9. World Bank Operation Manual, *Development Cooperation and Conflict*, OP 2.30 (2005), January 2001 (revised June 2005).

Significantly, too, the Bank defined prevention through development as one of its objectives in conflict-related programmes. In its Operation Manual 2.30, titled *Development Cooperation and Conflict*, the Bank categorised its work in conflict areas as being (a) in countries that are vulnerable to conflict, where the Bank would provide development assistance that would minimise potential causes of conflict; (b) in countries in conflict, where the Bank would provide what assistance it could while also offering analytical expertise on the impact of conflict and assistance; and (c) in countries in transition from conflict, where the Bank would 'support economic and social recovery and sustainable development through investment and development policy advice, with particular attention to the needs of war-affected groups who are especially vulnerable by reasons of gender, age, or disability.'[10]

Doctrines on the ground

How did these emerging doctrines work in practice? In 2009, the Peacebuilding Commission's Report, *Post-Conflict Needs Assessment*, confessed that the window of opportunity that the immediate post-conflict period offered had been missed too often, because it had not been possible 'to provide basic security, deliver peace dividends, shore up and build confidence in the political process, and strengthen core national capacity' and so the foundations for sustainable development had not been laid.[11] Within the UN, it said, 'despite ongoing efforts to integrate planning for security, efforts aimed at political, humanitarian and development remain a serious challenge.'

Perhaps they were setting the ante too high. Post-conflict situations might offer a window of opportunity but they are also plagued by illegal war economies and their beneficiaries, and by political actors seeking to maximise power, not to mention all their dependents and collaborators. In such situations political and economic development have to contend with innumerable obstacles, both large and small, especially if there are several countries involved in the conflict. Afghanistan is a case in point: after 10 years the civilian institutions that have developed under international protection seem as vulnerable to attack as were the institutions developed prior to the Taliban takeover. But the aspiration for a democratic polity also has a considerable constituency today, whose effects are difficult to measure.

10. Ibid.

11. United Nations General Assembly Security Council, Report of the Secretary General on Peacebuilding in the Immediate Aftermath of Conflict, A/63/881–S/2009/304, 11 June 2009. See: http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N09/367/70/PDF/N0936770.pdf.

Perhaps in recognition of such obstacles, the 2009 Peacebuilding Commission's report highlighted three core areas of action, on what they called 'recurring priorities':

> Support to the provision of basic services, such as water and sanitation, health and primary education, and support to the safe and sustainable return and reintegration of internally displaced persons and refugees;
>
> Support to restoring core government functions, in particular basic public administration and public finance, at the national and subnational levels; and
>
> Support to economic revitalization, including employment generation and livelihoods (in agriculture and public works) particularly for youth and demobilised former combatants, as well as rehabilitation of basic infrastructure.[12]

All three, as we have seen, were also on the development agenda.

India's position

India is a founding member of the Peacebuilding Commission and is an active participant in the Peacebuilding Commission's operations in Africa. Speaking at the UNSC on 'Post-Conflict Peacebuilding' in October 2011, India's Minister for State for External Affairs, E. Ahamed, mentioned India's additional contribution to the Peacebuilding Fund and made the following points: first, that peacebuilding distilled lessons learned from peacekeeping and that India had a sixty-year long experience in this area – 'Our peacekeepers have invariably also been early peace-builders.'[13] Second, having itself made the transition of nation and state building, India would continue to share its 'experience and expertise with ... countries that have embarked onto the path of transition from conflict to peace.' Third, while security is 'the key pillar for peace-building... (it was) equally important to focus on economic opportunity, particularly for the youth in tandem with political and social stability.' And fourth, that there should be 'an effective two-way dialogue between countries on the Agenda of the PBC and the Commission itself through all phases', so as to ensure 'national ownership.'[14]

In an earlier statement at the UNSC in February 2011, Mr. Ahamed had spelt out the Indian government's position on the interdependence between security and development in great detail. Quoting Mahatma Gandhi's remark that 'poverty is the worst form of

12. Ibid.

13. Statement by External Affairs Minister (EAM) at the Security Council on Post-Conflict Peacebuilding, New York, 31 October 2011. Available at: http://www.mea.gov.in/mystart.php?id=515818471.

