NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

CENTER ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

**Engagement on Development and Security:
New Actors, New Debates**

edited by Jake Sherman, Megan M. Gleason, W.P.S. Sidhu, and Bruce Jones

September 2011

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

CENTER ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

The world faces old and new security challenges that are more complex than our multilateral and national institutions are currently capable of managing. International cooperation is ever more necessary in meeting these challenges. The NYU Center on International Cooperation (CIC) works to enhance international responses to conflict, insecurity, and scarcity through applied research and direct engagement with multilateral institutions and the wider policy community.

CIC's programs and research activities span the spectrum of conflict insecurity, and scarcity issues. This allows us to see critical inter-connections and highlight the coherence often necessary for effective response. We have a particular concentration on the UN and multilateral responses to conflict.

Table of Contents

Engagement on Development and Security: New Actors, New Debates

edited by Jake Sherman, Megan M. Gleason, W.P.S. Sidhu, and Bruce Jones

Introduction and Overview of the New Actors and New Debates

by Jake Sherman, Megan M. Gleason, W.P.S. Sidhu, and Bruce Jones

Introduction

In the past several years, key governments and multilateral institutions have devoted considerable effort to the task of more effectively integrating development and security policy responses to the related challenges of countries affected by conflict, post-conflict peacebuilding, and conflict prevention. The looming deadline of the Millennium Development Goals, has focused attention on this important nexus and the near impossibility of crisis- and conflict-affected states achieving these goals unless development and security is more effectively integrated.[1] Despite progress on several fronts, including at the United Nations and at the international financial institutions, developing policy for effective development and security engagement remains a challenge in both conceptual and operational terms – not least because discussion of political, security, economic, and humanitarian issues traditionally has occurred in different multilateral fora, among different sets of stakeholders.

Consequently, coherent and integrated development, security and political support to countries emerging from conflict has proven difficult. Organizing the international response around early support to economic recovery, livelihoods, and services, and the core task of statebuilding has proven a greater challenge. Core political, security, economic, and humanitarian tasks are carried out by an ad hoc and fragmented array of bilateral and multilateral development actors. Existing humanitarian, development and peacekeeping tools currently do not adequately address several fundamental areas of support to conflict-affected and post-conflict states: *(i)* consolidation of peace through sustained mediation support and early investment in national political institutions; *(ii)* rebuilding trust in the state, *(iii)* supporting core state capacities (security, justice, job creation); and *(iv)* strengthening political, economic, and administrative governance capacity.

Moreover, most development organizations maintain financing mechanisms that in many cases are deeply unsuited to conflict and post-conflict settings. Development funds are largely designed to pay for sustainable development under conditions of political stability with stable governments. This approach is a poor fit with conditions of conflict and post-conflict transitions, where instability is the norm, legitimacy is contested, and risks are high. Adding to the problem is that most established donors work on the basis of short-term timeframes and an assumption of linear transitions, whereas in reality most genuine transitions are more turbulent and occur over far longer timeframes.

At the same time, assistance to conflict-affected countries is characterized by the rising influence of the emerging economies/powers[2] – particularly China, India, Brazil, and South Africa, but also the Gulf states. As of yet, international efforts to integrate security and development policy have not adequately incorporated the increasing influence of emerging states. Indeed, while the term "emerging power" initially referred to growing economic weight, the term now encompasses the growing role of these states in global political, security and development dialogues.

This growth is evident in the increasingly prominent role played by IBSA and BRICS in the G-20, the international financial institutions and the UN Security Council. The positions of these emerging powers in the governance of the global economic and financial system is relatively well articulated, especially with regard to the reform of the international financial institutions – notably the World bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). Similarly, their approach to reform of the UN is also well known, although there has been less movement there. In contrast, however, despite their growing role in conflict-affected and post-conflict states, relatively little is known about their approach to more effectively integrating development and security in these troubled states.

All of this matters for three reasons. First, the emerging powers are playing a greater role operationally in crisis-affected and post-conflict environments alongside traditional Western development and security actors,

Engagement on Development and Security: New Actors, New Debates

thereby increasing the challenge of coherence policy support to national governments. Second, greater engagement on the ground by new actors is matched by their growing influence in multilateral policy fora, where their views are increasingly being integrated into policy frameworks. Third, the emerging powers' own relatively recent experiences with political transformation, economic development, and violence reduction may have important lessons relevant for states currently confronting transitions away from conflict – indeed, a major theme of the 2011 World Development Report is that the experiences of what the Bank calls "new middle income countries" may be more salient than the standards and institutional forms typically associated with western aid.

At present, there is no forum where traditional donors and the emerging powers can discuss and debate these issues on equal terms. In multilateral institutions, policy debate remains caught between group politics that exaggerate the differences between western and emerging power policy approaches. The OECD has sought to engage the BRICS, but in discussions for this project several counterparts in Delhi, Brasilia and elsewhere made clear that they had no intention of using the OECD as a platform for this discussion.

Against this backdrop, the purpose of this paper is to provide a basis for informal dialogue among traditional donors and emerging powers on key development and security policy issues in fragile states – both to identify opportunities for collaboration, and as a means to deepen policy dialogue around multilateral issues.

To this end, the paper first summarizes the major policy perspectives, institutional arrangements, and operational approaches of emerging actors and Western states on security and development in crisis-affected and post-conflict settings. This is drawn from papers prepared on each emerging power, CIC's ongoing work with the UN, World Bank, and OECD, and interviews with policy officials at multilateral missions and in capitals. Second, to stimulate discussion among the advisory group for this project, it identifies potential areas of shared interest and modalities for cooperation moving ahead.

I. Policy Perspectives

For most states engaging in some aspect of security and/or development support to countries affected by conflict, their engagement is informed by a policy perspective on the relationship between the two spheres, and on the desired 'end state' of development.

Security/development perspectives

Recent domestic political and economic experience of emerging powers, combined with their growing international diplomatic, economic and political engagement, informs their approach in crisis and post-conflict states. Growing engagement reflects more expansive, and in some cases more assertive, foreign policies. As these actors deepen their engagement, they are adopting approaches that balance regional and global positions, and stress the importance of partnerships in international assistance.

South Africa's democratic transition and experience with reconciliation informs the South African model of conflict resolution, prioritizing unity governments and reconciliation. Since 2000, South Africa has sought to strengthen cooperation in democracy, good governance, conflict prevention and development cooperation.[3] The anticipated creation of a development agency (explored in further detail below) intends to coordinate South African assistance and strengthen development cooperation partnerships.[4]

Brazil has recently put forward a more ambitious foreign policy and its international assistance forms a part of its regional and global engagement. This assistance prioritizes South-South cooperation and technical assistance, and Brazil states that it bases its decisions to engage on both policy priorities and the mix of resources that it can bring to bear in a given situation.[5] Brazil bases its growing international assistance on an inter-state partnership model characterized as horizontal cooperation, questioning the donor-ship model that it perceives to characterize aid offered by other actors, including traditional OECD donors. Its experience in Haiti

has demonstrated the need to integrate stabilization and development activities, and has encouraged a more open attitude towards more expansive multilateral engagement, particularly in environments characterized by institutional breakdown and escalating violence.[6]

In the UN Security Council, India recently identified three critical components to its approach to post-conflict peacebuilding:[7] (i) the relevance of India's own statebuilding experience as compared to Western states, (ii) an inclusive and comprehensive model of peacebuilding and governance at the local level, and (iii) greater focus on South-South cooperation through the IBSA grouping, the Least Developing Countries (LDCs), and African regional institutions including the African Union. Building on prior experience in these environments, India's recent engagement has stressed the importance of capacity building.[8]

The recent growth in China's development assistance, both within Asia and globally has attracted much attention. China has developed major trade, development and investment relationships with states outside its region and is now Africa's second largest trading partner.[9] Economic interests, notably the acquisition of resources, have driven much of China's international engagement over the last decade.[10] China's first foray into aid, especially in the South Pacific and Africa, generated intense criticism both among civil society in those regions and in the West, for the scale of corruption involved, the use of Chinese labor, and exploitative practices. (Many of them redolent of the West's own blighted role in 'development' in Africa during the Cold War.) More recently though, under pressure in particular from the African Union, China's newest investments (for example in Ethiopia) are more contract based, use more local labor, and are increasingly being welcomed by African leaders for actually generating jobs – something most western aid has failed to do.[11] China's recently released White Paper on foreign aid indicates its increased comfort to be perceived as both a donor and a developing country and comes at a time of rapid increase in China's international development assistance.[12]

In the Persian Gulf, the United Arab Emirates, Qatar, and regional bodies like the Islamic Development Bank, are taking an increasingly prominent role in security and economic development assistance in the region, including in response to the Arab Spring. *(Although not part of the initial work plan for this project, given the significance of issues arising from the Arab Spring, CIC will prepare an in-depth paper on Gulf approaches to security and development as part of the next phase of this project.)*

These actors – as well as, on a smaller scale, countries such as Indonesia and Turkey – are entering a terrain that has traditionally been dominated by OECD donors, but at a time when the latter's policy landscape is in flux. Two major strands are driving changing policy among OECD states. First, recognizing that prevailing approaches to international aid have been plagued by a number of inefficiencies limiting its impact, the OECD has been attempting to pursue a global "aid effectiveness" agenda, which stresses national ownership, mutual accountability, and alignment.[13] Canada, Sweden, and the Netherlands, among others, have recently developed action plans on aid effectiveness, which stress the use of partner country systems, alignment and accountability for results, among other objectives. However, the aid effectiveness agenda more broadly and the Paris Declaration have also generated skepticism with both some countries within the OECD and some non-OECD states that argue that this agenda is too process-focused and perpetuates a one-way aid relationship rather than fostering two-way partnerships.

At the same time, a second strand of policy is being driven by operational experiences in Afghanistan, which has dominated policy discussions in Western capitals. NATO members have pursued a "civilian surge" model of developing and deploying their own cadres of rapidly deployable experts, particularly for security and justice sector development.[14] Indeed, at the recent Lisbon Summit, NATO itself decided to establish a civilian reserve, as part of its search for a "coherent approach."[15]

These two strands of policy are arguably in tension, though, as western experts, however skilled, typically lack

in-depth knowledge of the country context and struggle to build sustainable capacity. Both the *World Development Report 2011* and the UN's Independent Review of Civilian Capacity have called for reforms stressing national owner-ship and partnership, including through more flexible and timely use of national and regional expertise and which is drawn from countries with more recent experience with transitions, or that share political, economic, or cultural traits.[16]

Desired 'End States,' Engagement Objectives and Focus

External assistance to crisis-affected and post-conflict states is guided by particular normative objectives and conceptions of the desired "end state" on the part of providers. These are often influenced by historical, political and security considerations and some emerging power approaches, like those of traditional powers, display a distinction between their immediate region and activities carried out on a global scale. The absence of consensus on the desired "end state" and how to achieve it is an obstacle to greater policy coherence on the ground and in multilateral fora.

Brazil states that its priority is to promote political stability and governance, and the reduction of poverty and social inequalities.[17] Its international engagement proposes a balance between peace, solidarity and development and, as noted above, Brazil focuses on developing partnerships with recipient countries.[18] Assistance is provided without ties to commercial interests or foreign investment and the sovereignty of recipient states is at the forefront of all development cooperation.[19] Brazil's international assistance targets Latin American and Lusophone states, and it has recently expanded its regional and global security and political commitments.

Although South Africa has not articulated a desired "end state" for its engagement, it prioritizes diplomacy, negotiated settlements, and reconciliation. It has stated its preference for assistance to approach the model of partnerships, rather than a donor-recipient relationship and this engagement is guided by three principles: *(i)*

building African institutions, *(ii)* increasing regional integration and socio-economic development, and *(iii)* strengthening bilateral relationships.[20] The vast majority of this assistance is targeted within the African region, the stability of which is conducive for South African economic development and security. South Africa has played a key role in supporting political settlements and engaging in preventive diplomacy in neighboring countries. It has also been an important driver for regional integration, including the South African Development Community.[21]

India has not formally formulated a strategy for its security and development engagement, but its approach is shaped by four principles: consolidating the peace; rebuilding trust in the State; building the building blocks of states; and strengthening governance in the target states.[22] India's security and development assistance has been focused in its immediate region and reflects the strategic use of aid and assistance. Indian officials have called attention to the importance of regional peace, prosperity and stability.[23] Indian support to post-conflict states indicates a respect for sovereignty and stresses national capacity and institutions to govern, with priority given to the need for inclusive processes.[24] Assistance is provided without conditionality and encourages recipient participation in the decision making process.[25] India's approach is well demonstrated through its engagement in Afghanistan, where it emphasizes long-term strategic partnership. It has provided significant financial assistance – some US$ 2billion since 2001, making it the largest regional donor and fifth largest international donor, and trains Afghan civil servants in India, supports small business development, and provides medical treatment and education.[26] Indian officials stress, however, that Afghanistan is an exceptional case for India, given its regional strategic significance.

China views itself as a developing country and offers assistance on this basis, without conditionality, packaging aid with trade and investment, with a focus on South-South cooperation.[27] It stresses the importance of non-interference in domestic matters, and is reluctant to engage on political and security issues, arguing that reform in these areas should be domestically driven. China's engagement is guided by their five foundational

principles for peaceful coexistence: mutual respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity; mutual non-aggression; non-interference in each other's affairs; equality and mutual benefit; and peaceful coexistence.[28] Its engagement decisions are also informed by economic and security interests, particularly energy security. China's approach within its region is distinct from assistance delivered further afield. The former is characterized by a focus on strategic interests in stability as well as security, diplomatic and economic interests, while engagement in other regions focuses more on economic interests and development assistance.[29] The desired end state is self-reliance and economic growth with the state responsible for its own security. Assistance is recipient-led based on nationally identified priorities.

There is no consensus in the OECD grouping about end states. The OECD as an institution has identified resilience – the ability to manage change and the capacity and legitimacy to govern – as a central goal of statebuilding assistance.[30] It also stresses the need to align assistance with nationally articulated strategies and priorities. It argues that international assistance should be structured to support statebuilding and the development of core government functions.[31] However, at the level of individual states, there remains considerable variation in policy priorities and modes of engagement. Some, including Canada, the Netherlands, and Norway have articulated policy approaches on a number of key sub-sectors of assistance, including security and justice sector reform and supporting inclusive political settlements. Other countries, like the UK, favor direct budget support; Japan continues to favor bilateral engagement with a focus on infrastructure; and in the US, aid policy is both undergoing wholesale review and caught in Congressional/Administration battles over budget and policy.

II. Actors: Agencies and Strategies

A key consideration for engagement on security and development concerns which government agencies and actors lead and coordinate these activities and how or whether they are guided by articulated strategies. As the scope of their development cooperation expands, emerging powers are developing institutional and policy platforms for its implementation. A similar trend can be seen among more traditional donors where the breadth of actors involved in development cooperation in crisis- and conflict-affected states has generated new institutional arrangements and integrated approaches.

South Africa is in the process of creating the South Africa Development Partnership Agency, expected to be operational by the end of 2011[32], building on the Department of International Relations and Cooperation (DIRCO) and the African Renaissance Fund (ARF). Currently, aid is channeled through DIRCO and a number of government departments, particularly the Department of Defense and the Department of Education. DIRCO is also in the process of finalizing a foreign policy White Paper (building from a 1999 DIRCO White Paper), which will have implications for the South African approach. [33]

In Brazil, development cooperation runs through the Brazilian Agency for Cooperation (ABC), linked to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. ABC was originally created to improve coordination of assistance to Brazil, but now works to strengthen coordination of Brazil's assistance both internally and with external partners.[34] Technical assistance capacities are deployed from a number of government departments, including the Ministry of Defense and Ministry of Justice. Other line ministries including in health, education and agricultural research also play key roles. ABC has undergone recent expansion both in terms of scope of activities and budget, yielding some bureaucratic challenges as Brazilian government agencies take on additional international roles.[35]

The primary actor implementing India's development assistance is the Ministry of External Affairs (MEA), though responsibilities are shared across a number of government ministries. The MEA also provides advice to the Department of Economic Affairs in the Ministry of Finance on international aid packages.[36] Indian assistance has largely been channeled through two instruments – Indian Technical and Economic Cooperation (ITEC) and the India Development Initiative (IDI). ITEC deploys Indian experts to over 150 countries to provide training and technical

assistance.[37] In addition to restructuring aid receipts and paying off India's own debt, the IDI works to cancel debt of Heavily Indebted Poor Countries and provides project assistance to developing countries particularly in South Asia and Africa to promote India's economic interests.[38]

China's foreign aid is overseen by the Ministry of Commerce with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Finance and the Export-Import Bank of China all providing input. These bureaucratic arrangements leave China with fewer administrative requirements than traditional donors allowing it to act in a more ad-hoc manner, often with more rapid disbursement of aid.[39] The 2011 White Paper on foreign aid, which states that China's foreign assistance has 'entered a new stage,' lays out the objectives and types of Chinese international aid and reiterates its position that its international engagement should be thought of as mutual assistance between two developing countries.[40]

Recognizing the links between the humanitarian, political, security and development domains, a number of OECD countries have developed "whole of government" approaches and created stabilization units to coordinate the activities of this diverse group of actors. The state of the art is arguably Australia, where the Prime Minister's office leads a whole of government approach in operations like the Solomon Islands. Canada's 2005 International Policy Statement introduced a whole of government approach, and the Stabilization and Reconstruction Task Force (START) was designed to enhance Canadian engagement in crisis and conflict environments.[41] START has also made moves towards actually integration of strategy at the decision-making stage, as distinct from simply coordinating different strategies on the ground. Sweden has also promoted an integrated approach, including through the creation of teams comprising humanitarian and development experts to improve the quality of both forms of aid and strengthen strategic decision-making.[42] In addition, several OECD countries have developed specific funding instruments for countries transitioning out of conflict or coping with crisis, including the Canadian Global Peace and Security Fund. These innovations complement development institutions within member states, which have traditionally been the main conduit for foreign aid,

including humanitarian assistance. Depending on the state, these development actors either stand-alone or are housed within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs or the Office of the Prime Minister. In the United States, the recent QDDR called for an upgrade of its Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization, turning it into a Bureau.[43] S/CRS still suffers though from a lack of authority over resources.

Yet, despite the increasingly widespread establishment of whole of government approaches as a tool for aligning policies and operational activities within governments, there remain a number of obstacles to increased policy coherence.[44] First, within many governments, there is still a legal and institutional divide between foreign affairs and development funds within government, which creates a gap for financing critical peacebuilding activities like mediation support and security sector reform. (The Netherlands Stability Fund and UK Conflict Pool are notable exceptions.) Second, across governments, differences in which ministry or department has the lead for driving policy in a particular context creates confusion over whom the appropriate counterpart is within partners. Third, there are often distinct differences in policy guidance and approach between capital level and embassy/mission level, further complicating policy coordination.

These bureaucratic issues are already a source of confusion among Western actors. With emerging powers entering the fray, the situation is potentially even more confused, as these actors' bureaucratic structures have evolved differently – for example, several do not have an equivalent to an aid agency, for obvious reasons. This is changing rapidly, though. Moreover, the emerging powers have a stronger preference for action with and through multilateral institutions, whereas the major western players have been drifting away from multilateral operations for some time.

III. Operations

Policy end states play out through specific operational tools. This section of the paper examines peacekeeping, South-South cooperation and trilateral partnerships, and engagement through international groups and fora like the IBSA, the G20, and the UN Peacebuilding Commission.

Peacekeeping

Emerging powers are strong contributors to UN peacekeeping operations. Brazil, China, India and South Africa all stand in the top twenty troop contributing countries.[45] Emerging powers have developed nuanced approaches to peacekeeping, emphasizing key aspects of their international engagement in conflict-affected and post-conflict countries. Participation in UN peacekeeping has been a traditional means of engagement for the emerging powers in the security-development arena, if one that – until recently – did not translate into a greater voice on security policymaking. Nonetheless, the disproportionate involvement of these actors in peacekeeping relative to Western countries has helped to strengthen their influence within the UN.

Brazil's contribution to peacekeeping is growing. In 2010 Brazil deployed 2,198 troops and registered the second-highest increase in troop contributions to UN peacekeeping in 2010.[46] Brazil's role in Haiti as head of military command for MINUSTAH yielded a number of lessons in terms of integrating diplomatic, military and development cooperation activities. Brazil has played a key role in stabilization in Haiti, and has re-imported lessons from this engagement. For instance, experience in dismantling gangs in Port-au-Prince later informed responses to slum violence in Rio de Janeiro.[47]

India is also a key supporter of UN peacekeeping deploying 7,727 troops in 2010, including contingents playing critical operational roles in the Democratic Republic of Congo, Liberia, and Sudan.[48] Its approach seeks to strengthen local institutions and where possible to work through local mediation and conflict resolution mechanisms.[49] India's engagement in UN peacekeeping differs from its development assistance in that the former is a global commitment whereas development cooperation has been primarily focused within the neighboring region.[50] It is not clear how such strong involvement in peacekeeping supports India's national interests other than strengthening its commitment to the UN and making a stronger argument for a larger role in UN and global governance dialogues.

South Africa has adopted a 'developmental peacekeeping' approach, seen as more in line with the regional needs in addressing peace and security. This approach stresses the interconnectedness of peacekeeping and peacebuilding and the need for conflict-sensitive development assistance.[51] South Africa has also played a unique role regionally, where in some cases its early engagement has paved the way for larger regional or UN peacekeeping operations. In 2010 South Africa contributed 2,004 troops to UN peacekeeping operations.[52] The volume of post-conflict and crisis-affected states in the region leads to South African overstretch, even as it faces international pressure to increase its assistance.

China is a cautious, but growing, supporter of UN peacekeeping. It has increased its participation and is currently the most active peacekeeping contributor of the five permanent members of the Security Council.[53] In December 2010, China had 1,955 personnel deployed to nine UN peacekeeping operations, representing 20-fold growth since 2000.[54] It focuses its support in the areas of military observers, engineering, transportation and medical roles. Though it has twice affirmed the responsibility to protect, this support is secondary to non-interference and a requirement for host state consent.[55]

While Western countries have historically been significant troop contributors to UN peacekeeping operations, recent years have witnessed a decline in troop support from a number of these states, with assistance for UN peacekeeping shifting to financing the assessed budget for these operations. For these countries, the emphasis on troop deployment has moved to regional organizations including the European Union and NATO. Western troop contributions to Afghanistan, however, are deployed under a UN mandate.

The importance of peacekeeping is not just on security issues, though obviously the connection to the security role of peacekeepers is a vital one – for example in Haiti. More broadly, though, most peacekeeping operations – at least, those deployed by the UN – are 'integrated missions' or through another mechanism have a multidimensional policy function. There are critical development and

statebuilding functions that occur within peacekeeping missions, not just alongside them. Thus, peacekeeping policy matters a great deal to development/security discussions. There are sustained debates on these issues at the UN, but here the architecture is confused: different states have different weight in the several bodies that address aspects of the issue: UN development agencies, where western donors dominate soft policy but boards are divided; the Security Council, where the P5 still dominate; the Committee on Peacekeeping (C-34), where troop contributors play a vital role; and the budget committees, where power is divided between the West and the Group of 77. Confusion and divided policy direction reigns.

South-South Cooperation and Trilateral Partnerships

South-South cooperation (SSC) and trilateral partnerships (between a recipient country and two providing institutions or states) feature strongly in emerging power approaches to security and development assistance. SSC fits well with emerging power desires to frame international engagement and assistance as partnerships between two equals. These arrangements also allow for these new development partners to share experiences from their own development to inform approaches in crisis- and conflict-affected states. While trilateral cooperation poses advantages for the scope and sustainability of engagement, it also raises some concerns for emerging powers in terms of how this impacts partnerships and ownership.

In Brazil, SSC is based on solidarity, shared experiences and exchanging capacities.[56] It is a key soft power asset as Brazil strives to increase its voice in global discussions on peace and security. Brazil has cultivated strong relationships with developing countries, making it an attractive partner for traditional donors in trilateral aid arrangements, and Brazil finds that this type of engagement can ensure sustainability of efforts, a key priority for its aid.[57]

South Africa stresses the importance of SSC to achieve development objectives, including the MDGs. It finds trilateral partnerships effective for reducing costs and to

avoid a sense of regional interference or hegemony.[58] Its use of these arrangements has grown since 2000, and in the same year the ARF was amended to allow it to receive and spend funds from international donors. By 2007, South Africa had arranged trilateral partnership agreements with the Netherlands, Switzerland, Sweden, Norway and Belgium.[59] Donors recognize South Africa's comparative advantage in engaging in African countries, however, limited practical cooperation may underscore a hesitance on the part of South Africa to be perceived as a donor country.[60]

India's various modes of capacity building and technical assistance demonstrate its strong commitment to SSC. Through ITEC, India provides training assistance in over 158 countries.[61] India is also one of the largest contributors to the Commonwealth Fund for Technical Cooperation and a major contributor to the SAARC Development Fund. India has also created a sister program to ITEC called "Special Commonwealth Assistance for Africa Programme," which provides targeted assistance to the 19 African Commonwealth countries. India has also established a number of technical assistance programs in Africa and the India-Africa Forum's 2010 Joint Action Plan commits to the creation of 21 capacity building institutions in Africa. [62]

SSC is an important mode of assistance for China and also key conceptually, as it validates its engagement in other developing states. However, Chinese officials have recently stressed that SSC should be viewed as a complement to North-South cooperation and that it should not be seen as a substitute for assistance from the North.[63] For China, SSC is best delivered on a bilateral basis. While China is open to cooperating with other actors, including through trilateral arrangements, there may be less incentive for partnerships with traditional donors as these may weaken the sense of cooperation between two developing country partners.[64] These partnerships also run the risk of diluting recipient voices, an experience felt in a 2008 European Commission-Africa-China cooperative initiative. EU efforts under this arrangement were not well received by African countries, which felt excluded from the process, leading China to reduce its engagement through this mechanism.[65] The only example of trilateral cooperation on security issues is the counter-piracy operations on the coast of Somalia.[66]

Engagement through International Groupings

While overall the multilateral landscape has to date failed to adequately incorporate the implications for the rise of emerging powers, a number of institutional groupings and innovations are providing the platforms for emerging powers to demonstrate and strengthen their growing engagement in crisis- and conflict-affected states.

The IBSA Fund for the Alleviation of Poverty and Hunger was created in 2004 within the IBSA Dialogue countries (India, Brazil and South Africa). Each country contributes $1 million per year, and these funds are deployed to implement replicable and scalable projects.[67] Though modest in size, the fund has provided support to projects in Haiti, Guinea Bissau, Cape Verde, Burundi, and the Palestinian authority. Proposed projects are evaluated against criteria to assess their contribution to poverty reduction, national ownership, SSC, use of IBSA country capacities, strengthening local capacity, sustainability, impact, replicability and innovation.[68]

The International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding is a platform for dialogue between fragile states and donors on objectives and means of assistance. Its inaugural meeting in April 2010 yielded the Dili Declaration, which articulated a set of peacebuilding and statebuilding goals, and identified challenges to their achievement.[69] The OECD acts as the Secretariat for the International Dialogue and members of the OECD's International Network on Conflict and Stability (including Canada and Sweden) are participants. Nonetheless, efforts by the OECD to bring the emerging powers into its existing policy fora has underestimated the extent to which the latter have their own policy approaches and priorities. In 2007 the OECD adopted a policy of enhanced engagement with five emerging economies: Brazil, China, India, Indonesia and South Africa. Enhanced Engagement is intended to increase interaction between the OECD and emerging countries. While the policy has shown increased participation of these states in a number of OECD policy areas, it has not yet resulted in strong emerging power engagement in OECD development cooperation groupings. The notable exception is the participation of Indonesia and South Africa as observers in the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness.[70]

The emerging powers have recently increased their efforts for stronger voices in global governance institutions, most notably the UN Security Council (excepting China which is already a permanent member of the Security Council). They have also become increasingly outspoken against unwritten international conventions regarding leadership of multinational institutions, most recently displayed in the selection process for a new Managing Director of the IMF. While BRICS countries released a statement criticizing what it called an "obsolete" convention for a European to lead the IMF,[71] the current leading candidate France's Christine Lagarde has devoted considerable attention to garnering support from middle-income and emerging economies.

Establishing better links between traditional bilateral donors, international financial institutions, and the UN's political/security machinery was the initial motivation behind the establishment of the UN Peacebuilding Commission.[72] Some country-specific mechanisms have played a role in helping national authorities assert greater coherence on external security and development actors – for example, the Norwegian chair of the Burundi CSM negotiated with the IMF to delay a review decision that would have caused Burundi to default, on advice from the peacekeeping mission that the decision would be profoundly destabilizing. In more general terms, though, the PBC has yet to use its role to bring coherence among the disparate entities involved in a post-conflict intervention, where there remains lack of a common strategic vision and consensus on how to achieve it. One exception was the recent meeting of the executive board of the World Bank with the full PBC, potentially a first step towards deepening cooperation and aligning approaches between the key security and the key development multilaterals.

The newest entrant into the field of development is the G20 Development Working Group. The G20 is oddly accused by some of exclusivity, despite the evident fact of its broader representation than the G8. Still, as it moves into development issues, the relationship between it and

Engagement on Development and Security: New Actors, New Debates

the main development institutions – the World Bank, the IMF, the WTO, etc – will be in question. Its multi-year action plan includes activities and timeframes for actions in the priority areas of infrastructure, human resource development, trade, private investment and job creation, food security, growth with resilience, financial inclusion, domestic resource mobilization and knowledge sharing.[73] While this agenda is not limited to crisis- and conflict-affected states, given the engagement across these priority areas by G20 members in these environments, the outcome of the action plan has the potential to have meaningful implications for how both traditional and non-traditional development partners engage. Already some G20 DWG members have called for interaction with, for example, the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding, indicating a potential appetite for policy spread.

IV. Conclusion and Potential Areas for Cooperation

The growing international role of a group of emerging powers now extends from the economic sphere to the political, security and development areas. Emerging powers have considerably expanded their engagement on development and security issues, both in crisis- and conflict-affected states and through multilateral institutions. However, institutional responses have not yet incorporated these shifts in a meaningful way, leaving a gap between traditional donors and emerging powers around key development and security policy issues in crisis- and conflict-affected states.

Several options for how to bridge differences in approach include:[74]

- *Engage in dialogue on a South-South-North basis*, to include recipient states and stress national ownership. The participation of some key traditional donors in the LDC meeting in New Delhi and the Istanbul conference is another venue to build this discussion.

- *Explore functional areas of cooperation around post-2015 follow up to the Millennium Development Goals*, which crisis- and conflict-affected states are furthest from achieving. Building on the considerable experience of both OECD states and emerging states, cooperation potential may exist in areas such as health, agriculture and education.

- Identify methods of *complementary assistance or division of labor*, including in capacity development. Some default division of labor is already occurring including in terms of infrastructure assistance in Africa, where Western donors are more active in supporting 'soft infrastructure' whereas China, for instance, is active in supporting 'production-oriented infrastructure.' However, there are possibilities to build on and develop more active modes for division of labor particularly around capacity development.

- *Identify areas of cooperation around the agenda of the G20 Development Working Group*. The Working Group's multi-year agenda presents opportunities for increased cooperation around the priority areas identified.

- *Deepening cooperation in the Peacebuilding Commission*. The recent development-security meeting of the World Bank and PBC at member state level provides a potential governance mechanism to endorse further clarification of the sequencing of security and development activities, and the division of labor among the various stakeholders.

Those options refer to processes for dialogue. The deeper question is whether there is a substantive convergence, or the possibility for it. There are obvious points of difference between some western actors and some emerging power actors on such issues as the balance between national ownership and international standards, issues of human rights and democratization, and questions of timelines and the forms of institutional development.

Here, reviews of the various actors' policy, and discussions and interviews in preparation of this paper, suggest that following starting points for substantive debate.

• *Stability*. There is a broadly shared interest in seeing states affected by conflict find sustainable pathways to minimize their risk and overcome legacies of conflict. While there are policy differences on end-states, none of the western nor emerging powers see either a national interest or a global interest in states being mired in conflict or failing to overcome its legacies. A recognition of a shared interest in stability is an important political starting point.

• *National political institutions*. As OECD states' policy evolves, there is increasingly convergence around a central issue – the critical role played by the evolution of domestic political institutions, including for maintenance of the rule of law (interior ministry functions, police, etc.) While this has not been a traditional domain for western aid policy, there is increasing recognition by the OECD, the World Bank and others of its importance. For the emerging powers, the importance of national political institutions is a central, common plank of policy. There are, however, important differences in terms of perspectives on modalities – not the if of national political institutions, but the how of supporting their development. A discussion that took the importance of development national political institutions as a starting point, and focused on the question of modalities, could be productive.

• *National ownership and international standards*. Although there are differences of views and differences in the sense of timelines, no serious discussion of international policy on development/security can avoid a genuine discussion of this question.

Progress on these issues, as well as on identifying modalities for improved policy coherence, would constitute an important step forward in providing effective support to states affected by conflict.

Endnotes

[1]See World Development Report 2011: Conflict, Security and Development.

[2]In discussions for this paper, some Indian colleagues stressed a preference for the term "emerging economies", while some Brazilian colleagues preferred the term "emerging economy". At the World Bank, neither phrase is used, rather "new Middle Income Countries" is used. Acknowledging that there are different views on terms, for the purposes of this paper CIC uses "emerging power" for convenience, with no particular political emphasis.

[3]South African Institute of International Affairs, *Emerging Donors in International Development Assistance: The South Africa Case*, International Development Research Centre, January 2008.

[4]Republic of South Africa, Department of International Relations and Cooperation, "Status on When will the South African Development Agency be Established," November 2009.

[5]Monica Hirst, *Brazil's Renewed Responsibilities in Cooperation for Development and International Security*, Background paper prepared for the Center on International Cooperation, June 2011.

[6]Ibid.

[7]Statement by H.E. Mr. S.M. Krishna, Minister of External Affairs of India on Maintenance of International Peace and Security: Interdependence between security and development at the United Nations Security Council on 11 February 2011.

[8]Some of these ideas were first articulated in a discussion on 13 July 2010 between the permanent missions of India and Sweden to the UN on "Moving the Dialogue on International Support in Transitions Forward". In the joint paper, the need for national ownership; rapid, flexible, predictable funding; and South-South cooperation was emphasized.

[9]Elsina Wainwright, *Emerging Power Engagement in Development and Security: China's Role in Conflict-Affected States*, Background paper prepared for the Center on International Cooperation, June 2011.

[10]Ibid.

[11]Ibid.

[12]The People's Republic of China, China's Foreign Aid, Information Office of the State Council, April 2011.

[13]See the 2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the 2008 Accra Agenda for Action.

[14]See for instance, the United States Civilian Response Corps, Canada's Stabilization and Reconstruction Task Force and the United Kingdom's Stabilisation Unit.

[15]NATO, Active Engagement, Modern Defence, Strategic Concept for the Defence and Security of the Members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation adopted by the Heads of State and Government in Lisbon, Portugal, November 2010.

[16]See World Bank 2011 World Development Report: Conflict, Security and Development and the United Nations, Civilian Capacity in the Aftermath of Conflict, Independent Report of the Senior Advisory Group, A/65/747-S/2011/85, 22 February 2011.

[17]Ibid. Monica Hirst.

[18]Alcides Costa Vaz and Cristina Yumie Aoki Inoue, Emerging Donors in Development Assistance: The Brazil Case, International Development Research Centre, December 2007.

[19]Ibid. Monica Hirst.

[20]Ibid. South African Institute of International Affairs.

[21]Republic of South Africa, Department of International Relations and Cooperation, Strategic Plan 2010 – 2013.

[22]See "Moving the Dialogue on International Support in Transitions Forward".

[23]W.P.S. Sidhu, *India's Evolving Role in Development and Security in States at Risk*, Background paper prepared for the Center on International Cooperation, June 2011.

[24]Ibid. W.P.S. Sidhu and Statement by H.E. Ambassador Hardeep Singh Puri, Permanent Representative of India at the UN Security Council on

[25]Post-Conflict Peacebuilding: Institution Building on 21 January 2011.

[25]Ibid. W.P.S. Sidhu.

[26]Ibid. W.P.S. Sidhu and Daniel Norfolk, Why India Matters in Afghanistan, Pragati, Gateway House, 8 June 2011.

[27]Ibid. The People's Republic of China, China's Foreign Aid Paper and Ibid. Elsina Wainwright.

[28]See, for example, Hu Jintao's 2011 New Year Address for a reavowal of these principles, January 1, 2011.

[29]Ibid. Elsina Wainwright.

[30]OECD, *Supporting Statebuilding in Situations of Conflict and Fragility: Policy Guidance*, February 2011.

[31]Ibid.

[32]Republic of South Africa, Department of International Relations and Cooperation, "Status on the Establishment of the SA Development Agency," 14 April 2011.

[33]See Republic of South Africa, Department of International Relations and Cooperation, Strategic Plan 2010 – 2013, note 19.

[34]Sarah-Lea John de Sousa, *Brazil as a New International Development Actor, South-South Cooperation and the IBSA Initiative*, and Ibid. Monica Hirst.

[35]Ibid. Monica Hirst.

[36]Ibid. W.P.S. Sidhu.

[37]Ibid.

[38]Ibid.

[39]Ibid. Elsina Wainwright.

[40]Ibid. The People's Republic of China, China's Foreign Aid Paper.

[41]Government of Canada, START – Stabilization and Reconstruction Task Force, http://www.international.gc.ca/START-GTSR/index.aspx?view=d, accessed 15 June 2011.

[42]OECD, Transition Financing: Building a Better Response, Conflict and Fragility, 2010.

[43]Government of the United States, *Leading Through Civilian Power: The First Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review*, 2010.

[44]OECD, Whole of Government Approaches to Fragile States, 2006.

[45]Center on International Cooperation, Annual Review of Global Peacekeeping Operations, 2011.

[46]Ibid.

[47]Ibid. Monica Hirst.

[48]Ibid. Center on International Cooperation.

[49]Statement by H.E. Ambassador Hardeep Singh Puri, Permanent Representative of India at the UN Security Council on Post-Conflict Peacebuilding: Institution Building on 21 January 2011.

[50]Ibid. W.P.S. Sidhu.

[51]Theo Neethling, "The Security-Development Nexus and the Imperative of Peacebuilding with Special Reference to the African Continent," African Journal on Conflict Resolution, Volume 5, Number 1, 2005.

[52]Ibid. Center on International Cooperation.

[53]The People's Republic of China, National Defense White Paper, Beijing, 2010.

[54]Ibid. Elsina Wainwright.

[55]Sarah Teitt, 'China and the Responsibility to Protect', Report for Asia-Pacific Centre for the Responsibility to Protect, December 19, 2008.

[56]Ibid. Monica Hirst.

[57]Instituto de Pesquisa Economica Aplicada (IPEA) (2010) Cooperação Brasileira para o Desenvolvimento Internacional: 2005-2009, Brasilia, December.

[58]Ibid. South African Institute of International Affairs.

[59]Ibid.

[60]Ibid. and Francis Kornegay, Emerging Power Engagement in Development and Security: South Africa's 'Peace and Security' Perspective on Conflict-Affected States, Background paper prepared for the Center on International Cooperation, June 2011.

[61]Ibid. W.P.S. Sidhu.

[62]Plan of Action of the Framework for Cooperation of the India-Africa Forum Summit, 2010.

[63]Statement by Ambassador Wang Min, Deputy Permanent Representative of China to the UN, at the Second Session of the Intergovernmental Preparatory Committee for the Fourth UN Conference on the LDCs, New York, April 4, 2011.

[64]Ibid. Wainwright.

[65]Alan Gelb, 'Africa opposed to Chinese-Western aid cooperation – Wikileaks', Post on Global Development: Views from the Center, Center for Global Development, December 8, 2010.

[66]Bernardo Mariani, Thomas Wheeler, et al, *China's Growing Role in African Peace and Security*, Saferworld China Programme report, January 2011.

[67]IBSA Trilateral Official Site, IBSA Fund, http://www.ibsa-trilateral.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=29&Itemid=40, accessed 9 June 2011.

[68]Ibid.

[69]International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding, Dili Declaration: A New Vision for Peacebuilding and Statebuilding, April 2010.

[70]Megan Gleason, OECD *Engagement in Development and Security*, Background paper prepared for the Center on International Cooperation, June 2011 and OECD, On-line Guide to OECD Intergovernmental Activity, http://webnet.oecd.org/oecdgroups/, accessed 3 May 2011.

[71]Statement by the IMF Executive Directors Representing Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa on the Selection Process for Appointing an IMF Managing Director, 24 May 2011.

[72]United Nations, General Assembly Resolution 60/180 and Security Council Resolution 1645, 2005.

[73]G20 Development Working Group, Multi-Year Action Plan on Development, 2010.

[74]A number of these ideas were articulated in Elsina Wainwright's background paper, *Emerging Power Engagement in Development and Security: China's Growing Role in Fragile and Conflict-Affected States*, prepared for the Center on International Cooperation, June 2011.

13

China's growing role in fragile and conflict-affected states

Elsina Wainwright

Introduction[*]

China's presence in fragile[1] and conflict-affected states has increased markedly in recent years, as part of an overall increase in China's development and security engagement with Least Developed Countries (LDCs). The perspective of China's policymakers on such states is shaped by a number of factors, including China's foreign policy paradigm and perception of itself as a developing country. It is also shaped by an approach to development, conflict and peacebuilding that diverges in a number of ways from those of Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) donors.

This paper will examine China's policy perspective and development approach in crisis- and conflict-affected states, and how they diverge from those of OECD states. It will also provide an overview of some shared interests and existing cooperation between China and traditional bilateral and multilateral donors in assisting states at risk, and assess prospects for enhanced donor cooperation.

Foreign policy paradigm

China has no overarching policy on fragile and conflict-affected states, and does not even use the term 'fragile states'. Its approach to LDCs – and to foreign policy and development in general – is governed by the foundational five principles of peaceful coexistence: mutual respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity; mutual non-aggression; non-interference in each other's internal affairs; equality and mutual benefit; and peaceful coexistence.[2] In addition to these principles, China's engagement is determined by a calculation of its national interests. Initially the paramount interests were strategic and security, including combatting threats to China's sovereignty and promoting the One-China policy.

A 2008 rapprochement has lessened the intensity of Sino-Taiwanese competition, but these motivations remain strong.

In the last decade or so, however, economic interests, particularly an intense search for resources, have increasingly driven China's growing engagement in LDCs. As a result, Chinese policymakers' perceptions of China's security interests in LDCs have broadened to encompass the need to safeguard burgeoning private and state investments in these states, to maintain security of energy supply, and to protect the expanding expatriate communities.[3] China's security interests also now include an increased apprehension on the part of Chinese policymakers about transnational threats, such as terrorism, piracy, and drug and people trafficking, emanating from some conflict-affected and post-conflict states.

Additionally, diplomatic factors shape China's involvement – China has sought to expand its diplomatic influence and exercise 'soft power' not only as a regional Asia Pacific power but also as an emerging global power with global economic interests. There is a reputational dimension, too, as China seeks to be seen as a 'responsible' international actor.

Lastly, China's engagement is determined by geography. China's assistance to its neighbors in Southeast Asia, for example, has more of a strategic and diplomatic focus than its assistance in Africa or South America, notes a 2007-8 New York University Wagner School study.[4] China provides over 40 times the amount of military assistance to Southeast Asia that it spends in Africa.

Approach to development

In April 2011 China released its first-ever Aid White Paper, which provides the most comprehensive statement yet as to how its aid program works. The White Paper describes the rapid growth of China's foreign aid levels by nearly 30% each year from 2004 to 2009, a product of China's dizzying economic growth and 'enhanced overall national strength.'[5] While often characterized as an emerging

donor, China has actually provided international assistance since 1950. Up to 2009, states the White Paper, China had disbursed 256.29 billion yuan – this equates to about $39.4 billion or just over the 2011 US foreign assistance budget. [6] According to the White Paper, China provides three types of aid – grants, interest-free loans and concessional loans – and focuses on the following sectors: agriculture, industry, economic infrastructure, education, public facilities, health, and as a recent addition, climate change adaptation. The objective of China's foreign aid disbursement is 'to foster local personnel and technical forces, build infrastructure, and develop and use domestic resources, so as to lay a foundation for future development and embarkation on the road to self-reliance and independent development.' [7]

China's development assistance differs from that of traditional OECD donors in a number of significant ways. First, unlike traditional official development assistance (ODA) – a 'North-South' transfer of aid for poverty reduction purposes – China's assistance is better characterized as a package of trade, aid and investment. China's assistance relationships are predominantly bilateral rather than multilateral, and assistance is usually recipient country-led, based on the recipient government's list of priorities.[8] Its aid primarily entails projects rather than budget support, and includes high-visibility, rapidly completed, 'turn-key' projects such as public facilities (for example parliaments or sporting venues) and infrastructure.[9] China's assistance to LDCs has also included debt reduction and cancellation, and the creation of overseas trade and economic zones to promote trade capacity, investment, and jobs growth in states such as Ethiopia and Cambodia.

Second, a key feature of China's assistance is its lack of conditionality. The White Paper states that China 'respects recipient countries' right to independently select their own path and model of development, and believes that every country should explore a development path suitable to its actual conditions.'[10] The only condition China attaches is an external one: that recipient states adopt a One-China policy and recognize China rather than Taiwan in UN matters.

Adherence to the non-interference principle translates into engagement regardless of the nature of the regime. China has strong relationships with states such as Sudan, Zimbabwe, Myanmar and North Korea, with which Western donors either do not engage or do so minimally and with strict conditions attached. China also has engaged in arms transfers to, for example, Sudan, Zimbabwe, and Myanmar.

A third difference is that the concept of 'equality, mutual benefit, and win-win' is at the front and center of China's foreign assistance program.[11] Chinese policymakers characterize assistance as 'mutual help' between China and the recipient state, and stress that both should benefit economically from their trade, aid and investment relationship. In addition, Chinese aid is tied, requiring around half of the services and materials for each project come from China.[12]

Fourth, while the existence of the White Paper indicates that China is now happy to be seen as a donor, China still views itself – and wants to be viewed – as an aid recipient and a developing country.[13] China describes its approach to developing states as 'South-South cooperation' – China is helping friends and peers based on its recent experience as a developing country with a successful growth story. Assistance is cast as showing 'solidarity'[14] to fellow developing states, which might have also felt the yoke of Western colonialism and be under-recognized in the Western-dominated international system.[15]

From China's perspective, the South-South transfer of experience is most effective when done bilaterally. However, China has engaged in multilateral South-South cooperation as well. In 2000, for instance, China helped create the multilateral Forum on China-Africa Cooperation (FOCAC), which meets every three years – it has been a useful mechanism for dialogue, including on security issues.[16]

Finally, unlike OECD states, China does not have a single aid agency – aid disbursement is overseen by the Chinese Ministry of Commerce, with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Finance and the Export-Import Bank of China all providing input. Projects are coordinated and managed in country by the local Chinese Embassy or consulate.[17]

Notwithstanding this atypical organizational structure, China's aid projects have fewer bureaucratic requirements than traditional bilateral and multilateral donors.[18] Decisions are more ad hoc, and are made more quickly.