14. Ibid.

violence,' he cited the Charter of the United Nations as recognising that violence and the lack of development are interrelated and committing the United Nations to promote 'social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom.' Development, he said, had to be based on the principles of inclusivity and tolerance; moreover:

> The lessons of inclusivity can also be applied to international efforts in the maintenance of peace and security. The process of implementing a peace agreement must run along with the provision of humanitarian and emergency assistance, resumption of economic activity, and the creation of political and administrative institutions that improve governance and include all stakeholders, particularly the weak and underprivileged.[15]

Despite the UN's recognition of the interdependence of peace and development, he pointed out, the peacekeeping budget of the UN, which is about USD 8 billion annually, is more than the combined budgets of UNDP and UNICEF, concluding: 'It is obvious that development expenditures need to be enhanced greatly if they are to make a dent on security problems ... We also need to ensure that collective security mechanisms intersect with our collective efforts for economic progress to mitigate the causes of persistent insecurity at a global level.'

Both statements made a strong pitch for increased participation and deployment of human resources for peacebuilding operations from developing countries, especially from 'the global South', citing the African Union's initiatives through NEPAD and the African Peer Review Mechanism, which drew lessons that were relevant to national ownership, and India's own learning curve from post-colonial transition to its current phase of inclusive development through enactment of the rights to information and education along with rural employment guarantee programmes and reserved seats for women in the legislatures and local bodies.

The Indian government's engagement with peacebuilding currently appears to be on a series of tracks. Foremost is its pledge to work under the aegis of the UN and with the Peacebuilding Commission, both operationally and in the formulation of doctrine. On the latter, they work within the UN and seek improved coordination between the P5 and elected members of the UNSC as well as between the UNSC, the General Assembly and the Peacebuilding Commission. At the same time, the Indian government is working with Brazil and South Africa through the three-country IBSA mechanism, the African Union and regional African groupings, 'to promote South-South perspectives on development and security.'

15. Statement by EAM at the Security Council on 'Maintenance of International Peace and Security: Interdependence between Security and Development', New York, 11 February 2011. Available at: http://www.mea.gov.in/mystart.php?id=515817166.

Second, the Indian government's peacebuilding activities are not confined to UN operations alone. In West Asia, India contributes development support to the Palestinian Authority of USD 10 million annually as untied budgetary support, along with grants to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA).

India's biggest investment in peacebuilding is in Afghanistan (USD 1.5 billion to date). Though it has 'gone it alone' in Afghanistan, the relative success of Indian peacebuilding there, as measured by the spread of activities across Afghan provinces and effective use of resources, has attracted international attention and provided useful models for agencies in the field.

Conclusion

As can be seen from the brief description above, India has been active in bringing the development and peacebuilding agendas together. The Indian approach can be summarised as follows:

- Development, peacebuilding and security impact closely on each other, and for a successful transition from conflict to peace they should form the three pillars of policy and programmes.

- As peacebuilding evolves, developing countries should provide key components for peacebuilding operations, both on the ground and in terms of experience-sharing. Regional actors such as the African Union can lead the way.

- India's experience in global peacekeeping and domestically its transition to freedom, nation, state and institution building, together with its position as an aspirant to permanent membership of the UNSC, indicate both its capacity and willingness to play an active role in UN peacebuilding.

- India will also act as a regional peacebuilder where and when possible.

- National ownership of peacebuilding programmes is central. In Afghanistan, India's investment in peacebuilding has been chanelled through the Afghan government, and has comprised both infrastructure and human resource development and civil society institution building (media, women's self-employment).

- The involvement of international financial organisations in the Peacebuilding Commission's operations should have a beneficial impact. Nevertheless, the development budget of the UN needs to be doubled or trebled to bring it into line with the peacekeeping or security budget.

Looking at the close parallels between the Indian position and the UN's evolving doctrine on peacebuilding, can we conclude that the development agenda and peace building have now fused into one policy strand, or even that they are now in sync? Fortunately or unfortunately, the answer is 'no'. Development agencies will continue to have a wider range of activities and far more funding for work in the more peaceful countries than in post-conflict countries simply because they will have a better chance of success in relatively peaceful environments, along with a higher potential return on investment. The underlying principle here is the same as the policy of shoring up oases of peace in conflict areas, i.e. that it will contain the area of conflict and offer a substantive incentive to emerge from conflict and expand the oases of peace.

Nevertheless, we also see from the above that the link between development and peacebuilding has grown stronger over the past 5 years and is now located in the concept of human security, with an emphasis on rule of law, protection of civilians and human rights, and inclusive economic development that ensures that dispossessed, disaffected and formerly armed groups are provided for. On the ground this has meant the expansion of the civilian components of peace operations and a closer policy planning and implementation relationship between military and civilian organisations.

Moreover, from the brief analysis of India's position given above, developing countries and in particular Brazil, India and South Africa are likely to play a much larger role in peacebuilding, not only at the doctrinal level but also in the field. Equally significantly, there is far closer interaction between the officials involved in a peace mission and civil society organisations, including joint programmes; indeed there is civil society participation in many official missions. Notably, many peace operations today include anthropologists who specialise in the local customs and practices of the concerned area.