In the past, China's aid has been criticized, especially in Africa and the South Pacific, for exploitative business practices, significant levels of corruption, and the use of Chinese rather than local labor. China's more recent assistance efforts, particularly in Africa, have started to involve more local labor and focus more on local employment generation. A number of recipient states now prefer Chinese aid to OECD donor assistance for its quick turnaround and lack of conditionality; some also appreciate the leverage their relationship with China provides over OECD donors. However, there has been also been some backlash over the rapid increase and sheer scale of China's presence in some fragile states, with concerns that it could overwhelm local enterprise and processes. Concerns also remain about the poor quality of some of China's assistance, for example some of its construction work.

China in fragile and conflict-affected states

While China's Aid White Paper does not provide a country-by-country breakdown of aid in-flows, it states that the recipients of China's aid are largely 'low-income developing countries'. China's aid to LDCs is growing, from 40% of China's 2009 aid budget, to over 50% of the 2010 budget;[19] a significant number of these are, in fact, fragile and conflict-affected states. The White Paper also sets out the regional distribution of China's aid program: in 2009 Africa received 45.7% of China's total foreign assistance, Asia 32.8%, Latin America and the Caribbean 12.7%, and Oceania 4%.[20]

The rapid growth in Chinese foreign assistance has been documented by the 2007-8 NYU Wagner School study. It found that Chinese aid and government-backed projects to Africa, Latin America and Southeast Asia had increased from under $1 billion in 2002 to $27.5 billion in 2006, before shrinking slightly to $25 billion in 2007.[21] While assistance is provided predominantly on a bilateral basis, China is also a donor to international organizations, including many UN agencies, programs and funds. In addition, China provides support to some regional organizations, such as the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), the Pacific Islands Forum, and the African Union (AU).[22]

Asia Pacific

In the states bordering China – such as Myanmar, Laos and North Korea – China's strategic interests are directly engaged and Chinese policymakers are concerned above all with these states' internal stability. Chinese officials want to retain sympathetic regimes in power in these states, as an exercise in strategic denial of other major powers, and to prevent state collapse and so limit potential refugee flows into China. Furthermore, China seeks to prevent transnational crime crossing borders into China, and it appears to have provided assistance to Myanmar, Cambodia and Laos to combat people trafficking and drug trafficking.[23]

Accordingly, China is the 'primary supplier of economic and military assistance' to Myanmar, Cambodia and Laos, and has given them an 'implicit security guarantee'.[24] It has provided significant assistance for infrastructure, agriculture, energy (particularly hydropower) and public works in the region. In 2009 China announced the creation of a $10 billion China-ASEAN cooperation fund for infrastructure, energy and resources, and information and communication. Specific examples of support include a $39.7 million assistance package to Cambodia, Myanmar and Laos for urgent needs, as well as major investments in infrastructure in Laos and natural gas in Myanmar, and student scholarships to Myanmar, Cambodia and Laos.[25]

China's focus on public works, education, health, human resource development and military support in Southeast Asia can be seen in its assistance to post-conflict Timor Leste. Projects include Timor Leste's new $7 million Ministry of Foreign Affairs building, the $6 million presidential palace, the $6 million Ministry of Defence and Security and military headquarters, and an elementary school. China has also provided human resources development training (600 East Timorese civil servants have studied in China) and significant health and agricultural support.[26]

In the South Pacific, China is the third largest donor behind Australia and the United States. In 2009, according to a Lowy Institute study, China provided $209.82 million in soft loans and pledged grant aid to eight of the fourteen developing states in the region. China has funded large resource projects in Papua New Guinea, for instance, and provided $100.4 million in loans to Tonga (which equates to one third of Tonga's GDP).[27] China's interests in the South Pacific have traditionally been dominated by Sino-Taiwanese competition, though this competition has reduced since 2008. In recent years China has increasingly pursued resource and other commercial opportunities in the region, and sought to protect its expanding expatriate communities.[28]

Africa

Much has been written about the extraordinary expansion of China's trade, development support and investments in Africa, including in a number of Africa's most conflict-affected and at-risk states.[29] China is now Africa's second biggest trading partner behind the European Union. China's growing presence is driven by the search for resources, including oil and minerals, and agricultural commodities.[30] Chinese projects in Africa include infrastructure, particularly rail; and power generation, in particular hydropower.

In the conflict-stricken Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), for example, China's EXIM Bank offered a $9 billion loan package of copper and cobalt mining and infrastructure in 2008 – this is over three times as large as the DRC's $2.7 billion budget in 2007.[31] The loan package involves $6 billion of infrastructure – rail connecting the resource-bountiful southeastern DRC with the DRC's port on the Atlantic, as well as two hydropower dams, roads, airports, hospitals and schools.

In Nigeria, China's oil investments in the restive Niger Delta have resulted in China being in the middle of conflicts over ownership of that oil. Chinese oil workers have been threatened and kidnapped by resistance groups. Even in post-conflict Burundi, which has few natural resources and where China's interests primarily appear to be

Burundi's proximity to the DRC, China's aid increased from $2.5 million in 1995-2000 to $42 million by 2001-2005. Assistance has included a hydroelectric power station, a textile mill, a malaria treatment and prevention center, and support to the Burundi military.[32] China also participates in the United Nations peacekeeping mission in Burundi.

South America

China's presence in South America is also increasing, though off a very low base, driven by the search for resources and agricultural commodities.[33] In Suriname, for instance, China appears to have become the largest donor after the election of a controversial new president. China's support in Suriname includes the new Foreign Ministry headquarters, housing, military support, and renewable energy assistance.[34]

Stability and conflict

There is broad agreement between OECD donors and Chinese policymakers on the importance of promoting stability in conflict-affected and post-conflict states. Similar to their OECD counterparts, Chinese policymakers believe that poverty can lead to instability and be a trigger for conflict, and that 'the international community's first task is to help the countries concerned ensure basic security, promote the political process, provide basic services, support core government functions, and reinvigorate the economy and development.'[35]

China is a member of the UN Peacebuilding Commission, and China's policymakers believe that post-conflict countries should 'bear the primary responsibility for peace-building', with the international community providing assistance. National ownership and national capacity are crucial, according to Chinese officials, and institution building should 'consolidate peace, safeguard stability, revive the economy and enhance the rule of law.'[36] China's approach to promoting stability focuses on economic growth through investments such as infrastructure, employment opportunities, and human resource development. The desired 'end state' for a conflict-affected state is 'sustainable peace and development,'[37] with an economic

growth trajectory and with the state handling its own political processes.

There are significant points of difference between OECD states and China on conflict prevention and peacebuilding, however. In OECD states, the doctrine of state fragility that has developed over the last decade focuses on promoting political settlements and good governance. Chinese policymakers are suspicious of this approach, and maintain that political and institutional reform should be domestically driven.[38]

China also remains reluctant to be drawn into conflict prevention and resolution efforts in crisis- and conflict-affected states, notwithstanding that its resource investments have sometimes entangled it in conflicts fuelled by those resources, such as in the DRC, Sudan and Nigeria. There have been instances of Chinese involvement in conflict resolution, for instance China's role in the Sudanese government's consent to a peacekeeping force in Darfur and China's 2007 vote in favor of an AU-UN force after this consent was given. China also helped put pressure on the Rwandan and DRC governments in 2008 over the conflict in eastern DRC.[39] But such efforts have been limited and ad hoc, and have often come only after considerable international pressure.

In terms of peacekeeping operations, China has been a qualified supporter – still requiring host-state consent – and an increasingly active participant. It has contributed 17,390 personnel to 19 UN missions as of the end of 2010 – more than any other UN Security Council permanent member.[40] In December 2010, there were 1,955 Chinese personnel in nine UN missions – around 20 times its deployment figures in the year 2000. Chinese peacekeepers performed military observer, engineering, transportation, or medical roles, in the United Nations Organization Mission in the DRC (UNMONUC), UN Mission in Liberia (UN-MIL), UN Mission in Sudan (UMIS) and the AU-UN Hybrid Operation in Darfur (UNAMID). In addition, China has affirmed the responsibility to protect principle twice at the United Nations, but still requires host-state consent before any intervention.[41]

Paradigm under pressure?

The paramount policy objective for Chinese officials remains the maintenance of China's own regime; fears of a demonstration effect are a key reason for China's general caution about the 2011 Arab revolutions, for instance. China's steadfast adherence to the principles of sovereignty and non-interference is coming under growing pressure, however, as its investments, trade volumes and the number of Chinese nationals increase in states at risk. Chinese investments and nationals have been targeted in states such as Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, and Tonga. There is a greater awareness that a secure environment is optimal for economic growth; that instability threatens China's investments, economic interests and citizens in conflict-affected and post-conflict states; and that China therefore needs to grapple with the security challenges posed by these states.

There are also signs that China is seeking to cooperate with other donors more on security matters, including conflict prevention and resolution. China has already acknowledged that its economic and energy interests are threatened by the piracy emanating from Somalia, and is participating in international counter-piracy escort operations in the Gulf of Aden. In 2005 President Hu Jintao called for 'a comprehensive strategy featuring prevention, peace restoration, peacekeeping and post-conflict reconstruction', although he also stressed that there should not be 'a predetermined model of governance.' [42]

A growing contingent within China's policy circles contend that while the principle of noninterference served China well as it consolidated its internal stability and economic development, now China's foreign policy needs to be more in tune with China's status as a major global power.[43] Yan Xuetong, for instance, proffers evidence of recent ferment: the internal Chinese debates on the Libyan no-fly zone, sanctions on North Korea, and response to attacks on ethnic Chinese in Myanmar, in addition to policy changes after the recent Japanese earthquake, and the vote in favor of sanctions against Libya.[44]

Reputational considerations are also working in favor of a shift: a tension exists between China being viewed as a responsible global power and its support for regimes that many other states deem pariahs. And of course, all development assistance, trade and investment has a transformative effect on the internal affairs of conflict-affected states, with their weak institutions and limited absorptive capacity. It can be argued that this is especially so in the case of Chinese support, given its rapid escalation in many of these states.

Still, the principle of non-interference thus far continues to prevail in China, and may even have strengthened in the short term as a reaction to the NATO Libyan operation and concerns of domestic contagion from the Arab spring. Any paradigm shift will continue to happen at a glacial pace.

Limits to cooperation

The differences between China and traditional Western donors in how aid is viewed and managed have circumscribed the amount of cooperation possible in fragile and conflict-affected states. Chinese policymakers believe that their recipient country-led model of trade, investment and development support is more relevant to developing countries than the OECD orthodoxy. They have had little incentive to prioritize cooperation with Western states, when this could dilute the strong message to recipient states of South-South cooperation.[45]

Like other emerging Asian donors such as South Korea, China believes that the Paris Declaration provides a framework too focused on process and the one-way flow of funds to be meaningful in the context of assistance relationships which incorporate trade and investment as well as development. Anthea Mulakala observes this disjuncture between 'the MDG framework and the economic growth agenda', and contends 'it is both impractical and difficult to apply the Paris Declaration indicators which refer to more structured and institutionalized transfers of aid.'[46] Furthermore, the plethora of actors – both public and private – involved in China's trade, investment and assistance relationships mean there is some question as to how much control the

Chinese Government has over the whole process.[47] This is also an inhibitor to enhanced donor cooperation.

Perhaps as a result of all these obstacles, attempts at cooperation with China by the EU and the US have not been hugely successful. Notwithstanding a 2008 European Commission initiative on trilateral cooperation with Africa and China[48] and agreement at a 2009 China-EU summit to explore options for cooperation on African security issues, little tangible has been achieved. Trilateral cooperation between China, Africa and other donors on security matters has largely been limited to the counter-piracy operations off Somalia.[49] Additionally, the EU's efforts of trilateral cooperation appear to have been poorly received by African states, which felt excluded from the process; China became less involved as a result.[50]

But these obstacles are not insurmountable. Some cooperation already takes place, and it appears China is becoming more willing to engage multilaterally. The White Paper states that China has sought 'practical cooperation' with other bilateral and multilateral donors, and that China supports and participates in multilateral aid programs.[51] China has collaborated with the UN Development Program and the World Bank on training, for example, as well as the UN Food and Agriculture Organization on agricultural assistance. While not an observer to the OECD Development Assistance Committee's (DAC's) Working Party on Aid Effectiveness, China is a participant in the OECD International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding, and in 2009 helped establish the China-DAC Study Group to share experience on growth and poverty reduction.

In addition, China has engaged with regional organizations and other donors on humanitarian disaster relief assistance, and participates in multilateral disaster relief training and regime building, particularly in the Asia Pacific. The Chinese Government also sent personnel to join international disaster relief operations after the 2010 Haiti earthquake. In its own region, China is working with the Asian Development Bank and Thailand to create the Greater Mekong Sub-regional Cooperation mechanism, in order to develop infrastructure connecting poorer regional

states to the Chinese and Thai markets – it is constructing the Laos section of a major highway between China and Thailand.[52]

Future prospects for cooperation

The White Paper declares that China's foreign assistance has 'entered a new stage,'[53] and China's increasing comfort with its dual identify as donor and recipient may mean there are now greater prospects for enhanced donor cooperation. Any dialogue on further cooperation could start by acknowledging the importance of the South-South framework, so as not to be viewed as excluding recipient states.[54] But traditional donors should adopt a gradual and cautious approach, as the Chinese Deputy Permanent Representative to the UN recently made these comments: 'South-South cooperation is only a useful complement to North-South cooperation. It cannot substitute North-South cooperation in providing support to developing countries, especially the LDCs. South-South cooperation cannot be forced into the policy framework and guiding principles of North-South cooperation.'[55]

Dialogue could continue to explore shared interests and areas of agreement, for example on the importance of economic growth, education and training in stabilizing states at risk. The focus could then be on finding opportunities for ad hoc, functional cooperation rather than anything broad based. Humanitarian assistance and disaster relief offer clear prospects for enhanced cooperation, building on collaboration already taking place, especially in the natural disaster-prone Asia Pacific.

While conflict prevention and resolution and peacebuilding should be topics for discussion, substantial cooperation on security matters aside from perhaps peacekeeping probably remains off limits. But Chinese aid priorities in LDCs that are less neuralgic – such as agriculture and food security, hospitals, schools, domestic water, clean energy, and human resources training – likely present the greatest opportunity for cooperation. The Chinese scholar He Wenping suggests, for example, that 'China and the US can cooperate in such areas as supplying teaching facilities, training teachers and building education networks. This

could include building schools, especially rural elementary schools.'[56]

Within sectors, it makes sense to aim for complementary assistance, building on existing cooperation on infrastructure, training and capacity building. This is already happening, to some extent, with infrastructure in Africa: Western donors are assisting with the 'social infrastructure' of roads and water, while China is supporting the 'production-oriented infrastructure' of rail and power generation.[57] The Chinese Government has also called for enhanced donor cooperation in regional transit transport in LDCs, [58] and the scholar He Wenping has suggested that China train African health personnel while the US construct medical facilities.[59]

The G20 and its Development Working Group agenda might offer prospects for further cooperation between traditional and nontraditional donors, as it appears to approximate more closely the approach of some nontraditional donors.[60] The G20 is also favorably viewed by some nontraditional donors as more accurately reflecting the enhanced influence of a number of emerging powers than some other international fora.

Conclusion

While China is still a smaller donor than many OECD states, its development assistance to LDCs has expanded rapidly over the past decade, and the Chinese Government has declared that this trend will continue.[61] Differences in approach have to some extent circumscribed the level of cooperation between China and traditional OECD donors, but there is scope for enhanced donor cooperation based on shared interests, complementarity, and a focus on functional collaboration.

Endnotes

*This paper was prepared as a background paper for a Center on International Cooperation project on Emerging Powers. Its purpose within this project was to set out China's perspective on its development and security engagement, and as such, it does not examine the merits of China's development and security policy.

[1]This paper uses the World Bank definition of 'fragile states': 'countries facing particularly severe development challenges: weak institutional capacity, poor governance, and political instability. Often these countries experience ongoing violence as the residue of past severe conflict.' See the World Bank's Fragile and Conflict-Affected Countries webpage. As noted in this paper, China does not use the term 'fragile states'.

[2]See, for example, Chinese President Hu Jintao's 2011 New Year Address for a reavowal of these principles, January 1, 2011.

[3]There are more than 1 million Chinese nationals in Africa alone, and a significant number of Chinese expatriates live in Timor Leste and some Pacific Island states.

[4]Cited in Thomas Lum, Hannah Fischer, Julissa Gomez-Granger, Anne Leland, 'China's foreign aid activities in Africa, Latin America, and Southeast Asia', Congressional Research Service report, February 25, 2009, p. 8.

[5]China's Foreign Aid White Paper, section I, Foreign aid policy.

[6]See Claire Provost, 'China publishes first report on foreign aid policy', Guardian.co.uk, April 28, 2011. See also Tim Kauffman, 'State, US AID targeted for 10 percent budget increase', Federal Times, February 2, 2010, which reports the US 2011 foreign assistance budget as $36.4 billion.

[7]Information Office of the State Council, People's Republic of China, China's Foreign Aid White Paper, Beijing, April 2011.

[8]Megan Gleason, Meeting note from interview with Chinese officials in Timor Leste, October 2010.

[9]See Thomas Lum, Hannah Fischer, Julissa Gomez-Granger, Anne Leland, op. cit., February 25, 2009, p. 4; Benedict Anderson, 'China in Africa: A macroeconomic perspective', Center for Global Development Working Paper 230, revised December 22, 2010, p. 10.

[10]China's Foreign Aid White Paper, section I, Foreign aid policy. See also the 1964 Eight Principles for Economic Aid and Technical Assistance to Other Countries, which the White Paper reaffirms.

[11]See Fu Ziying, Vice Minister of Commerce of China, Statement during the general debate at the Fourth UN General Conference on LDCs, Istanbul, May 12, 2011.

[12]Thomas Lum, Hannah Fischer, Julissa Gomez-Granger, Anne Leland, op. cit., p. 2.

[13]The first sentence of China's Aid White paper is categorical: 'China is a developing country'. This perhaps stems in part from not wanting to agitate a domestic audience when there in still so much poverty in China, but also seems to stem from how China wants to be perceived internationally. See, for example, Philippa Brant, 'China releases first White Paper on Aid', Lowy Institute Interpreter blog, April 27, 2011.

[14]Upon the release of the White Paper, Chinese Vice-commerce minister, Fu Ziying, said that 'solidarity' was the purpose of China's aid to Africa. Cited in Claire Provost, 'China publishes first report on foreign aid policy', Guardian.co.uk, April 28, 2011.

[15]He Wenping, 'How far can China go in Africa?', People's Tribune, August 3, 2010.

[16]For example, the 2010-2012 FOCAC Action Plan states in section 2.6.1 that 'The Chinese Government will continue to support the United Nations Security Council in playing a constructive role in solving conflicts in Africa and continue to support and participate in UN peacekeeping missions there. It will strengthen cooperation with countries concerned in the UN Peace Building Commission and support countries in their post-war reconstruction processes.'

[17]The White Paper states that the Commerce, Foreign Affairs and Finance ministries created a foreign aid inter-agency liaison mechanism in 2008, which was 'upgraded' in February 2011 into an 'inter-agency coordination mechanism'. China's Foreign Aid White Paper, section V, Management of foreign aid.

[18]China's foreign assistance bureaucrats in Beijing have been reported as numbering less than 100. Fergus Hanson and Mary Fifita, 'China in the Pacific: The new banker in town', Lowy Institute Policy Brief, April 2011, p. 7.

[19]Fu Ziying, Statement at the Istanbul conference, op. cit.

[20]China's Foreign Aid White Paper, section IV, Distribution of foreign aid.

[21]Cited in Thomas Lum, Hannah Fischer, Julissa Gomez-Granger, Anne Leland, op. cit., summary page. It should be noted again that the 2011 China's Foreign Aid White Paper states that a total of 256.29 billion yuan or about $39.4 billion had been disbursed from 1950 to 2009.

[22]For example, China has provided $1.8 million to the AU for peacekeeping in Sudan.

[23]Thomas Lum, Hannah Fischer, Julissa Gomez-Granger, Anne Leland, op. cit., p. 16.

[24]Ibid. See also Thomas Lum, Wayne M. Morrison, Bruce Vaughan, 'China's "soft power" in Southeast Asia', January 4, 2008, p. 5.

[25]See Chinadaily.com.cn, 'China rolls out aid package for ASEAN', April 12, 2009; Brian McCartan, 'A helping Chinese hand', Asia Times Online, April 20, 2009.

[26]Megan Gleason, Meeting note, Timor Leste, op.cit.; and Ian Storey, 'China's Inroads into East Timor', China Brief, Volume 9, Issue 6, March 18, 2009.

[27]Fergus Hanson and Mary Fifita, 'China in the Pacific: The new banker in town', Lowy Institute Policy Brief, April 2011, pp. 4, 8.

[28]Ibid., pp. 5, 10.

[29]See, for example, Deborah Brautigam, The dragon's gift: The real story of China in Africa, Oxford University Press, 2009.

[30]As the December 2010 China-Africa Economic and Trade Cooperation White Paper states, 'Africa's exports of crude oil, minerals, steel and agricultural products play an active role in promoting China's economic development and improving the Chinese people's livelihood[s].' Cited in Deng Yushan, Liu Chang, 'China-Africa cooperation flourishes with rising interdependence', Xinhua News Agency, English.news.cn, May 27, 2011. See China's African Policy, January 2006, http://www.gov.cn/misc/2006-01/12/content_156490.htmm for a full statement of the Chinese Government's objectives in Africa and intended areas of cooperation with African states.

[31]See Hannah Edinger and Johanna Jansson, 'China stirs the DRC financing plot', MiningWeekly.com, September 12, 2008.

[32]Megan Gleason, Burundi research note, 2010.

[33]Thomas Lum, Hannah Fischer, Julissa Gomez-Granger, Anne Leland, op.cit., p. 13.

[34]Simon Romero, 'With aid and migrants, China expands its presence in South American nation', New York Times, April 10, 2011.

[35]Ambassador Wang Min, Deputy Permanent Representative of China to the United Nations, Statement to UN Security Council in Post-conflict peacebuilding debate, January 21, 2011. See also Ambassador Liu Zhenmin, Statement at Security Council Open debate on post-conflict peacebuilding, July 22, 2009.

[36]Ambassador Wang Min, op. cit.

[37]Ibid.

[38]As the academic He Wenping has said in the context of Africa: '"Democracy", "human rights" and "good governance" are not houses to be built on sand, and cannot be realized in a short period of time merely through catchy slogans and intensive propaganda. They have to be founded on economic development, rise of educational levels, development of rule of law, and growth of democratic values. The fact is China is ... helping African countries in large scale infrastructure development, raising people's living standard, reducing poverty and vigorously developing African personnel training programs, which are all helping to build an economic and human resources foundation for Africa to realize democracy and good governance. Africa's development

path has to be chosen by Africans.' He Wenping, 'How far can China go in Africa?', People's Tribune, August 3, 2010. Sourced on Forum on China-Africa Cooperation website.

[39]See Bernardo Mariani, Thomas Wheeler, et al, 'China's growing role in African peace and security', Saferworld China Programme report, January 2011, pp. iii, vi-viii.

[40]Information Office of the State Council, People's Republic of China, China's National Defense in 2010 White Paper, Beijing, March 2011, Section IV, Deployment of the armed forces.

[41]See Sarah Teitt, 'China and the responsibility to protect', Report for Asia-Pacific Centre for the Responsibility to Protect, December 19, 2008.

[42]Cited in Bernardo Mariani, Thomas Wheeler, et al, op. cit., p. 80.

[43]See Yan Xuetong, 'How assertive should a great power be?', New York Times, March 31, 2011; and Raja Mohan, 'The uses of aid', IndianExpress.com, April 27, 2011.

[44]Yan Xuetong, op. cit.

[45]Bernardo Mariani, Thomas Wheeler, et al, op. cit., p. 69.

[46]Anthea Mulakala, 'Is there an Asian approach to development cooperation?' Lowy Interpreter blog, April 4, 2011.

[47]See Benedict Anderson, op.cit., p. 13.

[48]European Commission, Communication to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, 'The EU, Africa and China: Towards trilateral dialogue', Brussels, October 7, 2008.

[49]See Bernardo Mariani, Thomas Wheeler, et al, op.cit., p. 68.

[50]See Alan Gelb, 'Africa opposed to Chinese-Western aid cooperation – Wikileaks', on Global Development: Views from the Center, Center for Global Development website, December 8, 2010.

[51]China's Foreign Aid White Paper, section VI, International cooperation in foreign aid.

[52]See Evelyn Goh, 'Rising power … to do what? Evaluating China's power in Southeast Asia', RSIS Working Paper No. 226, March 30, 2011, p. 10.

[53]China's Foreign Aid White Paper, section I, Foreign aid policy.

[54]The China White Paper states that '[u]nder the framework of South-South cooperation, China will work with all parties concerned to conduct complementary and fruitful trilateral and regional cooperation on the basis of respecting the needs of recipient countries and jointly promote the process of global poverty alleviation.' China's Foreign Aid White Paper, section VI, International cooperation in foreign aid.

[55]Ambassador Wang Min, Deputy Permanent Representative of China to the UN, Statement at the Second Session of the Intergovernmental Preparatory Committee for the Fourth UN Conference on the LDCs, New York, April 4, 2011.

[56]He Wenping, 'Challenges of the aid architecture building in the area of cooperation modalities', March 23, 2011.

[57]Benedict Anderson, op. cit., p. 9.

[58]Wang Hongbo, Minister Counsellor, Chinese Mission to the UN, Statement on Agenda Items 23 (a) and (b) at Second Committee of 65th UNGA Session, October 18, 2010.

[59]He Wenping, 'Challenges of the aid architecture building in the area of cooperation modalities', op. cit.

[60]Mulakala, op. cit.

[61]Vice-Minister of Commerce Fu Ziying stated at the UN Conference on LDCs in Istanbul in May: 'we will tilt our foreign aid in favor of LDCs.' Fu Ziying, Statement at the Istanbul conference, op. cit.

India's Evolving Role in Development and Security in States at Risk

by W. P. S. Sidhu

Introduction

In the sphere of development and security India has the distinction of being, perhaps, the oldest and biggest actor in providing international security to states at risk through peacekeeping missions and, possibly, one of the smallest actors in providing development assistance, especially to crisis- and conflict-affected states.

From the 1950s and until today India has contributed nearly 100, 000 peacekeepers to 40 of the United Nation's (UN) 64 peacekeeping missions. Presently, India has 8680 Indian personnel in 9 of the 14 UN peacekeeping operations and remains among the top four troop contributing countries (TCC) in the world.[1] On account of its troop contribution record India has also been a member of the UN's Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) since its creation in 2005.

In contrast, India was the world's largest recipient of foreign aid between 1951 and 1992 and received around $ 55 billion during this period.[2] It remained a substantive aid recipient even as late as 2003. Yet, in the 40 years from 1964, when it started providing foreign aid and assistance through the Indian Technical and Economic Cooperation (ITEC) scheme, until 2003, when it launched the India Development Initiative (IDI) scheme India not only disbursed $ 430 million but also provided training and assistance to recipient countries.

However, since the launch of the IDI, India is rapidly transforming from a recipient to a donor country. In just the first year of the IDI (2003-2004) India disbursed and approved $ 400 million aid to African and South Asian countries.[3] Today, the estimated Indian assistance is around $ 2 billion per year and the ITEC training programme covers 158 countries. New Delhi is now planning to create the India Agency for Partnership in Development (IAPD) with an estimated budget of over $ 11 billion to be disbursed

over five to seven years.[4] The story of India's emergence as a development actor is closely linked to its own economic liberalization, which began in earnest in 1991, and its aspirations to become a global actor.

Yet, unlike China (which recently released its first white paper on foreign aid) India does not have a well-articulated and cohesive policy that offers a strategic underpinning either for its contribution in the peacekeeping or the development field. Thus, India's policy paradigm for development and security in states at risk has to be deduced from both a variety of public pronouncements and actions taken either to provide aid or to support peace operations.

This paper begins with an overview of the primary drivers of India's foreign policy and how these in turn are affecting New Delhi's approach towards development and security. It then examines India's engagement objectives and desired end state as well as recent developments and shifts in the engagement process. The paper then seeks to identify the key actors and their strategies in this process. Finally, it examines the ongoing operations to assess their effectiveness in meeting India's stated objectives. By way of conclusion the paper will identify possible areas of cooperation between the 34 Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) states and India in development and security.

Policy Paradigms

There is broad agreement among scholars that in the post-Cold War era the primary driver of India's foreign and security policy has been "to sustain the economic growth that took off after the reforms of the early 1990s"[5] coupled with the emergence of coalition politics and realignment in the domestic political arena. For instance, David M. Malone argues that since 1991, "a new era of pragmatism" became evident both domestically and internationally. At the domestic level there was the "growing pragmatism of political parties, which were compelled to engage in electoral alliances, more often ones of convenience than of ideological sympathy". This "ideological unmooring of the domestic sphere was reflected also in the international arena" when

India embarked on a pragmatic policy of multi-alignment and built myriad strategic alliances in an uncertain world. Similarly, since 1991, foreign policy not only "assisted India in creating higher levels of economic growth" and allowed global opportunities to benefit "domestic constituents in the hope of ameliorating poverty"; it also provided a "pathway to great power status".[6] Thus, India's own political and economic evolution informs New Delhi's international approach to development and security.

There is also general agreement that the primary focus of India's foreign, security and development policy has been its immediate neighbourhood. According to Nitin Pai, while "the Americas, Europe, Africa, Central Asia and East Asia are seen as sources of opportunity, the fragile and failing states in the immediate neighbourhood are seen as sources of risk".[7] To establish a peaceful neighbourhood India has developed "seven broad approaches: cautious prudence; strategic investment; unilateral reassurance; physical insulation; non-interference; humanitarian assistance; and maritime security."[8] To sustain these approaches India has developed four principles: respect for sovereignty with greater emphasis on diplomacy and an abhorrence of military intervention; greater acceptance of the involvement of Western powers in its neighbourhood, as long as this is consistent with India's own interests; greater engagement in multilateral cooperation, both ad hoc and structured; and the use of foreign aid and assistance as a strategic instrument.[9] The last principle is evidenced by the fact that the "bulk of India's overseas assistance is directed at neighbouring countries of Bhutan, Afghanistan and Nepal".[10]

How does this emerging policy paradigm affect India's approach to development and security beyond its immediate neighbourhood? One view argues that India's assistance and aid is purely altruistic and has no strategic or even commercial linkages. Another view asserts, "India's current assistance strategy is determined by political factors (strengthening relations with other developing countries, for example to gain support for India's bid to gain a permanent seat on the UN Security Council) and by economic factors (such as gaining access to markets or raw materials)".[11] While the former inclination might have influenced India's original approach to development

aid and assistance this is, clearly, no longer the case. One indication of this shift is the fact that investment by Indian public and private sector companies has invariably followed official Indian aid, particularly lines of credit. For instance, the $ 4.3 million lines of credit offered by India to the least developed countries (LDCs) since 2003 have coincided with an investment of over $ 35 billion by Indian companies in primarily the same beneficiary LDCs. It is equally clear that India's role in development and security is likely to evolve further in the coming years and will be directly influenced by the evolution of India's foreign, security and, above all, economic priorities.

However, none of this explains India's longstanding commitment to UN peacekeeping. It would appear that India's emergence as the world biggest peacekeeping nation was almost entirely accidental.[12] After the Second World War India was one of the few countries that possessed an expeditionary force capability (the others were the former colonial powers who for a variety of reasons did not provide as many troops) which could be effectively deployed under chapter VI operations of the UN. Another reason was that many of today's leading TCCs were in the process of decolonization and attaining their own independence.

With the exception of its involvement in the Korean War in the 1950s almost none of the Indian participation in UN peace operations during the Cold War can be related to its strategic or broader national security interests. Even in the post-Cold War era it is difficult to see how providing peacekeepers to UN missions furthers India's own interests, apart from the obvious argument that it endorses India's contribution to the UN and strengthens New Delhi's case for a greater role in the UN-led global governance system.

Another significant distinction between India's contribution to peacekeeping and its contribution to development is that most of the former has occurred further afield from India's neighbourhood while most of the latter has been focused on India's immediate neighbourhood. In fact, ever since the establishment of the UN monitoring group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP) in January 1949 (which India regards unfavorably), New Delhi has sought to keep

UN peacekeeping out of its immediate neighbourhood. In fact the one 'peacekeeping operation' in Sri Lanka and the proto humanitarian intervention in Bangladesh was carried out unilaterally and without any UN mandate.

Desired 'End States' and Engagement Objectives:

Against this policy paradigm, how does India regard its development and security objectives to engage with crisis- and conflict-affected states and how does it identify the desired end goal. Significantly, Indian officials and policy makers have never defined the term "fragile states" and are reluctant to use it to describe states particularly outside the immediate neighbourhood.[13] The aversion to use the term "fragile states" in the official discourse is not clear but might relate to its perceived connotation as challenging the sovereignty of a state by questioning its ability to govern. It might also relate to the inherent inequality between states that the term implies. Finally, it might relate to India's own historical experience where it was once also considered to be a potential "failed state". However, this has not prevented the call for a "comprehensive neighbourhood strategy" based on political engagement; support for political stability; assistance for economic development; and improved connectivity and market access for the neighbours to the Indian economy. As the Indian home minister recently noted, "A stable, peaceful and prosperous neighbourhood is vital for the security of the people of India."[14]

In a statement to the UN Security Council India's permanent representative to the UN, Ambassador Hardeep Puri elaborated on the desired end state beyond the neighbourhood:

> Peace cannot be restored to post-conflict societies and their citizens cannot be freed from fear or want unless national authorities are able to govern effectively. The capacity of effective governance, in turn, depends on the existence of institutions that enable these authorities to respond effectively to the aspirations of the people… Political and administrative institutions that decentralize governance are, in our experience the key to nation building. Institutions must be locally relevant and must include all stakeholders, particularly the weak and under-privileged, in the governance process… The key to success of these institutions… lies in what we call "inclusiveness".[15]

Recent Developments and Shifts in Engagement:

A statement by the Indian foreign minister, S. M. Krishna in February 2011, on the interdependence between security and development at the UN Security Council (UNSC), along with previous statements made in UNSC, provides India's broad vision of peacebuilding, especially in crisis- and conflict-affected states that are under the care of various UN missions. There are three key elements to India's approach to peacebuilding as statebuilding: First, India's own experience in "overcoming many of the challenges of transforming a colonial legacy into a modern dynamic nation".[16] This experience is likely to be more relevant to the states of UN concern, many of which are still states in formation, than the experience of many post-modern Western states. The challenge, of course, would be for India to be able to transfer its experience to the other countries in transition in practical ways.

Second, the Indian model of peacebuilding would aim to be inclusive and comprehensive. It would simultaneously seek to provide humanitarian and emergency assistance, resume economic activity and create political and administrative institutions to improve governance while also including "all stake holders, particularly the weak and underprivileged". This is reminiscent of India's own efforts at *panchayati raj* – a system designed to devolve political power to the local village level, which has at best achieved mixed results.

Finally, instead of the traditional multilateral mechanisms—particularly the OECD—India will put greater emphasis on multilateral development initiatives with its IBSA partners (Brazil and South Africa) as well as with the African Union and regional African groupings to promote South-South cooperation on development and security.

This partly relates to the common approach that IBSA has to crisis- and conflict-affected states as compared to the OECD approach, which often imposes conditionality for providing assistance.

Until recently South-South cooperation was largely rhetorical and limited to in-kind contribution given that India and other states were themselves recipient countries. However, since the leading economies of the South, notably Brazil, China and India, embraced economic reforms and notched up impressive growth rates, the South has developed substantial economic muscle. According to one study in 1990 the South's GDP in PPP terms was only 53 per cent of the North (OECD countries). However, by 2006 the South's GDP was already 70 per cent of the North (in PPP terms). With the current economic and financial crisis hitting the North harder, it is estimated that the GDP of the South may exceed that of the North by 2013.[17] With this backdrop South-South cooperation now holds real promise.

Since 2004, India has deliberately curtailed receiving aid and launched the IDI particularly to assist the LDCs. Although India has championed the cause of LDCs ever since the UN created this category in 1971, New Delhi hosted its first ever LDC ministerial meeting only on 18-19 February 2011. Of the present 48 LDCs (the number has nearly doubled from 25 when the category was created 40 years ago) five – Afghanistan, Nepal, Bhutan, Bangladesh and Myanmar – are in India's neighbourhood.[18] The Delhi Declaration called for a comprehensive approach to development including augmenting the LDCs "productive capacity, institutional strength and policy space to lead their respective development processes" and set the stage for the Istanbul conference in May 2011. Notably, observers from leading OECD countries, including Australia, the European Union, Finland, Germany and the US also attended the meeting, underlining the need for North-South cooperation.

Significantly, India, which had announced a $ 500 million credit line facility at the New Delhi meeting doubled it to $ 1 billion at the Istanbul conference, held in May 2011, and also extended capacity building and economic assistance in the priority areas of agriculture, infrastructure, telemedicine, energy, banking and information technology.[19]

Soon after the Istanbul conference, the second India-Africa Forum Summit in Addis Ababa built on the first India-Africa Forum Summit in New Delhi in 2008 between India and 14 African heads of states and eight African regional groups. The Forum marks India's re-engagement with Africa for three related reasons: to enhance economic ties, particularly access to energy resources and markets; to garner support for India's bid for a permanent seat on the UNSC; and "India's quest to change the world's perception of the country from being a developing country in need of aid to being a developed country able to provide aid to the needy."[20]

The two Forum summits further elaborated elements of India's evolving development strategy as a mixture of capacity building and training, lines of credit and investment by India's public and private sector.[21] The 2010 Joint Action Plan envisages the setting up of 21 capacity building institutions all over Africa. Apart from India's state-owned oil companies and private sector truck and automobile companies, Bharati Telecom, one of the biggest Indian telecom giants alone has made investments of over $ 10 billion in Africa.

Actors: Agencies and Strategies

Although there have been growing calls for a separate aid or development agency, similar to the ones in other donor countries, India still does not have a dedicated agency for development cooperation or international assistance although some reports suggest that it is likely to set up one in the near future.[22] Presently this responsibility is spread over several ministries, with the ministry of external affairs (MEA) being the lead agency. The MEA is directly responsible for Afghanistan, Bhutan and Nepal, which remain the largest recipients of Indian aid and assistance. In addition, the MEA also advises the department of economic affairs in the ministry of finance on aid packages to other countries.[23]

Until now Indian aid and assistance has broadly been channeled through two instruments:

ITEC: The ITEC began in 1964 and uses India's vast technical manpower and training assets to provide assistance and aid. It has four components – training; projects; deputation of Indian experts; and study tours. India reportedly spends $ 11 million per year on ITEC activities and trains about 5,000 people every year. Today the ITEC scheme provides training to 158 countries and, according to one expert, the "bulk of Indian aid is spent on human training, capacity building and other "soft" investments in recipient countries".[24]

Training accounts for about 60 per cent of the annual ITEC budget and is primarily spent on covering the tuition and living costs of trainees attending the 220 odd courses offered by various Indian training institutions. The courses range from six weeks to a year or more. Indian experts, mostly from state-owned enterprises are sent on deputation under ITEC to provide in-country assistance and training as well as to conduct feasibility studies.[25]

IDI: In 2003-2004 the IDI was established partly to replace the lines of credits extended to developing countries by India since 1964. The IDI has three objectives – restructuring India's own aid receipts and paying off outstanding debt owed to bilateral donors; cancelling the debt of heavily indebted poor countries (HIPCs); and providing grant and project assistance to developing countries particularly in Africa and South Asia to promote India's economic interests.[26]

In the first year of the IDI $ 400 million were disbursed and approved to countries like Mozambique, Sudan and Angola with the objective of promoting India's economic interests in these countries. In the same year India repaid bilateral credit owed to 15 donor countries totaling $ 1.6 billion and also made a pre-payment of $ 2.8 billion debt owed to the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank. Simultaneously, India also wrote off the debt of seven HIPCs – Mozambique, Tanzania, Zambia, Guyana, Nicaragua, Ghana and Uganda.

Operations

Peacekeeping:

Although India contests the notion of "fragile states" and is critical of the "multidimensional" peacekeeping operations as well as the lack of uniformity in the organizational context of peacebuilding, it remains a key actor in both peacekeeping operations and on the peacebuilding commission.

Despite recent criticism of some Indian peacekeepers in UN peace operations in Africa, India remains committed to UN peacekeeping. It has participated in every type of peacekeeping operation – from relatively straightforward truce supervision to more complex operations. It is one of the top troop contributing countries and is likely to remain one of the leading peacekeeping nations in the world.

Indian officials also claim that the Indian approach to peacekeeping is both unique and effective. For instance, India's permanent representative to the UN, Ambassador Hardeep Puri asserted:

> Indian peacekeepers instinctively understand that no peace can be effective unless it is accompanied by growth of local institutions. Indian peacekeepers… have made conscious efforts to assist local authorities in restoring national structures that had collapsed during conflict. Our peacekeepers donned peacebuilding hats and attempted to restore administrative processes, strengthened local policing and activated judicial mechanisms in areas they have served. They always attempt to work through indigenous mechanisms for conflict resolution and mediation in order to strengthen these local institutions so that they become viable political institutions.[27]

While Indian units in different peacekeeping operations might have been effective at the tactical level on the ground, the inability of India to establish this norm at the strategic level is telling. This is partly because of the limited role of India in the planning

of peace operations and partly on account of its inability to translate this practical experience into a normative form.

South-South Cooperation and Trilateral Partnerships:

In recent years India has also emerged as a leader of South-South cooperation. In 2006 it co-founded the Global Network of Exim Banks and Development Finance Institutions; in 2007 it promoted the setting up of the Development Cooperation Forum under UN ECOSOC; it is one of the largest contributors to the Commonwealth Fund for Technical Cooperation; and a significant contributor to the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation Development Fund. Similarly, India has played a key role in the establishment of the IBSA Fund for the Alleviation of Poverty and Hunger, managed by UNDP.[28]

India has also set up a sister programme to the ITEC called "Special Commonwealth Assistance for Africa Programme", which is specifically targeted at the 19 African Commonwealth countries. Another Africa specific programme is the "Techno Economic Approach for Africa India Movement (TEAM), which provides eight West African states with $ 500 million credit lines. Similarly, India has also offered NEPAD another $ 200 million of credit lines and is also investing an additional $ 100 million to establish a Pan-African E-Network.[29]

Perhaps the best example of India's South-South cooperation in action is in its neighbourhood, particularly in Afghanistan. Here, India, which has already provided $ 1.5 billion for development assistance recently announced an addition $ 500 million, taking New Delhi's total commitment to $ 2 billion. This makes India one of the single largest bilateral donors in that war-torn country. Indian prime minister Manmohan Singh justified the additional tranche of $ 500 million thus: "Our two countries face similar development challenges… Many of your problems are also our problems".[30]

Even more important is how this aid is to be disbursed. "This will consist of specific projects and schemes and other

initiatives that will be developed in consultation with the government of Afghanistan", prime minister Singh noted. It is expected that the latest aid package will focus on the social sector, agriculture, capacity-building and access to the Indian market.[31] Simultaneously, India also announced a strategic partnership with Afghanistan, thus underlying that Indian aid and assistance is also closely linked to its security interests.[32]

Institutional Groupings and Increased Engagement:

Ever since India became a net creditor to the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Food Programme in 2003, it has significantly increased its engagement with the global financial and economic groupings, notably the IMF and the G-20. In 2005 it also contributed to the IMF's Emergency Assistance Fund, to support recovery from natural disasters and armed conflicts.

More recently India, along with other BRICS countries, has also challenged the "obsolete unwritten convention" of a European leading the IMF although a consensus BRICS candidate was not declared in time to challenge the consensus European candidacy of Christine Lagarde.

Similarly, India, which is now serving as an elected member on the UN Security Council, has long argued for a permanent seat and is likely to push for a vote to support its candidacy in the UN General Assembly.

Conclusion

India's engagement in development and security is likely to increase substantially in the coming years. Although even with this increase, India is likely to remain a small donor, it will establish its own unique and distinct profile, which is unlikely to follow the normative guidelines and operational procedures of the OECD donor community. For instance, India has far fewer conditionality to its grants and also provides the recipients a greater say in the process than most OECD donors. Similarly, India's "unconditional non-interference" and non-insistence on democracy or respect for human rights, in the recipient country

distinguishes it from OECD donors.[33] At best it calls for the development of "plural, multi-cultural and multi-ethnic societies through the consolidation and development of … plural democracy."[34] Thus, any possible cooperation between OECD donors and India is likely to occur outside the formal OECD forum.

India's growing engagement in development and security is increasingly linked to its own economic and strategic well-being and "is conceived of as an important foreign-policy instrument largely for self interest."[35] This has certainly been the case in India's immediate neighbourhood, as evident in Afghanistan, Bhutan and Nepal, and is also likely to be the case in India's engagement in Africa.

India would also do well to invest in better coordination and accountability of its development assistance. At the moment there is a lack of definitions, clear objectives, approaches, accounting and monitoring. This establishment of the IAPD might improve coordination and ensure accountability. Indeed, many of the OECD donor countries have had mixed experience with dedicated aid agencies, which have evolved into cumbersome and ineffective bureaucracies. There may room here for India to cooperate with OECD states on some of these coordination issues so as to see how the aid and assistance can be made more effective.

Clearly, although India's approach to development and security remains distinct, it has been most successful when it has been part of a multilateral effort – either in peacekeeping or in development. The best example is Afghanistan, where India, working closely with the UN, was able to achieve remarkable success in building the infrastructure of the war-ravaged country. The same is true of its accomplishments in UN operations in Africa, Asia and Latin America.[36] This might be the most significant lesson for India and OECD donors to consider as they ponder future cooperation in the sphere of development and security.

Endnotes

[1]See http://www.un.int/india/india_and_the_un_pkeeping.html and Lt. General (Retd.) Satish Nambiar, "UN Peacekeeping and India's National Strategy", *National Strategy Lecture,* Institute for Defense Studies and Analyses, New Delhi, 4 March 2011 available at: http://www.idsa.in/event/INSPInt/UNPeacekeepingIndiasNationalStrategy.