Does this mean that civil society organisations and/or members are being coopted? If so, it is a welcome departure. Since conflicts so often erupt when there is distance between government and civil society, if they can cooperate in peacebuilding then the first step towards laying the foundation for sustainable peace has been taken. There is of course a long way to go before such a conjuncture can emerge. At present partnerships between governments and civil society are stronger at the international and/or regional level than at the national level. Paradoxically, many peace missions find it easier to establish cooperation with local civil society than with national governments, leading to further fragmentation of political and delivery mechanisms. In effect, state-building remains the key to effective civil society participation.

Annexes

About the authors

Françoise Bouchet-Saulnier is the Legal Director of Médecins sans Frontières and former Research Director at the Fondation Médecins sans Frontières. She is the author of several books and articles on humanitarian law and international justice, in particular the *Dictionnaire pratique du droit humanitaire* (2000), a reference book translated into seven languages. Since 1991 she has been involved in shaping MSF responses to situations of armed conflict and in clarifying the legal rights and responsibilities of medical personnel who treat the victims of violence. She currently teaches in the Master's Programme at the Institut d'etudes politiques in Paris and at the Institut Catholique de Paris.

Radha Kumar is a trustee of the Delhi Policy Group, and Director of its Peace and Conflict Program. She is a specialist in ethnic conflicts, peacemaking and peacebuilding. Dr. Kumar was formerly Head of the Mandela Centre for Peace at the Jamia Millia Islamia University in New Delhi (2005-10) and Senior Fellow in Peace and Conflict Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations in New York (1999-2003). She is currently on the Board of the UN Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) and the Foundation for Communal Harmony (India, Ministry of Home Affairs), a member of the Council on Security and Cooperation in the Asia-Pacific (CSCAP India), and an Associate Fellow of the Asia Society in New York. She has recently been named one of the three Kashmir Interlocutors by the Government of India.

Raffaele Marchetti is assistant professor in International Relations at LUISS University, Rome. His research interests include global politics and governance, transnational civil society, and democracy. He was scientific coordinator of the FP6 project *SHUR. Human Rights in Conflicts: The Role of Civil Society*. He holds a Laurea in Philosophy from the University of Rome La Sapienza, a Ph.D. in International Political Theory from the London School of Economics and Political Science, and was Jean Monnet Fellow at the European University Institute. He has published extensively on global governance and civil society issues and is currently working on a book on *The Other Side of Global Politics: Goals, Strategies, and Impact of Civil Society Mobilization*.

Luis Peral is Senior Research Fellow at the EUISS, where he deals with the EU's contribution to multilateralism and in particular to the international security system, EU-Asia relations with a focus on India, and international responses to conflict situations such as Afghanistan and Libya. His academic research and publications focus on UN peacekeeping, human rights and forced migration. He is also a member of the editorial board of *The Refugee Law Reader*. Apart from his academic career, he has in the past been involved in second-track diplomacy as one of the directors of the Toledo International Centre for Peace.

Álvaro de Vasconcelos has been Director of the EU Institute for Security Studies since May 2007. Prior to this, he headed the Institute of Strategic and International Studies (IEEI) in Lisbon, of which he is a co-founder, from 1981 to 2007, from where he launched several networks including the Euro-Latin American Forum and EuroMeSCo. He has a particular interest in global governance, European integration and Mediterranean issues. He is author and editor of many books, articles and reports, notably in the areas of the EU common foreign and security policy, and on the world order.

Catherine Wihtol de Wenden est une politologue et une juriste française. Directrice de recherche au CNRS (CERI) et docteur en science politique (Institut d'études politiques de Paris), elle est une spécialiste des migrations internationales sur lesquelles depuis une vingtaine d'année, elle a mené différents travaux, mené de nombreuses études de terrain et dirigé différentes recherches comparatives, surtout européennes. Elle a été consultante auprès de l'OCDE, du Conseil de l'Europe, de la Commission européenne et « expert externe » auprès du Haut Commissariat des Nations unies pour les réfugiés. Elle est aussi membre de la Commission nationale de déontologie de la sécurité.

Zhu Liqun is Vice-President of China Foreign Affairs University (CFAU) where she is also Professor of International Studies. She is a former Director of the Institute of International Relations at CFAU. She is Secretary-General of the China National Association for International Studies, and a board member of the Guiding Committee of History Teaching of the Chinese Ministry of Education. She is also Deputy Editor-in-Chief of the journal *Foreign Affairs Review*.