[2]C.R. Bijoy, "India: Transiting to a Global Donor", *The Reality of Aid: Special Report on South-South Cooperation* 2010.

[3]Gareth Price, "India's aid dynamics: from recipient to donor?", Chatham House, *Asia Programme Working Paper*, September 2004 and P. Vaidyanathan Iyer, "Chidambaram shelves aid initiative", *Rediff.com*, 26 June 2004.

[4]"Charity Begins Abroad", *The Economist*, 13 August 2011 available at: http://www.economist.com/node/21525836.

[5]Nitin Pai, *The Paradox of Proximity: India's approach to fragility in the neighbourhood*, NYU, Centre on International Cooperation paper, April 2011, p. 4. See also Devesh Kapur, "Introduction: Future Issues in India's Foreign Policy: Ideas, Interests and Values", *India Review*, 8, no. 3, 2009, p. 205.

[6]David M. Malone, *Can the Elephant Dance? Contemporary Indian Foreign Policy*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

[7]Pai, *The Paradox of Proximity*, p. 4.

[8]For an elaboration of these approaches see Pai, *The Paradox of Proximity*, pp. 7-13.

[9]Pai, *The Paradox of Proximity*, p. 13.

[10]Subhash Agarwal, "Emerging Aid Donors: India", *India Focus*, New Delhi, September 2010.

[11]Gareth Price, "Diversity in donorship: the changing landscape of official humanitarian aid – India's official aid programme", Overseas Development Institute, Humanitarian Policy Group Background Paper, September 2005, p. 3.

[12]W. P. S. Sidhu, "An absent-minded peacekeeper, so far", *Mint*, 11 July 2011

[13]The one exception appears to be Pakistan. In recent remarks the Indian home minister, P. Chidambaram noted, "the state structure in Pakistan has become fragile". See opening remarks of Home Minister at India-US Homeland Security Dialogue, 27 May 2011.

[14]Chidambaram, opening remarks.

[15]Statement by Ambassador Hardeep Singh Puri, Permanent Representative of India at the UN Security Council on Post-Conflict Peacebuilding: Institution Building on 21 January 2011.

[16]Statement by H.E. Mr. S.M. Krishna, Minister of External Affairs of India on Maintainence of International Peace and Security: Interdependence between security and development at the United Nations Security Council on 11 February 2011.

[17]Dr. Ramgopal Agarwala, "Reforming the Bretton Woods System for Inclusive Development and Democratic Global Governance", Research and Information System for Developing Countries, RIS *Policy Brief*, No. 40, December 2008. See also "Power Shift", *Economist On-line*, 4 August 2011 available at: http://www.economist.com/blogs/dailychart/2011/08/emerging-vs-developed-economies.

[18]Rajiv Bhatia, "India's tryst with LDCs: Is it working?", *The Hindu*, 5 April 2011.

[19]Statement by H.E. Mr. S.M. Krishna, Minister of External Affairs of India at UNLDC IV at Istanbul, 12 May 2011.

[20]Peter Kragelund, "India's African Engagement" ARI 10/2010, 19 January 2010, available at: http://www.realinstitutoelcano.org/wps/portal/rielcano_eng/Content?WCM_GLOBAL_CONTEXT=/elcano/elcano_in/zonas_in/ari10-2010.

[21]See address by Indian prime minister, Manmohan Singh, at the Plenary Session of the 2nd Africa-India Forum Summit, Addis Ababa, 24 May 2011 and Addis Ababa Declaration: Second Africa-India Forum Summit 2011, 26 May 2011.

[22]"Charity Begins Abroad", *The Economist*, 13 August 2011

[23]Price, "Diversity in donorship, p. 5.

24 Agarwal, "Emerging Aid Donors

25 Price, "India's aid dynamics: from recipient to donor?", p. 12 and "Diversity in donorship, p. 11.

26 Price, "India's aid dynamics: from recipient to donor?", pp. 4-11, Iyer, "Chidambaram shelves aid initiative",

27 Puri, Permanent Representative of India at the UN Security Council on Post-Conflict Peacebuilding: Institution Building on 21 January 2011.

28 Bijoy, "India: Transiting to a Global Donor".

29 Kragelund, "India's African Engagement"

30 Manmohan Singh, "Ultimately it is the people of the region who must take chare of their own future", *Indian Express*, 16 May 2011.

31 "We are not the US: Manmohan", *The Hindu*, 12 May 2011.

32 C. Raja Mohan, "The Kabul Game", *Indian Express*, 16 May 2011.

33 Matthias Jobelius, "New Powers for Global Change? Challenges for the International Development Cooperation: The Case of India", Friedrich Ebert Stiftung Briefing Paper 5, March 2007, p. 6.

34 Addis Ababa Declaration: Second Africa-India Forum Summit 2011, 26 May 2011.

35 Bijoy, "India: Transiting to a Global Donor".

36 W. P. S. Sidhu, "Global Peacebuilding – the Indian way", *Mint*, 21 February 2011.

Brazil`s renewed responsibilities in cooperation for development and international security*

by Monica Hirst**

Introduction

The presence of a group of countries, currently lumped together as emerging powers, has begun to trigger changes in the configuration of multilateral agendas dealing with global economic, political and security matters. As these actors represent new sources of pressure, stances, and resources, they also seem determined to broaden and deepen the scope of their responsibilities and compromises towards developing countries; be it to improve capabilities for the provision of public goods, to give prompt response to humanitarian crisis in contexts of escalating violence and internal turmoil and/or of natural disasters. Brazil, without question, has become an active participant of this group.

In this same context, a rearrangement of the world order has been pushed forward by the efforts of these powers that, in the context of globalization, aim to extend their space and influence. This process has become especially dynamic involving several innovations in design and normative premises in the economic, political and security fields. Relevant here is the analysis from Andrew Hurrell that emerging powers constitute essential pieces in a scenario that slowly conjoins the structuring of a new system of balance of power for the twenty-first century.[1]

Within this new reality, Brazil projects a diverse set of goals aimed at assuring i) greater influence in the design of a multilateral global architecture; ii) an expanded role in scenarios of post-conflict reconstruction, humanitarian crisis and natural disasters according to legitimate multilateral norms and institutions; iii) an attuned and amplified capability in South-South cooperation; and iv) a strong regional role on peace, stability and sustainable development and cooperation.

This paper will focus on Brazil's international role as an emerging power and its expanded responsibilities in South-South Cooperation (SSC), particularly in countries affected by conflict and severe institutional crisis. It begins with a brief profile of recent changes in Brazil's foreign policy, with emphasis placed on innovations in its cooperation with other Southern emerging powers. In doing so, it highlights the political motivations and conceptual foundations for Brazil's recent initiatives in multilateral and regional spheres. Secondly, this paper addresses the conceptual and institutional grounds of Brazilian SSC, its main fields of expertise, and geographical priority areas. The next section will offer a brief overview of Brazilian involvement in Haiti as an emblematic case for Brazil's recent responsibilities in post-conflict reconstruction with special attention on the articulation between development cooperation, humanitarian aid and local security. In closing, it will present a few final considerations regarding the new role of emerging powers and the particularities of those assumed by Brazil in South-South Cooperation and international security.

Recent Shifts in Brazilian Foreign Policy

In recent years Brazil has put forward a more ambitious foreign policy with the aim of expanding the country's presence in international economic negotiations, in global governance matters and institutions, and in regional affairs.[2] Under the active presidency of Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, known as Lula, Brazil actively cultivated ties with both industrialized economies as well as the emergent South. Under Lula's administration, Brazil also prioritized the inclusion of the social agenda as a component to strengthened bilateral ties, drawing on its domestic experience of inclusive social policies and increasing state capacity for the provision of social goods. This path of action appears likely to continue in the government of Dilma Rousseff, elected in 2011, as one of its priorities has come to be the elimination of extreme poverty within Brazil.

Brazil's strengthened bilateral relations have been combined with a renewed focus on SSC and a stronger regional presence in South America. An example of such

activism has been its involvement in the creation of the IBSA and the BRICS coalitions. Firstly, in June 2003 as a result of the Trilateral Foreign Minister Meeting, India, Brazil and South Africa signed the "Brasilia Declaration" which led to the creation of what has become known as the IBSA bloc.[3] The bloc was the brainchild of South Africa and was conceived as a strategic partnership among developing democracies. With Brazil's initiative and India's immediate acceptance, IBSA has been transformed into a South-South inter-state cooperation based largely on soft power assets. This grouping serves as a trilateral forum for articulating common goals, positions and values in world politics and economics. IBSA also aims to bolster the importance of development cooperation on global agendas, to underline the importance of a Southern understanding of democratic rule and values, and to put pressure on the reform of major multilateral forums (including the UN, IMF and World Bank) as advocates for the developing world.

In 2006, the BRICS group (Brazil, Russia, China and most recently South Africa) was formed. While BRICS started out as a market-oriented label, this group has expanded its profile in world politics and security matters, contributing even more to strengthening the voice of emerging powers in matters of global governance.[4] For Brazil, this has become a crucial platform to deepen ties with China, putting together old time commonalities regarding South-South multilateralism with the most recent expansion of bilateral economic relations.[5]

Regional security and politics have also assumed unprecedented importance for Brazilian foreign policy, particularly in terms of strengthening democratic institutions and values. This focus, developed during the Lula administrations, is expected to continue during the Rousseff government as well. During the first years of the twenty-first century, South America faced a new phase of political instability, particularly in the Andean region, which led to institutional breakdown, massive popular protests, political violence, and local turmoil accompanied by strong anti-American sentiment.[6] Brazil became crucial as a stabilizing force in South America, focusing on finding political solutions that avoided US-led securitized

interventions, particularly those pushed forward during the Bush administration. In this same direction, Brazilian diplomacy became particularly active in the promotion of political governance in South America, leaving behind the previous attachment to the long standing principle of non-intervention in affairs of other states which had been one of the pillars of Brazil foreign policy all throughout the twentieth century. In this fashion, Brazilian policymakers have focused on inclusive conflict prevention and political mediation between all parties involved rather than exclusive negotiation tables. Brazil has been, together with Argentina, a major architect of MERCOSUR, an economic and political grouping of Argentica, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay, and more recently a major player in the development of the Union of South American Nations (UNASUR), with special involvement in the articulation of the areas of defence and public health cooperation.

Hence, Brazil has pursued innovative participation in global/regional political and economic institutions. At the same time, this country has reframed approaches to deal with global security threats and inter- and intra-state conflict realities. After 9/11, Brazil avoided alignment with U.S. security policies while granting discrete support to the U.S.-led war against terrorism. In multilateral arenas, most notably the UN, it has insisted on the need for a conceptual revision of global governance institutions, particularly the reform of the UN Security Council (UNSC) arguing for a greater role for developing powers in the inner circle of international politics. Brazilian foreign policy became especially concerned with the question of legitimacy of the use of force in international interventions as well as the humanitarian impact of military action and the importance of solutions which sought equilibrium between peace, solidarity and development. Brazil's pro-active diplomacy allowed its election as a non-permanent member of the UNSC five times in the post-Cold War era: in 1989-90, 1993-94, 1998-99, and 2004-2005 and 2010-2011.[7] At present Brazil is the 11thlargest contributor to UN peacekeeping, participates in eight peace missions, and registered the second largest increase in troop contributions in 2010. In addition to Haiti, where Brazil holds the military command of the MINUSTAH, Brazilian troops have also been sent to East Timor, Lebanon and Cyprus in recent years.

Brazil has also pursued a leading role in world economic negotiations: in the creation of the G20, a group of twenty WTO member states concerned with the distortion of trade practices for agricultural goods, the uneven conditions of market access and the dramatic problems of food security and in face of the 2008 world financial crisis, Brazil has played its part as an emerging power in the talks and remedy-search debates. It has defended the replacement of G8 by G20, as the primary global financial decision-making body, representing an important step for a more inclusive world economic order.

To summarize, together with other emerging powers Brazil has assumed leading roles in the promotion of a renewed multilateral architecture, and innovative inter-state coalition-building among developing countries. More than just contesting the world power structure, Brazilian diplomacy criticizes the distribution of power in specific agendas; it stresses the need to strengthen multilateralism in world affairs, with a special emphasis on the need to reform governance of the UN and the international financial architecture.

Normative Conceptions

Brazil perceives development cooperation and South-South Cooperation (SSC) as an institutionally grounded action built upon the capabilities of its state agencies comprising technical assistance, skills transference and capacity building. It is centered upon the notion of inter-state partnership, based on ideals of solidarity, the relevance of shared experiences and the value of exchanging capabilities to overcome the social and economic limitations imposed by underdevelopment. For Brazil, SSC combines foreign policy motivations with the capabilities of its state institutions to respond to demands for technical assistance placed by other Southern partners. SSC is expected not to have any ties to commercial interests or foreign direct investments and it may, or may not, rely upon the participation of civil society organizations. The Brazilian South-South discourse underlines the idea that horizontal cooperation represents a valuable instrument to pursue mutual interests with developing partners.

Brazil's growth as a development partner has occurred as the country has slowly abandoned its condition as an international aid recipient. In the period 1995-2010 aid flows to Brazil remained stable[8], while its participation as an international donor has grown exponentially, reflected in the growth of the budget of the Brazilian Agency for Cooperation (ABC), as discussed in more detail below. Reducing previous dependencies on foreign aid has allowed Brazil to express more freely its critical stances on the problematic aspects of North-South assistance policies and practices. Brazil wishes to avoid the reproduction of North-South aid dynamics, often conditioned by structural asymmetries, and subject to OECD-DAC norms and procedures. In this context, it is among a reduced number of developing countries that did not sign the Paris Declaration. Brazil argues instead that United Nations agencies, particularly ECOSOC, must lead the global debate on international assistance for development, as OECD norms on cooperation do not represent the interests and perceptions of the developing world. The fundamentals behind this position may be traced in the collective memory of Brazil's diplomacy and the historic commitment of Brazilian foreign policy to multilateralism and the UN system.[9]

According to this same logic, the Brazilian government refuses to use the term "emerging donor", widely used nowadays in the literature encompassing South-South cooperation, preferring instead to perceive itself as a partner of developing country governments. Brazil also avoids the use of labels such as "failed, fragile or weak states" in the official discourse on its involvement in SSC in vulnerable scenarios as those of Guinea-Bissau or Haiti. Considered stigmatized and prejudiced concepts, such categories are seen as a subtle way to question the sovereignty of these same states, which by Brazil's standards must always be the basis for cooperation. This is even more importance when extreme poverty and weaknesses in institutions is caused by asymmetrical international structures of distribution of resources and power. The respect for the sovereignty of its partners explains why Brazil strives to respond to all requests for cooperation, even when local obstacles present real implementation challenges.

From a political standpoint, Brazil's increased performance in SSC is fueled by the special attention given to the relations with developing countries. Cooperation offered by Brazil corresponds to a means and an end that makes intensive use of the varied forums and coalitions shared with Southern partners. In other words, South-South relations and SSC, though not the same for Brazil, have become intertwined dimensions in its foreign affairs. Cooperation has been stimulated by cultural, social and economic affinities, solidarity ties and the opportunity offered by research and technical exchanges. Through the ABC, which is linked to the Foreign Ministry (known as Itamarati), and many other state agencies as mentioned, the country has sought to sketch its own style of "horizontal cooperation" with actions that aim to build points of transmission and exchanges of knowledge with other developing countries. Its assistance is based on a "structural" approach - a sustainable plan of action to reach long-term socioeconomic impact on the ground - avoiding fragmentation, which is considered counter-productive for local partners. Because this is an inclusive process, it often leads to a slower consultation process between Brazil and its partners.

SSC represents a valuable tool, a genuine **soft power** as-set, for Brazilian foreign policy as it allows the articulation between development assistance, institutional strength-ening and peace promotion. SSC as practiced by Brazil, should also be understood within a context of global transformation, particularly as Brazil seeks to project itself as an influential actor in the configuration of the South-South agenda to support development in Latin America, Asia and Africa. As has already been noted, these efforts are linked to recent changes in its international projection, motivated by new international ambitions, aiming to in-crease the country's presence in global economic negotia-tions, and its clout in regional and multilateral institutions.

Despite Brazil's aim to provide cooperation untied to economic or political motivations, in some instances it becomes difficult to consider these activities as an instrument totally disassociated from the country's economic and political interests. At times is seems challenging to trace borders between the public and private realms touched by cooperation. The connections between food production and market economy or between science and technology developments and certain industrial areas in which Brazilian investment have expanded in Latin America and Africa cannot be ignored.[10]

Operationalizing South-South Cooperation

Brazil's cooperation initiatives in development are carried forward as part of an ongoing process of "internationalization" of the governmental structure. This process must be understood within the frame of a set of transformations in Brazil´s development model, linked to a rebirth of state activism.[11] Hence, the increase of SSC initiatives in Brazil has been fueled by changes in state agencies stimulated simultaneously by the globalization of public policy agendas and the strengthening of state capabilities.[12] The key areas of expertise offered by Brazilian state agencies are: health, agriculture and food security, and education. The learning process in building intra-South partnerships is based on the idea of reciprocity, and has become a major motivation behind these programs. This approach can be observed in areas such as: economic planning, public health policies, environmental protection, labour legislation, sports training, education, and police training. Brazil's expanded presence in cooperation for development is thus a projection of its strengthened domestic institutions, particularly those related to the strengthening of state capabilities in areas of social inclusion, technical skills and technological innovation.

In recent years, there has been a major increase in Brazilian cooperative initiatives in a growing number of countries, concentrated in Latin America and Africa.[13] Since 2005, a more ambitious SSC agenda has been spurred by two related developments: the functional and budgetary expansion of the Brazil's development cooperation agency, ABC, and the greater involvement of a growing number of Brazilian state agencies in activities of international technical assistance.

These changes have had important implications for Brazilian institutions. During the period 2005-2011,

34

ABC's budget increased from USD19.5 million to USD32.7 million, distributed throughout the world. In 2010 27.5% of the ABC budget was destined for Latin America, and 42% for Africa.[14] This process supported strengthening partnerships in areas including agriculture and food and nutritional safety, environmental preservation, urban planning, sports training, governmental institutions strengthening, among others. These projects have been conducted with several state agencies including: the National Fund for Educational Development of the Ministry of Education of Brazil (FNDE), Brazil's Agricultural Research Corporation (EMBRAPA), Center for Strategic Studies and Training in Tropical Agriculture (EMBRAPA - CECAT), Ministry of Cities (CEF), and the Brazilian Institute form Environment Protection from Ministry of Environment (IBAMA) and the Oswaldo Cruz Institute of the Ministry of Health – particularly the agency (FIOCRUZ). The Ministry of Justice and Defense Ministry, including the Federal Police, have also deployed to a number of international missions including more than sixteen military training projects in Paraguay; the joint police control of the border shared with Bolivia; and government official training, as well as assistance for constitutional and civil codes reforms in several countries such as Haiti, Bolivia, Paraguay, and Guinea-Bissau.[15] Beyond fine-tuning the technical capabilities channeled by the production of domestic public goods, this international assistance also strengthens Brazil's international projection. In the area of health, for instance, this process has developed into Brazilian "health diplomacy."[16]

This process many times follows a fragmented logic, an almost inevitable consequence derived from the profile of the Brazilian administrative federal structure. New responsibilities are not always entered into smoothly and coherently since this is a recent process of "learning by doing." Challenges and limitations are many in administrative, judicial and financial spheres, which affect the state's capacity to coordinate and centralize information. Brazilian legislation regarding international activities of government agencies is slowly adapting to meet new responsibilities abroad. Additionally, Brazilian SSC continues to face challenges in monitoring results, critical to ensuring sustainability. Again, first steps

have been taken to organize and disseminate overall information on annual activities and costs of the States' activities in cooperation for development.[17]

In addition to growing bilateral assistance, Brazil has also expanded its engagement in trilateral initiatives involving multilateral entities, other Southern partners or Northern aid agencies.[18] Special mention should be made to the initiatives carried forward with the FAO in order to establish a program to strengthen agriculture and promote food and nutritional safety in African countries; as well as collaboration with FAO and the UN World Food Program (WFP) which focuses on the creation of a partnership to strengthen agriculture and food security policies, with a particular focus on sustainable school food programs in developing countries. In this same context Brazil has become particularly involved in the WFP, which led to the creation of an inter-ministerial group for humanitarian assistance.[19] In 2010 Brazil's work with WFP benefitted countries including Iraq, Malawi, Haiti, Sudan, Bolivia, Guatemala, Congo, Nigeria, Pakistan, El Salvador, Algeria, Somalia and Cuba. Brazil has also participated in the Donors Conference for humanitarian assistance for the reconstruction of Sudan, Palestine, Afghanistan, Lebanon and Haiti.

While these initiatives all demonstrate the key role that Brazil plays in international assistance, the country still faces problems regarding inter-bureaucratic coordination. In addition, these activities are confronted many times with the lack of administrative means in partner countries to deal with the challenges, exacerbated by extremely vulnerable economic and social realities. In the case of Haiti, for instance, the conditions for providing health assistance became even more difficult in light of the cholera epidemic in 2010.[20]

Brazil, like other Medium Income Countries (MICs), which stand out in the configuration of a new SSC agenda, wishes to be an influential part in the process of revision and construction of minimal consensus in the global talks on development cooperation within the international community, especially in multilateral forums as ECOSOC, FAO and others.[21] It seeks to project itself as a country

with developmental ideals and democratic governance values projected both globally and regionally. At the same time, Brazil has been earning growing attention from High Income countries (HICs) interested in triangular projects of cooperation given the advantages offered by its cultural, social and political affinities with countries from the Low Income Countries (LICs). For this particular cooperation dynamic Brazil has established partnerships with a number of countries including Japan, Germany, Spain, Italy, and France. These arrangements have resulted in numerous projects in Latin America and Africa encompassing diverse areas such as agriculture, food security, education and infrastructure among others. In addition to bilateral donors, multilateral agencies have also become an active part of triangular arrangements.[22] This format of assistance has expanded inside the bulk of Brazilian cooperation initiatives in Latin America and Africa, magnifying the outreach and sustainability of certain initiatives, and increasing the likelihood of sustainability, a recently articulated priority of ABC.

The articulation of technical assistance programs to multilateral agencies has been one of the approaches sought to minimize some of the deficiencies articulated above. In former phases, these agencies had been responsible for cooperation projects implemented in Brazil. Since the 1990's, with growing state capacity, Brazilian state agencies gradually assumed managerial and financial responsibilities for the implementation of these projects. Notwithstanding, as it occurs in many other countries, the UN Development Program (UNDP) stands as the main partner for horizontal cooperation, together with the local state agencies. In Brazil this concept of partnership has been at the backstage of the recent reform in the ABC undertaken to expand the outreach of Brazil's commitments in technical assistance for development. In addition to UNDP, other multilateral partners have been summed up to Brazilian SSC, among others the UNESCO, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the African Development Bank. Additionally, inter-state groups as BRICS and IBSA, together with regional associations such as MERCOSUR and UNASUR have functioned as Brazilian partners in cooperation for development. These partnerships have been of growing importance for Brazil's engagement in LICs, even more so when these are affected by severe institutional crisis, conflict and natural disasters. The varied methods and formats pursued in Brazil's engagement in Haiti illustrates the variety of assistance methods. In fact, the work done in this country has become a display of new responsibilities Brazil has assumed in vulnerable areas.

Brazil's Experience in Haiti

Since 2004, the Brazilian defense and foreign policy have devoted enormous attention to Haiti. This has occurred through a two-fold strategy: Brazil's full involvement in the UN Stabilization Mission in Haiti (MINUSTAH), complemented by SSC across a wide range of activities in several areas such as food security, environmental protection, rubble recycling, public health programs, police training and even sports coaching.

The decision to assume MINUSTAH's military command opened for Brazil a new set of challenges in which diplomatic, military and cooperation activities became intertwined. If until then Haiti had been almost completely absent from Itamarati and the Ministry of Defense's radars, it became a major platform for international security, and the most complex experiment of cooperation for development carried forward by the Brazilian state.

Since the beginning of MINUSTAH, Brazilian presence oscillated between coordination with its South American partners, which also participated actively in the UN mission, and the construction of its own framework of performance addressing its responsibilities on Haitian ground. This double focus mirrored that of Lula's government more generally, where new priorities within foreign policy seek to combine regional commitments as well as an expanded global projection.

Within this context, the broad universe of technical assistance activities developed by Brazil in Haiti acquired emblematic value; becoming the most representative of the country's SSC "package" in the commitment of timetables and resources, the diversity of bureaucratic agencies involved and of innovative triangular associations

with other donors and multilateral organizations. From a conceptual standpoint, this effort has been entwined with the notion that cooperation for development must be sustainable and structural. Brazil also made several steps forward regarding its involvement in local security matters with quite positive results regarding the dismantle of Haitian gangs in the slum areas of Port-au-Prince and supporting Haitian police to contain crime and violence, which haunted the stabilization process in Haiti in the first years of MINUSTAH operations.[23] This became a genuine learning by doing process, which at a later stage was "re-exported" back to Brazil, in responding to slum areas in Rio de Janeiro. The experience acquired in the Bel Air area in Port-au-Prince served to capacitate Brazilian officials, knowledge which was critical in informing work in the Rio de Janeiro slums.[24]

The decision to lead and assume a new type of responsibility on Haitian soil prompted a review of major postulates of Brazil's foreign policy. For the first time Brazil admitted more intrusive commitments in multilateral operations conducted by the UN within contexts of institutional breakdown and the escalation of violence. The very same Haitian reality in prior periods had been addressed by Brazil from its traditional anti-interventionist postures. In 1993 Brazil refused to participate in the UN mission to Haiti.[25] At the time, governing crises were not considered by Brazil as justifiable for military intervention as a threat to international peace.

In 2004, the noninterventionist principle was replaced with the notion of non-indifference, which held that new responsibilities assumed in Haiti must also work to minimize or even avoid the influence of "other presences" that would be harmful and traumatic to the local population. This switch led Brazil to participate militarily for the first time in a UN peace enforcement mission carried forward under Chapter VII of the UN Charter, prescribed for situations considered a threat to international peace and security. As the country assumed the military command of MINUSTAH a new phase of regional engagement in the reconstructions of Haiti took place.

However, there has been a benchmark regarding the before and aftermath of the earthquake in 2010 in reference to the regional acumen of Haitian recovery. The devastating impact of the earthquake swept with it the fairly optimistic scenery of late 2009, which had been gradually built up since 2004. At that moment a positive evaluation of results summed up: internal stabilization, major improvement in local public security, the strengthening of local government structures and a gradual recovery of a Haitian economic development project. The international community also called attention to the role of Latin American countries in sustaining these advances.[26] At the same time, since 2006 and the election of President Préval, the local political process evolved according to satisfactory democratic governance standards, the organization of the Haitian National Police moved ahead with the coordinated cooperation of South America, Canada and the US. In addition, foreign direct investment by the Dominican Republic, Brazil, and Mexico, identified opportunities to be explored and gained impulse with the Clinton Global Initiative. In this scenario took place an unprecedented interaction between the Haitian government and Latin American and Caribbean community, culminating with Haiti assuming the presidency of CARICOM. The results of this assistance for Haiti were palpable: the Cuban, Argentinean, Venezuelan, Mexican, Brazilian and Chilean cooperation all played key roles in social policy, economic development, human rights, and government institutional building. Lastly and equally significant, the UN gave signs that a reduction and even a withdrawal of the military component of MINUSTAH would be possible after the presidential elections of 2010 as it had become increasingly difficult to describe the Haitian reality as a threat to international security.

After the earthquake, the international community, including Brazil, had to adjust its presence in Haiti to a new reality, far more challenging and complex than the one met in 2004. In this context, Brasilia ascended steps regarding military and economic responsibilities in Haiti and its actions came to be more closely tied to local requests and to the international community expectations than to intra-South American articulations. Thus for Brazil, the assistance provided to Haiti since 2010, has led to

the deepening of commitments assumed since 2004 and broadening of the scope of engagement within the donor community. In addition to immediate relief actions that provided medicine and health assistance, food, water and first necessity products, the Lula government committed to a 100% increase in the Brazilian military presence in MINUSTAH. Subsequently, the Lula government assumed a protagonist role among bilateral donors and multilateral agencies in international conferences during the first half of 2010, held to determine the course of action and funds necessary for the reconstruction of Haiti.

The urgencies imposed by the humanitarian crisis in Haiti after the earthquake, aggravated by the cholera epidemic, led to a merging of the stabilization actions and cooperation for development initiatives carried forward by the Brazilian government. In fact, in different parts of the Haitian territory, Brazilian military troops became responsible for the tasks of rubble removal, medical assistance and road paving alongside technical assistance teams sent by various government agencies. Together with large donors as the United States, Canada, France, Spain, UE, UNDP, the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) and the World Bank, Brazil assumed a visible role in the reconstruction process of Haiti. As co-president of the first meeting of donors in New York in March 2010, the Brazilian government also assured the full pardon for the Haitian foreign debt also announced by international creditors.

By the end of 2010, the cooperation activities in Haiti managed by the ABC totaled USD737 thousand, and were expected to reach USD1.2 million. Brazil's SSC in Haiti involved three types of activities: (i) programs to improve professional capabilities in areas linked to productive activities and the management of public administration sectors, (ii) partnerships with multilateral agencies and other bilateral donors to broaden the outreach of cooperation for development initiatives, and (iii) deeper ties with the local population through long-term sustainable commitments, often including the use of Creole language to interact with Haitian counterparts. These activities have been pursued in a myriad of projects in areas of infrastructure and agricultural irrigation, health, education, sports, agri-

culture and food security, environment, vocational orientation, security, and civil rights.

Taken together, the activities of cooperation conducted by Brazil involve more than 50 actions, which implicate the participation of 32 different Brazilian agencies and/or organizations, 10 Haitian counterparts and 12 third party partners.[27] Amid Brazil's new partners in Haiti are: the International Labor Organization in a project of eradication of child labor, the government of Norway in projects of environmental protection and food safety, and Cuba as a Southern partner in public health initiatives. Additionally, ties between the Brazilian government and NGOs have deepened, with special mention to the partnership established with Viva Rio.[28]

In the political realm, the Brazilian government has supported the recent electoral process, which led to the election of Michel Martelly as the new Haitian president. One of the main expectations of the new administrations is to reduce the size of the UN military mission in the country and Brazil has already publically committed to back this objective in the next Security Council deliberations on MINUSTAH, scheduled for October 2011.

Concluding remarks

While the concept of emerging states was at first essentially applied to distinguish certain performances in the world economy, it is now used as well for actors that are outstanding in roles they play in global political and security realms. The link between such universes is explained not only as a consequence of the attributes shared by these states but for their regional and global projection, amplified through the growing visibility of the formation of interstate coalitions, such as the IBSA and BRICS groups. This process has also greatly expanded the possibilities of assistance to the developing world, generating new modalities of SSC and strengthening the outreach of humanitarian assistance programs.

This paper pinpoints Brazil's presence within this process. In the last decade, one can observe an innovative course of action which simultaneously and articulately

aspires to widen influence: redesigning the architecture of global governance institutions, participation in UN peace operations and its capacity to offer development cooperation in LICs in Latin America and Africa. New approaches have come into play in different governmental agencies regarding global governance challenges, their role in multilateral institutions, and the importance of civil organizations.

Linking the fight against poverty and unequal income distribution domestically with an outstanding international performance has, since 2002, been one of most innovative features of the Lula administration's foreign policy. More recently the Rousseff administration has stressed the determination to give full priority to battle and defeat extreme poverty in Brazil, which will certainly expand the impact of social policies offered by the federal government. In this context, it is expected that the connection between domestic and international involvement in inclusive social policy will continue and this will most certainly spillover to SSC cooperation and humanitarian assistance.

The Brazilian state structure has moved rapidly in recent years in the creation of bureaucratic rings responsible for the expansion of technical cooperation for development and humanitarian assistance programs, carried out by a network of governmental agencies which function with different degrees of inter-bureaucratic coordination and autonomy. This process lacks coordination and may lead to overlapping problems and/or of a feudalized approach in the built-up of partnerships with developing country governments. Recent efforts to coordinate initiatives and maximize results in the work done in Africa, for instance such as those undertaken between EMPRAPA and FIOCRUZ, demonstrate clear steps forward.

Among its emerging partners Brazil displays certain particularities. To start, it demonstrates selective criteria based not only on foreign policy priorities but also according to its available resources, be it to assume responsibilities in a stabilization force or to partner in activities to promote development and/or institutional strengthening. Also noteworthy is its use of soft power assets, principally its cultural attributes, which includes

giving major importance to sports training with special consideration to soccer, the national sport. In Africa, for instance, SSC policies have given preference to Lusophone countries, where cultural and linguistic ties favor communication and mutual understanding. In Haiti, the World Cup team visit in 2004, proved to be the most effective visiting card flagged by the Brazilian military command of MINUSTAH to gain confidence and esteem from the local population.

A notable example, as an area of great success in Brazilian SSC, has been that of public health. This is a field that has developed an autonomous SSC agenda in the Brazilian state structure carried out by a professional staff especially prepared to provide international assistance. A new generation of cooperation initiatives now involves trilateral arrangements with northern and southern donors as well as multilateral agencies. Food security programs have also become an outstanding area of work for Brazil, as this country has now become a major player in key international food programs and institutions.

Finally, Brazilian performance within different scenarios in the Southern world, contains a subliminal political message; a critical understanding of the past and present practices which have dominated North-South cooperation. It aims to associate its capacity to partner with a transforming sense of foreign action, that which represents a presence not identified with prior experiences of occupation and domination imposed upon the recipient country. Brazil's intention is to send out a message that the cooperation it wishes to provide can and ought to be propelled by solidarity and non-interested aims, built on the idea that there is a common urgency to overcome realities which, since they are well-known in Brazil, should be undertaken together as a responsibility shared by all partners involved.

Engagement on Development and Security: New Actors, New Debates

Endnotes

*I wish to thank Natalia Herbst for her assistance and Julia Beer for the English translation of the Portuguese version of this text.
** Professor at the Torquato di Tella University and fellow of the International Program of IPEA-Brasilia

[1]HURRELL, Andrew (2006) "Hegemony, liberalism and global order". *International Affairs*, volume 82, number 1, January. p. 1-20.
[2]See: HIRST, Monica &SOARES DE LIMA, Maria Regina (2006), "Brazil as an intermediate state and regional power: action, choice and responsibilities", International Affairs vol. 82, nº 1, pp. 21-4.Recent developments of Brazilian foreign policy see: HIRST, Monica; SOARES DE LIMA, Maria Regina; PINHEIRO, Leticia (2010) "A politica externa brasileira em tempos de novos horizontes e desafios". *Nueva Sociedad*. Luzes e sombras do Brasil atual, Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, Buenos Aires, diciembre, pp. 22-41 and HURRELL, Andrew, "Lula's Brazil: a rising power, but going where?", Current History, February 2008.
[3]This same year the creation of IBSA was announced to the international community during the 58th Session of the UN General Assembly by South Africa President Thabo Mbeki.
[4]See ROETT, Riordan (2010) *The New Brazil: From Backwater to BRIC*, Brookings Institution Press, WashingtonD.C.
[5]See HIRST, Monica (2009) "La perspectiva Sur-Sur: la importancia del vínculo con Brasil". In ROETT, Riordan and PAZ, Guadalupe(eds.) China's Expansion into the Western Hemisphere, Brookings, 2008,Washington D.C pp. 117-136.
[6]Examples of such scenarios were observed in: Argentina (2001), Bolivia (2003, 2005), Ecuador (2000, 2005), Haiti (2004), Paraguay (1999), Peru (2000) and Venezuela (2002).
[7]*Annual Review of Peacekeeping Operations 2011* Center on International Cooperation – New York University, 2011.
[8]World Bank data shows that Net Official Development Assistance and Aid Received (current US$) in 1995 accounts for 316.980.000 and in 2009 for 364.460.000. See: http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/DT.ODA.ALLD.KD?page=3.
[9]Fonseca, Gelson "Notes on the evolution of Brazilian Multilateral Diplomacy" *Global Goverance*, 17 (2011), 375-397.
[10]The Chairman of the Association of Brazilian Business and Executives in Angola committed to the viability of private/public projects in this country, based on the idea of common problems, in which Brazil counts with a wider expertise. In this way, private sector entrepreneurs access the market in order to invest in the improvement of local capabilities. Initiatives were held between representatives from the private sector and both countries "Brazil to Contribute to projects of public/private partnership", Angola Private Investment Agency, June 1 2011. At: http://www.iie-angola-us.org/full_headlines.php?id=1528
[11]An analysis of the implications of state transformations for the Brazilian development model is drawn by Glauco Arbix and Scott Martin in: "Beyond developmentalism and market fundamentalism in Brazil: Inclusionary state activism without statism". Paper presented at Workshop on States, Development, and Global Governance.
Global Legal Studies Center and the Center for World Affairs and the Global Economy (WAGE)University of Wisconsin-Madison, March 12-13, 2010.
[12]An analysis of the process of internationalization of the Brazilian state has been drawn by Cassio Luiz Da França and Michelle Ratton Sanchez Badin. See: DA FRANÇA, Cassio Luiz y RATTON SANCHEZ BADIN, Michelle (2010) *Análises e Propostas. A inserção internacional do poder executivo federal brasileiro*, n° 40, august, Fundação Friedrich Ebert (FES), São Paulo..
[13]In 2010 ABC's cooperation action totalized 81 initiatives, which involved 38 recipient countries in Africa and 18 in Latin America and the Caribbean.
[14]Brazilian Cooperation Agency – Ministry of External Relations (2011) *Brazilian Technical Cooperation*, mimeo.
[15]Brazilian Cooperation Agency – Ministry of External Relations (2011)

Brazilian Technical Cooperation, mimeo; *Brasil-Haiti. Programa de Cooperação Sul-Sul*, Agência Brasileira de Cooperação, Brasília, 2010;
[16]Buss, Paulo ~Brazil's Concepcion of South-South Structural Cooperation in Health" RECIIS, R. Eletr. Com. Inf.Saude, Rio de Janeiro, v. 4. N.1, p. 23-32, Mar. 2011.
[17]Instituto de Pesquisa Economica Aplicada (IPEA) (2010) *Cooperação Brasileira para o Desenvolvimento Internacional: 2005-2009*, Brasilia, December.
[18]As examples of these kind of partnerships it is possible to highlight those established with the ILO to fight child labor, with JICA encompassing a broad spectrum of working areas in several countries, with Viva Rio in the rehabilitation of peripheral areas, as well as many other projects launched with national agencies such as AECID (Spain), NOREF (Norway), and IDRC (Canada) among others.
[19]Created by Presidential Decree in June 21, 2006.
[20]Personal interviews with Brazilian officials in Haiti.
[21]José Grazziano, an outstanding Brazilian expert in agricultural development has been elected to serve as the next Director-General of the FAO.
[22]See: GÓMES GALÁN, Manuel; AYLLON PINO, Bruno; ALBARRÁN CALVO, Miguel (2011) *Reflexiones Prácticas Sobre Cooperación Triangular*, CIDEAL, Madrid. En: http://www.cideal.org/docs/COOP%20_TRIANGULAR_OnLine.pdf
[23]See: UN Secretary General reports: S/2005/313, S/2006/1592, S/2009/439
[24]Brazilian Armed Forces have participated in military missions in Haitian slums that resemble Rio de Janeiro's favelas. More than half of the soldiers that participated in the pacification of the slum Complexo do Alemão have served in Haiti, and the head of this operation was an ex-commander of the MINUSTAH.
[25]See: S/RES/867 (1993) detailed voting at:
http://unbisnet.un.org:8080/ipac20/ipac.jsp?session=1UK6421774973.20889&profile=voting&uri=full=3100023~!481641~!33&ri=2&aspect=power&menu=search&source=~!horizon
[26]*Action Plan for National Recovery and Development of Haiti*, March 2010. At: http://www.haiticonference.org/Haiti_Action_Plan_ENG.pdf
[27]*Brasil-Haiti. Programa de Cooperação Sul-Sul*, Agência Brasileira de Cooperação, Brasília, 2010.
[28]Viva Rio is a non-governmental organization, headquartered in Rio de Janeiro. Its main goal is to promote a culture of peace and social development through field work, research and formulation of public policies. Solutions created by Viva Rio through research, development and field tests are initially deployed on a smaller scale. Once positive results are achieved these efforts are expanded and can become public policies to be reproduced by the State, the market and other NGOs.

South Africa's 'Peace & Security' Perspective on Fragile States

by Francis Kornegay

Introduction

Since its democratic transition in the mid-1990s, South Africa has emerged as a key actor in conflict resolution, prevention and management in some of Africa's less stable and more conflict-ridden states twinned with a growing role in multilateral institutions involved in security and development. As the most recent entrant of the BRICS grouping, South Africa brings a new perspective to the emerging powers equation on development and security, one that is essentially an African-grounded peace and security perspective; albeit one that has yet to elaborate a clearly defined policy conceptualisation for its engagement in crisis- and conflict-affected states. It is also informed by South Africa's regional integration efforts, including efforts to establish, under the African Union (AU), a comprehensive post-conflict recovery regime as a component of the AU's broader peace and security architecture. This paper is informed by on-going but very recent policy research, analysis and discourse related to how South Africa, as an emerging power, understands its role in multilateral efforts to strengthen countries emerging from conflict. In doing so, it should be emphasised that the South African perspective is one intimately tied to its conflict resolution, prevention, management and peace and security activities on the continent.

South Africa's own evolution toward assuming a donor role on the continent has prompted the forthcoming creation of the South African Development Partnership Agency (SADPA). Internal dialogues persist on what role should be played by South Africa's development finance institutions (DFIs) as well as joint assessments with the United Nations (UN) on SA-UN interactions in a variety of peacekeeping, peace support and post-conflict situations, and finally on how Pretoria seeks to mediate its efforts through the AU and regional economic communities (RECs).

Before delving into the normative dimensions of the South African experience, some background to Pretoria's approach to fragile states may be useful as this experience relates to the engagements cited above. This will be followed by exploring the normative and operational dimensions of the South African experience.

Background: South Africa's Post-Apartheid Africa Policy

The South African approach to what have been considered 'fragile states' in Africa is one that has been heavily influenced by its own transition, including its experience in conflict resolution and management. Such states have been variously referred to as 'conflict,' 'post-conflict' or 'failing,' if not 'failed' states. This is without any apparent policy-related conceptual intent. As such, the term 'fragile state' carries no noticeable controversy in South African policy circles, in contrast to other states, including emerging powers, that choose not to use the term.

The uniquely 'South African model' of conflict resolution emphasises negotiated settlements, national unity governments, and reconciliation through the establishment of truth and reconciliation commissions. Taken together these experiences have heavily influenced the normative basis of Pretoria's Africa policy. In this respect, policy is oriented toward the peace and security stabilisation of the continental hinterland as an enabling condition for South Africa's own economic development and security interests. South Africa's leadership, early on, grounded policy and diplomatic implementation in the regional context in the Southern African Development Community (SADC).

This regional emphasis was early on reflected in South Africa's political intercession in support the transfer of power from Zairean president Mbobutu Sese Seko to Laurent Kabila in Zaire's 1997 transition to the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and in Pretoria's controversial 1998 military intervention in Lesotho. In the latter, South Africa's diplomatic coordination with Zimbabwe and Botswana to manage the political volatilities of Lesotho was carried out within a SADC framework.[1] This coordination took place with South Africa leading the politico-diplomatic intervention in the Kingdom (before

and after the military intervention) aimed at finding a political solution to Lesotho's dangerously polarised breakdown in governance and security.

What is notable about these early engagements in the Zaire-to-DRC transition and political and military interventions in Lesotho is that they were undertaken outside the framework of the UN, highlighting a larger disconnect between UN peacekeeping and regional initiatives. Indeed, regional peace and security urgencies have often required regional interventions that come in advance of UN mandates. The ECOMOG precedent in West Africa in the 1990s is exemplary of this situation. At present, there is an on-going but intermittent dialogue underway between the UN Security Council and the AU's Peace and Security Council, involving regional economic communities in efforts to more systematically respond to African conflict and post-conflict challenges. However, there is as yet no indication that this dialogue is close to achieving a coherent 'way forward' on a division of labour between the UN, the AU and Africa's RECs. At best, arrangements that arise are on an ad-hoc crisis management basis.

The international community has generally entertained very high expectations of South Africa occupying the 'middle power' role of regional security provider on the continent. This role has been reflected in preventive diplomatic mediations, as in the case of Mbeki's ECOWAS-sanctioned role in Cote d'Ivoire, and in peacekeeping responsibilities, as in Burundi (which was coupled with South African facilitated political settlement negotiations), with more recent peacekeeping commitments in Sudan – both in Darfur and in the North-South Comprehensive Peace Agreement – and Somalia. Though it was not as prominent an actor, South Africa also played a key role in the stabilisation of post-conflict Mozambique.

In the aftermath of the September 22, 1998 Lesotho debacle, South Africa's then Department of Foreign Affairs tabled its *White Paper on Peace Missions* to serve as a policy guide for future such South African engagements. It was approved by Cabinet in 1999 after almost two years of deliberations, adopting a "holistic, multidisciplinary approach, where political and military tasks were also driven by humanitarian concerns."[2] During this period, post-conflict reconstruction and recovery gained increasing currency with South Africa figuring importantly in the intellectual conceptualisation of 'developmental peacekeeping' as an approach more in line with African needs in addressing the underlying developmental imperatives of peace and security.

Whereas traditional peacekeeping emphasises the deployment and management of cease-fires and peace agreements between armies and/or armed groups, focusing purely on military aspects of 'keeping the peace,' the developmental dimensions of African conflict/post-conflict situations are seen as demanding something more comprehensive. Hence, 'developmental peacekeeping' and its emphasis on addressing a broader range of post-conflict reconstruction and developmental imperatives. Thus, the address given by former deputy defence minister, N.C. Madlala-Routledge at the African Defence Summit in 2004 was a major South African input in developing the 2005 *AU/NEPAD African Post-Conflict Reconstruction Policy Framework*, which successfully lobbied for the incorporation of developmental peacekeeping as a key tenet of the framework.[3]

South Africa has had a peace support mission presence in Burundi since 2000, and it played an important role in the transitional operation leading to the establishment of the UN Operation in Burundi in 2004, contributing approximately 1,500 troops to the peacekeeping operation. The mission's mandate came to an end in December 2006, and was succeeded by the UN Integrated Office in Burundi. Subsequently, an AU Special Task Force was set up that continued to rely mainly on South Africa. South Africa also continued to play an important role in the political process, including through the regional Partnership for Peace in Burundi.