Abbreviations

AIDS	Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
BIT	Bureau international du travail
CMPD	Crisis Management and Planning Directorate
CSO	Civil society organisation
DG	Directorate General
ECHO	European Commission Humanitarian Aid Office
EJO	Environmental justice organisation
GDP	Gross domestic product
HCR	Haut Commissariat pour les Réfugiés
IBSA	India-Brazil-South Africa Dialogue Forum
ICC	International Criminal Court
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
IT	Information Technology
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
OCHA	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
OIM	Organisation internationale pour les migrations
OSCE	Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe
PBC	Peacebuilding Commission
PRC	People's Republic of China
SALW	Small arms and light weapons
UN	United Nations
UNAMA	United Nations Mission in Afghanistan
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNSC	United Nations Security Council
UNSG	United Nations Secretary General
USD	United States Dollars
WTO	World Trade Organisation

Chaillot Papers

126 Jun 11 **The Western Balkans and the EU: 'the hour of Europe'**
Morton Abramovitz, Florian Bieber, Dejan Jovic, Robert Manchin, Alina Mungiu-Pippidi, Sašo Ordanovski, Momčilo Radulović, Denisa Sarajlić-Maglić, Igor Štiks, Veton Surroi, Jovan Teokarevic; edited by Jacques Rupnik

125 Apr 11 **The G-20: A Pathway to effective multilateralism?**
Juha Jokela

124 Dec 10 **European Involvement in the Arab-Israeli Conflict**
Muriel Asseburg, Michael Bauer, Agnès Bertrand-Sanz, Esra Bulut Aymat, Jeroen Gunning, Christian-Peter Hanelt, Rosemary Hollis, Daniel Moeckli, Michelle Pace, Nathalie Tocci; edited by Esra Bulut Aymat

123 Nov 10 **L'UE et l'Afrique : les défis de la cohérence**
Damien Helly

122 Oct 10 **Violence politique et paix dans le monde arabe**
Abdallah Saaf

121 Sep 10 **China's foreign policy debates**
Zhu Liqun

120 Apr 10 **Nuclear weapons after The 2010 NPT review conference**
Ian Anthony, Camille Grand, Łukasz Kulesa, Christian Mölling, Mark Smith; edited by Jean Pascal Zanders

119 Nov 09 **Back from the cold? The EU and Belarus in 2009**
Margarita M. Balmaceda, Sabine Fischer, Grzegorz Gromadzki, Andrei Liakhovich, Astrid Sahm, Vitali Silitski and Leonid Zlotnikov; edited by Sabine Fischer

118 Oct 09 **Global security in a multipolar world**
Feng Zhongping, Robert Hutchings, Radha Kumar, Elizabeth Sidiropoulos, Paulo Wrobel and Andrei Zagorski; edited by Luis Peral with an introduction by Álvaro de Vasconcelos

117 Jul 09 **EU security and defence. Core documents 2008 – Volume IX**
compiled by Catherine Glière (also published in French)

Books

2011 **The Agenda for the EU-US strategic partnership**
Bassma Kodmani, F. Stephen Larrabee, Patricia Lewis, Patryk Pawlak, Maria João Rodrigues; edited by Álvaro de Vasconcelos

2011 **Perspektiven für die europäische Verteidigung 2020**
Claude-France Arnould, Juha Auvinen, Henri Bentégeat, Nicole Gnesotto, Jolyon Howorth, F. Stephen Larrabee, Tomas Ries, Jacek Saryusz-Wolski, Stefano Silvestri, Alexander Stubb, Nuno Severiano Teixeira, Álvaro de Vasconcelos, Alexander Weis und Richard Wright; Mit einem Vorwort von Catherine Ashton. Herausgegeben von d'Álvaro de Vasconcelos

2010 **Global Governance 2025: at a Critical Juncture**
EUISS and NIC (Joint publication)

Civil society organisations have today acquired a new prominence as international actors. By virtue of their links to citizens and due to the extensive nature of their networks, they can now claim to give a voice to international – indeed global – public opinion. They are therefore in a unique position to address the widely perceived 'democratic deficit' in global governance.

This volume, which includes chapters derived from reports originally presented at the 2010 EUISS Annual Conference on the theme of civil society, examines the role of civil society actors with specific reference to the emergence of a global public sphere. It explores how civil society organisations are contributing to the global dialogue on key issues, with a particular focus on humanitarian assistance, peacebuilding and development. The book also highlights regional perspectives on the impact of civil society on governance and democratisation processes.

ISBN 978-92-9198-194-6
QN-32-11-946-EN-C
doi:10.2815/25825

published by the EU Institute for Security Studies
43 avenue du Président Wilson
F-75775 Paris cedex 16
phone: +33 (0)1 56 89 19 30
fax: +33 (0)1 56 89 19 31
e-mail: info@iss.europa.eu
www.iss.europa.eu