This engagement can be viewed more broadly as a component of South African peace and security engagement in the Great Lakes sub-region, where the DRC has constituted the main focus of its engagement. While the UN has had a peacekeeping presence in the DRC since

1999, South Africa did not deploy peacekeeping troops to the DRC until the 2003 Pretoria-led Inter-Congolese Dialogue process, which resulted in the Sun City Lusaka Accord. South Africa's troop contribution to the current UN peacekeeping operation, the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (or MONUSCO) as of a September 2010 UN update had increased to 1,056 personnel.

South Africa is also a troop contributor to the African Union-United Nations Hybrid Mission in Darfur (UNAMID). In September 2010 South Africa had 775 troops, 15 military observers and 79 police officers deployed in the mission[4], and was under pressure to make further contributions. This commitment is part of a larger South African peace-building intervention in Sudan under its AU mandate as Chair of the AU Peace and Security Council's Ministerial Committee on the Post-Conflict Reconstruction of the Sudan, focusing on implementation of the CPA in South Sudan. This South African role is a continuing commitment, including a public service and administration training programme at the University of South Africa in Pretoria. Given the huge state-building challenge confronting the newly independent Republic of South Sudan, South African assistance is expected to continue indefinitely.

Overall, since the ending of apartheid, South Africa has risen to among the top twenty contributors of troops to UN peacekeeping operations. In 2010, South Africa ranked the 13th largest contributor, ahead of China, with 2,004 'uniformed personnel' deployed.[5] Support for UN peacekeeping is deemed very much in South Africa's national interest in foreign policy terms with particular reference to Africa.

Stabilising conflict regions of the continent is seen as a precondition to progress in Africa's development in addition to the awareness that South Africa's security interests are intertwined with peace and prosperity in the rest of Africa. As such, support for peacekeeping dovetails with Pretoria's view of the intimate linkage between its fate and that of the rest of Africa; a realisation that was very much a part of former President Thabo Mbeki's articulation of 'African Renaissance' that was the vision

behind the interrelated change-over of the Organisation of African Unity into the AU and the launching of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD). Indeed, the AU/NEPAD post-conflict reconstruction framework reflects such a convergence, one that was motivated by South Africa. NEPAD principles reflect the importance of peace and security as preconditions to Africa's development. This remains an underlying nexus in Pretoria's Africa policy and often finds public expression in international fora.[6]

Normative Reflections: Conflating Post-Conflict and Failing States

The South African approach to weak or failing states reflects approaches it has undertaken over the years in implementing conflict resolution interventions in a variety of different African settings. From a normative perspective, it is one strongly informed by its own democratic transition as well as by "its own recent history and experience in the peaceful resolution of seemingly intractable conflicts."[7] It is an approach that prioritises diplomacy and non-military over military tools in promoting stability, prioritizing post-conflict stabilisation and inclusive political settlements.

'Development partners' and 'partnerships' rather than the traditional donor-client paradigm has become the approach to development assistance. The 'South African Development Partnership Agency' speaks to this normative emphasis on a non-hegemonic equality in inter-state relations with other African countries, which may be recipients of Pretoria's assistance in one form or another.

This reflects a widely held outlook among South African officials and non-governmental specialists who, at least, in part are motivated by an aversion to South Africa coming across as a hegemon acting unilaterally on the continent. Multilateralism is the preferred approach. On the conflict prevention 'front end' where a vulnerable state is in need of 'strengthening' to avoid a collapse into violent confrontation and/or to interrupt such a pattern, an inclusive negotiation process of mediation is featured. In what is a more specific examination of the norms and values underpinning South Africa's approach to peace

missions and fragile states, Dr. Tim Murithi has explored the South and Southern *Ubuntu* value system as a point of reference that guided former Archbishop Desmond Tutu's approach to the work of South Africa's ground-breaking Truth and Reconciliation Commission, mandated in the country's post-apartheid transitional arrangements.[8]

Murithi explores how Ubuntu's principles are undergirded by an assumption of one's humanity being intertwined with an affirmation of the humanity of others ('I am because you are'). This then establishes an empathetic basis for peace and reconciliation.[9] Ubuntu is predicated on the essential unity of humanity out of which emanates principles of empathy, reciprocity, inclusivity, cooperation, sharing and a shared destiny.

Although these principles may be seen as relating more discretely to a 'truth and reconciliation' process within a wider peace-building and post-conflict agenda, those aspects relating to public participation and to emphasis on human unity and interdependence suggest a possible broader normative application that Ubuntu could have in addressing the challenge of fragile states from a South African perspective.

At the operational level, these principles have already been (and are being applied) in state strengthening situations. However, while there are ample operational bases for documenting South Africa's engagement in fragile state strengthening, South Africa has not yet articulated a fragile state paradigm, focusing instead on 'developmental peacekeeping' and post-conflict reconstruction.

Implementing institutions, however, are grappling with how to approach these issues. In preparation for a 2010 'quality assurance' meeting at the Development Bank of Southern Africa (DBSA), the research unit submitted a discussion paper on 'DBSA's Post-Conflict Development Strategy.' It sets out to develop a process for identifying and engaging with post-conflict and states threatened with failure.[10] This exercise dovetailed with a companion dialogue organised by this author on clarifying the role for South African and African DFIs in strengthening post-conflict and/or failing states (about which more will be elaborated on later).

Beyond such ad-hoc exercises, the policy research 'state of the art' in South Africa has yet to catch up conceptually with its 'on the ground' operational endeavours in fragile states. Thus far, the fine-tuning of articulating priority areas of engagement in post-conflict states and those threatened with failure has not happened. It is possible that this will be reflected in the Department of International Relations and Cooperation (DIRCO) White Paper, expected to be released by the end of 2011.

Therefore, there exist no guideposts pertaining to a finely-tuned breaking down of when certain types of assistance should be made and the type of desired 'end state' that its engagement should help in achieving. Political stability presumably would be a major benchmark in whatever form this might take.[11] However, the absence of prescription at the official level apart from what has appeared in research literature does not mean that there is no sense of these considerations. It suggest that these have yet to be codified into a document that deliberates on how South Africa should meet the failing state challenge. Presumably, elaborating policy conceptualisation in this area should emerge as integral to the terms of reference of the prospective SADPA, who's role will also be further articulated in the forthcoming DIRCO White Paper.

Operationalising Engagement on Development and Security

South Africa's development and security engagements are closely linked and both inform its growing role as a development partner. As research from the International Development Research Centre notes: "In keeping with its surging economic growth and regional influence, South Africa has become an emerging donor that is increasingly involved in Africa as a development partner – largely via peacekeeping, post-conflict reconstruction, and research and development."[12]

In this regard, a 2009 joint evaluation of the UN's role in South Africa, including how it supports South Africa's regional role in peace and security, identified several areas of success, problems and challenges in South Africa-UN cooperation in addressing peace and security crises in

Engagement on Development and Security: New Actors, New Debates

Africa. South Africa's engagements were found to have been multidimensional with some areas of engagement reflecting greater success than others. From a success point of the view, South Africa's engagement in Burundi stands out and, indeed, is the sole focus of the of the report's findings on SA-UN relations in the peace and security field within the overall context of the UN support to South Africa. It does, however, allude to continuing challenges facing South Africa, the UN and other participant actors.

Success: Burundi, Lesotho & DRC

In addition to earlier engagement in countries affected by conflict, three recent examples point to successes in South Africa's assistance to post-conflict and fragile states. In the case of Burundi, deployment of the South African Protection Service Detachment (SAPSD) in 2001 constituted Pretoria's first engagement under the new policy conceived by the 1999 White Paper.[13] It reflected a purely African-initiated 'African solution' peacekeeping commitment and laid the ground for the subsequent UN peacekeeping operation.

At each stage, South Africa has played a leading role in supporting Burundi's peace process. From South Africa's central role in facilitating the peace negotiations to its police deployment to the AU and UN missions and the post-UN African Special Task Force phase, South Africa has played a critical role in Burundi's recovery, with analysis by the South African Institute of International Affairs concluding "South Africa has therefore maintained an almost continuous presence in Burundi since 2000."[14] Thus, to the extent that Burundi has been able to maintain its stability and now, subsequently, become a full-fledged member of the East African Community, South Africa has played a major leading role.

Success also has to be registered for South Africa in situations that have more mixed in terms of problems and challenges. In spite of the shambolic 'wake up call' experience of the controversial 1998 military intervention in Lesotho, South Africa's political, diplomatic and military interventions in the Kingdom have been critical for stability and security.[15] South Africa continues to closely monitor the often volatile political climate in the country, playing a key oversight role. The forthcoming SADPA, established within the context of South African rethinking of the revenue pool framework of the Southern African Customs Union, may have important impacts for security and stability in Lesotho.

South Africa also played a key role in the Lusaka Accord, ending the war in the DRC. Less successful, however, has been South Africa and, more broadly, the AU's capacity to support stabilisation in the DRC in order to end the chronic genocide and violence in eastern Congo and to otherwise advance effective governance of the DRC, despite a number of South African initiatives. Under President Mbeki, virtually all South African departments had been tasked in seconding public service personnel to Kinshasa and other parts of the DRC to assist in the country's post-conflict recovery.

There is a South Africa-DRC Bi-National Commission that meets periodically at ministerial level involving several departments. Among these, the Department of Public Service and Administration has been central in working to build the capacity of its DRC counterpart. Because of challenges presented by DRC's enormously large and complex terrain, poor infrastructure, a lack of political cohesion, and challenges in mobilising resources all confront South Africa, the AU and the UN with major challenges for stabilisation.

When assessing South Africa's role in these and other regional crises it becomes clear that the shear volume of conflict, post-conflict and fragile-to-failing state situations on the continent results in an ongoing 'over-stretch' crisis for South Africa, in addition to the AU and other African actors, to adequately address peace and security contingencies. South Africa is stretched too thin in its peace and security engagements throughout the continent while continually coming under pressure to escalate its involvement in additional crises. The challenge of Somali piracy demonstrates the most recent case in point.

These peace and security challenges often also require rapid responses from South Africa and other regional

actors. With respect to relevance, the joint UN-South Africa evaluation noted: "due to the need to act quickly, the politically approved processes – that is, those laid out in the White Paper – were not followed in many instances."[16] Peace and security crises that emerge often require key African state and regional actors to act proactively – militarily or non-militarily – before a UN-mandated process can begin. In response, regional institutions have deepened their links with each other. The AU's Peace and Security Council is linked to REC organs of conflict prevention-resolution-management (such as ECOMOG), and with IGAD and SADC in conjunction with efforts to put in place the African Regional Standby deployment system with assistance from various donor country sources.

Because of this problem of timing, South Africa's peace and security learning curve – and by extension, how it relates to fragile states – has been informed by the need for SADC and AU buy-in, if not timely UN responses (particularly since these need to be channelled through the UN Security Council). This requires greater efforts at coordination among institutions and a coherent division of labour among the UN, the AU and Africa's RECs to facilitate better UN-Africa communication and coordination in responding to or heading off peace and security threats. These problems, in turn, impact on other challenges – the joint UN-South Africa evaluation found that "the objectives have been reached with mixed levels of success in different countries, often due to factors outside the control of the parties involved in peacekeeping missions: time frames and levels of support can change rapidly and become unpredictable" in addition to "resource limitations" remaining a major constraint on effectiveness.[17]

Coming to grips with the post-conflict/fragile state conundrum

While a major dimension of the peace and security challenge lies in the field of post-conflict reconstruction and recovery, there has been a growing awareness in South Africa of how dealing with this challenge must relate to the challenge of what, until very recently, were referred to as 'fragile states.' The problem is that there has been no policy distinction for such states as situations requiring

conflict prevention and post-conflict state/governance reconstruction. The conflating of 'post-conflict' and state 'fragility' in South Africa policy thinking became more clearly reflected in discussions relating to how to more effectively operationalise the AU/NEPAD framework in defining a role for institutions like the Development Bank of Southern Africa (DBSA).

At a 2010 seminar on this issue,[18] it was observed that a major problem confronting implementation of the AU/NEPAD Framework was the prevalence of conventional approaches to post-conflict reconstruction (PCR) in Africa. Emphasis tended to be on 'stabilisation' as the essence of traditional, non-African conceptualisations of how post-conflict efforts should proceed and how to strengthen fragile states. Such approaches were seen as departing from a longer-term perspective in how PCR is conceptualised in the African context.[19] Instead, there was a general sense expressed that approaches should address questions of legitimacy at three levels: the national level, solidarity at a continental level and forging partnerships at the international level. What emerged from this discussion was a sense of a lack of coordination between AU/NEPAD priorities and international donors in supporting the AU/NEPAD framework as the point-of-departure for international engagement. In other words, the current situation reflected an uncoordinated multi-donor situation without AU/NEPAD as the point of reference.

In addition, the seminar sought to assess the role of the Development Bank of Southern Africa and other African DFIs in post-conflict/fragile states, including: how to partner with larger bilateral and multilateral donor institutions; how they should relate to such funding mechanisms as multinational trust funds; how to incorporate Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers; and how to coordinate with the process leading to the eventual establishment of SADPA.

Institutionalising Development Assistance

South Africa's commitment to SADPA grows out of the ruling ANC's commitment to establish a South African international development agency. At this point in time,

SADPA is in a start-up mode within DIRCO as it has been set for becoming operational during 2011, though it is still to be decided which directorate within the department it will be situated in. Thus, even as there remains a discourse on SADPA, it is being operationalised. The agency will build upon two existing initiatives; DIRCO, housed within the Department of Foreign Affairs (DFA), and the African Renaissance Fund (ARF), established in 2000 to assist various South African initiatives on the continent as an expression of the Mbeki administration's 'African renaissance' vision.[20]

The ARF was designed to identify and support (i) cooperation with other countries, particularly African countries, (ii) promote democracy and governance, (iii) prevent and seek resolutions for conflict, (iv) promote socio-economic development and integration, (v) provide humanitarian assistance, and (vi) promote human resource development.[21] The ARF was accompanied by the more African multilateral-oriented launching of the NEPAD in 2000 as the AU's development initiative. These two streams have been complimented by the expanding engagement of Southern African Development Finance Institutions in SADC and the rest of Africa.

To date, there has been no definitive evaluation of the effectiveness of South African development assistance in its diverse undertakings, whether bilateral or multilateral. As SADPA gains operational traction, it would be expected that such an exercise would increasingly inform its direction. What such an evaluation might find, and indeed part of the impetus for the creation of the SADPA, is a need for a centralised agency to manage the country's development assistance programmes. These have been expanding over several years as a spin-off from its various peacekeeping and post-conflict commitments, as detailed below.

Assistance has been provided, more or less, ad-hoc, through the ARF and a variety of government departments, especially Defence, Education, the South African Police Services (under the Department of Safety and Security), Minerals and Energy, Trade and Industry, Public Service and Administration as well as development financial

institutions. DBSA, meanwhile, has housed the NEPAD Secretariat until its recent incorporation into the AU as its 'development and cooperation' agency, though NEPAD retains a South African presence.

The picture that emerges is a chaotic administrative domain crying out for coordination. This is the niche that SADPA will fill. This lack of coherence and institutional centralisation reflects, perhaps, an even bigger challenge, which is the lack of a centralised and integrated policy apparatus within the Presidency spanning domestic and foreign affairs that would provide strategic direction to the country's expanding African and international agenda as an emerging power.

In addition to its expanding commitments, South Africa has no systematic database to track its development assistance, no separate financial reporting lines for development projects or overall government strategy to direct aid along with generic operating guidelines (outside the ARF apparently) to facilitate the overall provision of aid.[22] To date, the default institutional referee within government on such matters is Treasury, which is the interface with all other donor institutions – bilateral and multilateral – with a presence in South Africa, though the SADPA is expected to take on this role.[23]

In terms of funding disbursement, there is still room for improvement on rapidly disbursing funds, with on-going debate within the DBSA on how to best place African DFIs to support development on the continent. In this respect, the implementation of the AU/NEPAD Post-Conflict framework could enhance South Africa's fledgling donor role and, in the process, provide a framework for elaborating a more manifestly fragile state stabilisation strategy.

In spite of these circumstances, South Africa's development aid activities for 2006 amounted to between US$363 million and US$475 million, or 0.18 percent of GDP, with the vast majority of these expenses channelled through the Department of Defence (55 percent) and the Department of Education (36 percent).[24] South Africa's assistance does not come with formal ties or conditionality, though many

of its projects rely on South African labour or technological inputs.[25]

Research forms a small component of South African development aid, largely funnelled through the Department of Science and Technology and its plethora of 'science councils' including the National Research Foundation (NRF), the Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC), the Centre for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) and the Africa Institute of South Africa (AISA). AISA was heavily involved as a backstop in the Inter-Congolese Dialogues.[26]

South African NGOs also form an important component of South Africa's international assistance. The Electoral Institute of Southern Africa (EISA), the Institute for Democracy in South Africa (IDASA) and peace and security organisations – the Institute for Security Studies (ISS), the Centre for Conflict Resolution (CCR) and ACCORD – all work independently and in partnership with the government in a number of challenging governance and peace and security areas of the continent. Closely related in this regard are the outreaches of the government's Chapter 9 Independent Electoral Commission (IEC) throughout the continent as well as in the region and in South Africa itself. EISA (NGO) and the IEC (government) are two capacities that could be brought to bear on issues of governance and fragility under the forthcoming SADPA.

Since 2000, South Africa has increasingly experimented with 'tripartite partnerships' with a traditional donor to deliver development aid to a recipient country, usually in Africa. "Although each party's roles and responsibilities vary from case to case, these arrangements enable South Africa to play an increasing role in the continent without incurring high costs or engendering resentment from its neighbours."[27] Here the 'partnership' conceptualisation that characterizes South African development assistance as an emerging power in and of Africa is an asset to traditional donors seeking to engage in the region. By 2007 South Africa had established trilateral partnerships with the Netherlands, Switzerland, Sweden, Norway and Belgium.[28]

Developmental assistance trilateralism is not new. The advantage of this trilateralism for South Africa is that, within the African context, this approach dilutes ingrained African sensitivities about South Africa's perceived hegemonic shadow over the SADC region and elsewhere on the continent. This sensitivity makes multilateralism a preferred mode of engagement with African institutional actors (AU, NEPAD, African Development Bank) and external donors alike. Moreover, trilateralism offers a pragmatic partnering framework for collaborating with traditional western as well as non-western donors.

On the other hand, with SADPA coming on stream, questions have been raised as to whether traditional donors will begin drawing back from their own donor commitments, as South Africa becomes a new assistance provider. These questions are accompanied by questions on how South Africa and donors – western and non-western alike – will collaborate within the framework of SADPA: channelling funding through it or coordinating with it in relations to given initiatives on the continent.

As underlined in a recent IGD workshop on SADPA, the trilateral approach is seen as the best way of moving beyond conventional 'aid' a la ODA by emphasising 'partnership'; traditional donor aid being seen as having become discredited. Hence, SADPA being characterized as a 'partnership' as opposed to an 'aid' agency. This emphasis reflects a major updated South African approach to developmental assistance in keeping with its anti-hegemonic proclivities.

In addition to trilateral cooperation, South Africa also prioritizes South-South cooperation. Established in 2004, the IBSA Development Fund brings together funding from India, Brazil and South Africa (the IBSA grouping) and stands as an important example of how emerging 'global South' donors can engage collaboratively in channelling aid to African and non-African developing countries alike. The fund's modest aid, each country supplies US$1 million per year, is administered by the UN Development Programme and has been expended in the very fragile cases of Haiti, the Palestinian Authority and, more recently, mobilised under South Africa's leadership to

aid South Sudan's post-conflict and post-independence referendum development. Failing, unstable or otherwise vulnerable states have been targeted in virtually all IBSA Development Fund disbursements. These are situations that remain to be more fully documented and evaluated in terms of lessons to be learned for development aid disbursement and management in general, addressing state-strengthening in particular.

More broadly, South Africa notes continued areas for improvement in the multilateral institutional response to security and development in countries affected by conflict and crisis. The current configuration of the Security Council, with South Africa, Brazil and India all holding non-permanent seats, presents an opportunity for further exploring these issues including strengthening the relationship between the Council and the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), a key recommendation of the 2010 review of the PBC of which South Africa acted as a co-facilitator. Moreover, from South Africa's vantage point, such a dialogue between the PBC and the Security Council could provide a very fitting bridge between its peace and security experience in conflict resolution, peacekeeping and post-conflict recovery and a more coherent international policy response to countries affected by conflict and crisis.

Conclusion: The Way Forward

As South African engagement in security and development in crisis- and conflict-affected states has grown, so too have the bureaucratic complexities of its assistance. SADPA's creation cannot be seen in isolation from other reconfiguations or fine-tunings of South Africa's foreign policy and international cooperation architecture. This includes the DIRCO foreign policy White Paper when it is finalised, likely by the end of 2011. As an over-arching policy document laying out South Africa's commitments, this much anticipated White Paper would have to factor in SADPA and its partnership orientation as a complement to achieving foreign – especially Africa – policy goals.

The fact that SADPA is in the beginning stages of becoming operationalized is accompanied by an ongoing

exploration of its identity and terms of reference. At the moment, there remain questions as to how it will relate to SADC and SADC's member states. For that matter, given debate over the future of the Southern African Customs Union (SACU), SADPA role may figure in this discourse as well.

In the process of sorting out these regional issues, further articulation of the 'mutual benefit' of international assistance should also be included as South Africa seeks to strengthen its international development partnerships. Finally, any efforts to strengthen the institutional basis for South African engagement, and to avoid a 'siloed' assistance strategy, will also require a shift in the centre of the country's policy apparatus: the Presidency.

But this, in turn, raises yet another very fundamental question: institutional autonomy and independence vis-à-vis DIRCO and the country's foreign policy goals. Will SADPA become essentially a foreign policy 'tool'? On this could rest its credibility as a developmental partner elsewhere in Africa.

Endnotes

[1]There are a number of sources recording or referencing what was known as the 'SADC troika' on Lesotho. For example, "The Organ on Politics, Defence and Security: The rise and fall of a security community model?" chapter 4 in *Prospects for a Security Community in Southern Africa:An analysis of regional security in the Southern African Development Community*," by Naison Ngoma, ISS, 2005. There is also The Electoral Institute of Southern Africa (EISA) report, *The EISA Election Observer Mission Report: Lesotho National Assembly Elections, 17 February 2007* (2008). Also: Review article by Errol Henderson in, *African Studies Quarterly*, vol. 11, 2&3, Spring 2010 on: *The challenge of Southern African Regional Security: A review of peace and security in Southern Africa*, by Ibbo Mandaza, SAPES, 1996. 183pp. Online Journal.

[2]*Joint Evaluation of the Role and Contribution of the United Nations System in the Republic of South Africa*. Pretoria, 2009. p 32. Chapter 4, 'Peace & Security.'

[3]N.C. Madlala-Routledge, "Developmental Peacekeeping: What are the advantages for Africa," African Defence Summit, July 13, 2004.

[4]Center on International Cooperation, *Annual Review of Global Peace Operations 2011*, Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2011.

[5]Ibid.

[6]UN Security Council Debate: http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2011/sc10172.doc.htm.

[7]Mark Malan, *Renaissance Peacekeeping: A South African response to the conflict in the DRC?* Pretoria, Institute for Security Studies, March 1999. Occasional Paper no. 37. 11 pp.

[8]Tim Murithi, " Practical Peace Making Wisdom from Africa: Reflections on Ubuntu," Journal of Pan-African Studies, vol 1, no. 4 June 2006, pp. 25-34.

[9]At a 'global village' level, Murithi, outlined four lessons that can guide peace-making: (i) the importance of public participation in a peace-making process, (ii) support for victims and perpetrators alike as they go through emotionally wrenching peace-making processes, (iii) acknowledgement of guilt and remorse accompanied by forgiveness in achieving reconciliation, and (iv) the importance of constantly re-emphasizing the essential unity and interdependence of humanity.

[10]DBSA. DBSA's Post-Conflict Development Strategy (PCDS). Research Unit, January 27, 2009. 20pp. Also see: http://www.cic.nyu.edu/peacebuilding/docs/burundi.sorenson.pdf.

[11]See for example, Theo Neethling's 2009 paper "South Africa's Evolving Role in Peacekeeping: National Interest and International Responsibilities" in the *Journal of Military and Strategic Studies*, vol. 6 no. 2, 2003, 21pp.

[12]Wolfe Braude, Pearl Thandrayan, Elizabeth Sidiropoulos. *Emerging Donors in International Development Assistance: The South Africa Case*. IDRC Partnership & Business Development Division, January 2008. P. 3. Summary of a research report prepared by the SA Institute of International Affairs. P. 3.

[13]Op.Cit., *Joint Evaluation of the Role and Contribution of the United Nations System in the Republic of South Africa*. Pretoria, 2009 p.32.

[14]Ibid., p. 33.

[15]See: *South Africa's Role in Conflict Resolution and Peacemaking in Africa: Conference proceedings*, ed. Roger Southall. Pretoria, HSRC Press, 2006. 280pp. Also: Dirk Kotze, "Mediation During the Transition in South Africa." Paper presented at the 2nd Pan-European Conference on International Relations, European Consortium on Political Research, 13-16 September 1995.

[16]Op. Cit., p. 33.

[17]Ibid., p. 33.

[18]University of Johannesburg-DBSA African integration seminar on "The Role of Development Finance Institutions in Africa in Post-Conflict Reconstruction", 16 March 2010. Indeed, other institutions like the DBSA, similarly had to be re-oriented from their old Bantustan terms of reference.

[19]Development Bank of Southern Africa & University of Johannesburg. *The Role of Development Finance Institutions in Post-Conflict Reconstruction:*

Report on proceedings of the African integration and regional cooperation Vision 2014 seminar series. P. 3.

[20]The ARF was legislated into being by the African Renaissance and International Cooperation Fund Act (Act No. 51 of 2000) which broke with the apartheid era development assistance approach which incorporated the homelands.

[21]Government of South Africa, Establishment of the African Renaissance and International Co-Operation Fund, http://www.dfa.gov.za/foreign/Multilateral/profiles/arfund.htm, accessed 30 June 2011.

[22]Op. Cit. Braude, Thandrayan, Sidiropoulos, p. 13.

[23]Ibid., p. 3.

[24]Ibid., p. 3.

[25]Ibid., p. 3.

[26]Ibid., p. 3.

[27]Ibid., pp. 3-4.

[28]Ibid Braude, Thandrayan, Sidiropoulos.

ASEAN's Engagement in Countries Affected by Conflict and Crisis

by Megan M. Gleason

Introduction

The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) is the primary economic and political multilateral institution in Southeast Asia, encompassing ten countries with a combined population of nearly 600 million. Established in 1967 by Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand, ASEAN subsequently expanded to include five additional members: Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar and Vietnam.[1] ASEAN's institutional approach, including towards countries in crisis, has generated much debate, and observers differ markedly in their assessment of the organization's significance. Its critics call it a slow moving 'talk shop' with little impact on regional conflicts and crises.[2] Its proponents on the other hand, point to the fact that it has presided over an unprecedented period of peace and stability in recent Southeast Asian history, a region previously characterized by frequent turmoil, despite the lack of a clear formal conflict resolution mandate.[3]

In 2008 member states ratified the ASEAN Charter, giving the organization a legal basis and reinforcing previous commitments to strengthen integration and move forward in the creation of the ASEAN Community. This community, to be developed by 2015, is comprised of three pillars – (i) a security community, (ii) an economic community, and (iii) a socio-cultural community. However, despite the intention to create a holistic ASEAN community, the organization remains primarily an economic institution. Cooperation in other areas, particularly on political and security issues has proven more difficult in a region noted for its social and political heterogeneity.[4] As ASEAN pushes forward on integration, these differences have clear policy implications and for engagement in crisis- and conflict-affected states.

For though recent history has been largely marked by stability, Southeast Asia still grapples with a number of present crises. Recent mass protests and a devastating cyclone in Myanmar; separatist violence in the southern provinces of Thailand coupled with a military coup and violence around elections; recently re-started peace negotiations around the stalled peace process in the Philippines; and now renewed overt violence between two ASEAN members – Cambodia and Thailand – over a territorial dispute. Thus, while Southeast Asia has been largely characterized by peace, significant political and security crises persist.

This paper presents an overview of ASEAN engagement in conflict- and crisis-affected states by first assessing normative aspects around this engagement before turning to an examination of three cases. Finally, this paper presents an overview of how ASEAN and regional powers China and India are cooperating on related issues.

Normative Conceptions for Engagement – The ASEAN Way

ASEAN activity is characterized by consensus-based decision making, informal interactions and the principles of sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-interference, often known as 'the ASEAN way.' The principle of non-interference has particularly been important for ASEAN and its members, especially those members wary of international interference in their affairs, and the organization has been criticized for an inability to act in a number of regional crises due to strict adherence to the principle of non-intervention.[5] However, ASEAN's Secretary-General argues that changes within ASEAN, particularly with respect to integration, mean that the principle of non-interference is losing its pre-eminence for the institution.[6] Instead of a supreme respect for sovereignty, he argues, increasing integration between ASEAN member states makes it increasingly difficult for states to argue that their internal affairs are solely their concern. However, sovereignty and non-interference are still embodied in even the most recent ASEAN agreements, including most importantly, the ASEAN Charter.

ASEAN's Charter demonstrates some of the tensions around increasing integration and the typical mode of

ASEAN engagement. The Charter, the result of intense negotiation among members, simultaneously gives deference to the traditional ASEAN values of non-interference, consensus decision-making and sovereignty, while also conferring a more expansive role in areas less familiar to the organization. The Charter stipulates that one of the purposes of ASEAN is: "To strengthen democracy, enhance good governance and the rule of law, and to promote and protect human rights and fundamental freedoms, with due regard to the rights and responsibilities of Member States of ASEAN."[7] The subsequent Political-Security Blueprint calls for increased conflict prevention and confidence building mechanisms as well as measures to improve ASEAN capacities in post-conflict peacebuilding and to respond to non-traditional threats to security. It also calls for a network of regional peacekeeping centers for joint planning and training as a step in developing an ASEAN mechanism for peace and stability.

The Charter gives a legal personality to ASEAN and ushered in a new 'rules-based' character for the organization.[8] However, it is not clear if all member states intend for it to be fully implemented, perhaps expecting the continuation of a practice of failing to follow through with commitments.[9] Shaun Narine argues that in practice these two sets of norms are in contradiction and that "The ASEAN Charter envisions an ASEAN that is more intrusive than most of its members will tolerate."[10] The result then may be that little progress is made on the less traditional elements included in the Charter, particularly in light of intra-regional divides.

These new efforts have displayed tensions among ASEAN member states, whose fault lines tend to divide the original members of ASEAN from the later entrants – Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar and Vietnam, the so-called CLMV states. These later entrants hold the principles of sovereignty and non-intervention more strictly, with less comfort for external influence and intervention.[11] At least part of this divide can be attributed to the diversity of member political systems. This wide range can make cooperation on political or normative issues more difficult than those that are strictly economic, explaining why the

organization has achieved more in terms of economic integration than on political or security. As Elsina Wainwright notes, "The political and security sphere is no doubt the most challenging for ASEAN, and its activities have been mainly confidence building, quiet discussion of disputes, and behind-the-scenes diplomacy."[12] This also provides some explanation for why many military and counterterrorism agreements are negotiated bilaterally rather than regionally through ASEAN,[13] as cooperation on these sensitive issues may be too difficult among such a politically diverse group.

Negotiations around the Charter highlighted these divisions and some provisions, particularly around member suspension, human rights and non-interference, were diluted in the final document based on concerns of member states, largely falling along the older member-newer member divide. Notably, while the Charter does provide for the creation of a human rights body, sanctioning powers and compliance monitoring, which were included in early drafts, were opposed by the CLMV states and dropped from the final text.[14] These negotiations brought division between the two groups to the surface: "…the Charter indicates a real and growing ideological divide within ASEAN. Democratic values have taken root in some ASEAN states and these countries do not wish to be alienated from the international democratic community. For the first time in ASEAN's history, the domestic nature of member states is beginning to matter."[15] Not all divisions fall along these lines however. A 2004 Indonesian proposal to develop a regional peacekeeping force for deployment in ethnic conflicts was met with disapproval by Singapore and the proposal was stalled.[16]

A key determinant for ASEAN action (or lack thereof) is its Secretary-General. In January 2008, Dr. Surin Pitsuwan, the former Finance Minister for Thailand, began his five-year term. In his former role as Thailand's Foreign Minister, Dr. Pitsuwan advocated for a more pro-active ASEAN and one that plays "…a constructive role in preventing or resolving domestic issues with regional implications."[17] In his current role, he also called for a strengthened ASEAN, bolstered by the ratification of the Charter, and played an instrumental role in ASEAN support to Myanmar in the wake of Cyclone

Nargis in 2008 (addressed more fully below). It should be underlined that however strongly the Secretary-General pushes for change, he faces significant limitations to his ability to implement them as this is a member states body, where consensus remains the key mode of decision making.

ASEAN Response to States Affected by Crisis and Conflict

While ASEAN has been criticized for its hesitation or outright failure to act in a number of regional crises affecting its members, ASEAN action in several notable cases has yielded important lessons for the institution and region. Among other activities, ASEAN provided support to the peace process in Cambodia from 1997-1999, provided a small peacekeeping contingent under an ASEAN command in 1999 to Timor-Leste and deployed military observers to Aceh during the 2005 reconciliation process.

Writing in the World Bank's 2011 World Development Report, the Secretary-General reflected on these activities and identified three key lessons for ASEAN engagement in crisis- and conflict-affected states. First, ASEAN institutions are capable of playing a central convening role when crises generate member sensitivities. Second, ASEAN has demonstrated an ability to blend its regional capacities and its political convening role with the technical skills of international partners to enhance the collective response to crises. Finally, the more ASEAN engages in these circumstances, the greater its capacity for response. The Secretary-General acknowledges the complexity of such efforts: "It has always been like putting pieces of a diplomatic jigsaw together, weaving tapestry of peace, improvising the best modality and pattern from the available and suitable materials at hand."[18]

Three particularly relevant current examples can serve to highlight how ASEAN engages with post-conflict and crisis-affected states: (i) ASEAN's relationship with Myanmar, (ii) the conflict between Thailand and Cambodia, and (iii) Timor-Leste's request for membership.

Myanmar

Often considered its most problematic member, Myanmar's ascension to ASEAN membership was seen as an important test of the organization and a potential threat to its credibility. The closed and authoritarian regime, a pariah state to many Western nations, has confronted the organization with internal challenges and international criticism since it joined in 1997.

Critics of ASEAN's approach towards Myanmar argue that its principles of sovereignty and non-interference protect the ruling junta, by conferring legitimacy and shielding it from international criticism. In fact, ASEAN's position towards Myanmar hasn't adhered strictly to the principle of non-interference; with members convinced that including Myanmar could help to promote political change within the regime through closer interaction and less direct pressures for reform.[19] ASEAN's policy of 'constructive engagement' was based on a particular understanding of how regime change occurs – through youth education and foreign investment – rather than mass popular movements.[20] Member states felt that by bringing Myanmar into the organization, they could promote reform within its regime whereas shunning it would further exacerbate the regime's distrust of outsiders and its authoritarian tendencies.

But after over ten years of membership, the political change that ASEAN members hoped to promote failed to materialize, testing the strength of the organization's cardinal principle of non-interference. This has presented member states with the challenge of how to respond to Myanmar's entrenching and authoritarian elite, including in the aftermath of the brutal response to the 2007 protests, without fully going against the principle of state sovereignty. Lee Jones argues "ASEAN's ruling classes have come to see in Burma's continued intransigence a threat to their developmentalist projects. Their political conservatism, however, has powerfully shaped and defined the limits of their policies." [21]

In response to the deterioration of the political situation and increasing international pressure, ASEAN and its

individual member states have raised public criticism of the ruling junta. The ASEAN Inter-Parliamentary Myanmar Caucus is a network of six parliamentary caucuses on Myanmar started in 2004-2005 in six ASEAN states whose objective is to promote democratic reform in Myanmar. The caucuses display varying degrees of power which can be attributed to the social and economic forces at play within each country,[22] however, the political space they are allowed demonstrates the willingness of ASEAN states to call for reform in Myanmar.

The decision on the 2006 chairmanship was also a key moment in ASEAN-Myanmar relations. While Myanmar was scheduled to take the chair, ASEAN members, reportedly pressured by the threat of a Western boycott of its meetings, managed to convince Myanmar to skip its turn to take the rotating chair.[23] Myanmar saved face by stating that it would forego the chairmanship to focus on internal matters related to reconciliation and democratization.[24] This was an important moment for the institution and has key implications for Myanmar's current campaign for the chairmanship, as addressed further below.

A subsequent statement by ASEAN ministers in 2007 criticized the severe military response to mass protesters and a 2009 statement by Thailand in its role as Chairman called for the release of Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, the opposition pro-democracy leader who has been subject to a series of house arrests under the junta. However, these public responses must also be balanced with internal negotiations in ASEAN, which continue to give deference to Myanmar. The negotiations around the Charter, particularly the dilutions on human rights, are largely seen as giving allowances to Myanmar. Concerned by the implications of these changes, Indonesia delayed ratification of the Charter based on these issues, but ultimately decided to ratify.[25]

The wake of the 2008 Cyclone Nargis in Myanmar, which devastated the Irrawaddy delta and killed an estimated 140,000 people, led to an unprecedented engagement for ASEAN in Myanmar. Largely due to the efforts of Secretary-General Surin Pitsuwan, ASEAN played a key

role as a trusted interlocutor between the government and international relief organizations.[26] Immediately after the cyclone the regime limited access of international aid workers to the delta region. After an emergency meeting of ASEAN Foreign Ministers and a statement calling for increased access, the Secretary-General was able to negotiate the deployment of desperately needed humanitarian relief. ASEAN's relationship with the government allowed it to play the role of non-political mediator between the government and the international community. As a member of the Tripartite Core Group, with the government and the United Nations, ASEAN played a key role in the Post-Nargis Joint Needs Assessment and the Nargis recovery plan. The Secretary-General subsequently stated that ASEAN had been "baptized" by Cyclone Nargis,[27] prompting renewed efforts to ensure the institution's relevance.

Questions around Myanmar's political progress and its standing in the organization surfaced again in 2011 when Myanmar announced that it intended to assume the chairmanship in 2014.[28] At its May 2011 high-level summit ASEAN heads considered the proposal but deferred the decision, likely until late 2011. The bid presents a challenge to ASEAN, who have welcomed the 2010 Myanmar elections as an important step in democratization,[29] but who also want to be assured that real progress is being made on reconciliation, the political process and on normalization of the situation within Myanmar, including the release of political prisoners. The Secretary-General argued that ASEAN leaders are looking to ensure that enough progress has been achieved since 2006, when Myanmar publicly stated that it was not able to take on the chairmanship position, and that there must be a level of confidence in Myanmar's ability to perform in this role.[30]

Thailand-Cambodia Conflict

When the conflict between Thailand and Cambodia, sparked over competing territorial claims to the 11th century Preah Vihear Temple, erupted into conflict in 2008, ASEAN took minimal action,[31] but the response to renewed violence this year has demonstrated a number of 'historic firsts' for ASEAN.[32] In particular the efforts of

the current chair, Indonesia, and the personal role of its President, Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono, have been important for increasing ASEAN's role in managing this conflict between two of its members. The Chair invited ASEAN Foreign Ministers to meet informally on the conflict in February, the first meeting of its kind, and was asked to participate in the February UN Security Council debate on the topic.[33] There is also agreement in principle for an Indonesian Observer Team of military observers to deploy to monitor the disputed border area. While the mandate of these observers is likely to be limited, experts note that the team represents an important advancement in ASEAN engagement in crises.[34] Though efforts to bring the two parties together during the May 2011 summit failed, this represented the first time that an ASEAN Chair has made a real effort to engage in preventive diplomacy.[35]

However, despite these important efforts, this conflict has also revealed the limits to ASEAN conflict resolution ca-pacities. The statement issued from the most recent sum-mit merely called for an amicable resolution 'in the spirit of ASEAN solidarity.' [36] More recently, following a decision by the International Court of Justice, Thailand has indicated that observers may not be necessary if the dispute can be resolved bilaterally. Without a tested formal conflict reso-lution mechanism, efforts to promote reconciliation de-pend on the extent of good offices provided by the Chair. Progress on resolving this conflict this year under Indone-sia's rotation is key as Cambodia is scheduled to take the chairmanship in 2012.

Timor-Leste

After long indicating its intention to join ASEAN, Timor-Leste submitted a formal bid for membership in 2011. Timor-Leste's short history since independence from the 24-year Indonesian occupation has been beset by repeated crises – including civil conflict, violence between the police and military, and assassination attempts on the lives of the President and Prime Minister – and the country has hosted multiple successive international peacekeeping operations. With an improved relationship with Indonesia and growing security and political stability, Timor-Leste accelerated its proposal to join ASEAN.

The relationship between ASEAN and Timor-Leste dates back to early, though limited, support from ASEAN member states in initial peacekeeping operations – INTERFET and UNTAET. As a reflection of its growing interest in joining the organization, in 2009 Timor-Leste established a National ASEAN Secretariat and placed a liaison officer in the ASEAN Secretariat in Jakarta. In 2011 Timor-Leste hosted a meeting of the ASEAN Regional Forum. All of these activities are intended to demonstrate Timor-Leste's interest in joining ASEAN and its capacity to act as a full member.

The membership request was considered at the May 2011 summit, where high-level leaders chose to defer the decision and tasked their Foreign Ministers to provide recommendations for a possible decision at the end of the year.[37]   The Charter stipulates that new members are admitted based on a consensus decision, which may present challenges for Timor-Leste's proposal. Indonesia strongly and publicly supports including Timor-Leste, but Singapore reportedly has expressed concerns regarding Timor-Leste's capacity to attend all the ASEAN meetings and the possibility that its membership will delay economic integration.[38] There is also some concern that Timor-Leste is still a fragile state, which hosts a UN peacekeeping operation (though this mission is scheduled to drawdown after elections in 2012) and ASEAN members will likely consider Timor-Leste's security and stability when weighing its candidacy. In addition, there is a question of whether ASEAN can take on another state in need, and how its membership would impact Foreign Direct Investment, aid and support to other ASEAN members such as Laos or Cambodia.[39] The question could also pivot on how Timor-Leste's entry would affect the balance of membership, with Timor-Leste seen as an outspoken advocate of democracy.

Regional Engagement – the ASEAN Regional Forum and Engagement with Emerging Powers

ASEAN's relationships with other actors in the region also have implications for its response to crisis-affected states, and ASEAN has been at the center of a number of larger regional groupings including the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF). The ARF, established in 1993, was designed to be the primary regional security institution in Southeast Asia, bringing together ASEAN states as well as regional and global powers – including China, India, Japan and the United States.[40]   The ARF seeks to (i) provide a forum for dialogue on regional political and security issues and (ii) conduct activities around confidence-building and preventive diplomacy in the region. Its goal of becoming the main security institution in the region however, has encountered similar issues to that of ASEAN itself, principally "the tendency for member states to work around contentious issues."[41]   However, a 2009 jointly led US-Philippines disaster relief exercise under the ARF marked the first operationalization of the grouping, demonstrating a collaborative effort to improve regional responses to disasters.[42]   The ARF also confronts a very different regional landscape than it did when first established, particularly in terms of the balance of regional power.

Geographically sandwiched between China and India, the impact and influence of these two growing powers is a significant consideration for Southeast Asian states. Redoubled efforts to strengthen economic and institutional integration through the ASEAN community can be at least partially attributed to a desire to preserve political and economic space in the face to two growing regional – and global – powers.[43]   As can its desire to bring in new members, particularly with respect to Myanmar, whose membership is partially the result of a desire on the part of ASEAN to counter the growing Chinese influence in the regime (though growing Chinese influence within Myanmar would suggest that this policy has not been entirely effective).[44]   However, ASEAN has also sought to engage these two powers, including on the issue of Myanmar as well as through its institutions.

India has been a full dialogue partner with ASEAN since 1995 and is a member of the East Asia Summit, a key regional forum for political and economic dialogue, as well as the ARF. In 2004 ASEAN member states and India signed the 2004 ASEAN-India Partnership for Peace, Progress and Shared Prosperity, which commits parties to a strengthened partnership stressing peaceful co-existence, enhanced development and cooperation on transnational threats including trafficking and terrorism. An ASEAN-India Eminent Persons Group has been tasked with assessing cooperation between India and ASEAN member states and identifying areas for redoubled efforts, with its report expected in October 2011.

China is also a full dialogue partner with ASEAN, since 1996.[45]   In addition, the ASEAN-China Summit covers a range of topics including the South China Sea, tensions around which have recently escalated. The Sea holds vast oil and gas deposits, and is subject to overlapping and competing territorial claims. The 2002 ASEAN-China Declaration on the Conduct of Parties in the South China Sea was designed to provide a process for peacefully resolving these competing claims, though China has become increasingly assertive. ASEAN is developing guidelines for how to implement this agreement, which are hoped to be completed by next year and will then allow for the agreement to be activated,[46] though the individual disputes will each need to be resolved bilaterally. The ASEAN-China Strategic Partnership for Peace and Prosperity also stresses the need for peaceful settlement of disputes related to the South China Sea, in addition to committing to increased dialogue and to "cooperate on major regional and international issues for the maintenance of regional peace and security, while maintaining the authority and central role of the UN." China is also a member of the ASEAN Plus Three dialogue group (with Japan and South Korea), which in 2000 developed the Chang Mai Initiative, an emergency funding mechanism for East Asian states in response to the Asian financial crisis. Recently, Secretary-General Pitsuwan called attention to the role of this mechanism, which includes a regional office on macro-economic management, in loosening the grip of non-interference and strengthening integration. He noted that debt, inflation and spending all become issues of interest in a joint mechanism like this, because 'your problem becomes my problem.'[47]

Engagement on Development and Security: New Actors, New Debates

The relationships that China and India have with Myanmar also interplay with the leverage and limits of ASEAN's engagement with the regime. China and India both play important roles as needed sources of foreign investment, particularly in light of sanctions by a number of Western nations. Both have made significant investments in energy and China is currently building an oil pipeline through Myanmar.[48] China is the regime's second-largest trading partner and India its fourth, and both nations have pursued stronger ties with Myanmar. China has also provided Myanmar with significant international political and diplomatic coverage, including vetoing (with Russia) a 2007 draft Security Council resolution criticizing the regime. In 2008, China made it clear in the Security Council that it would not support placing sanctions on the junta in response to the 2007 crackdown on protestors, arguing that they would not solve the issues. This view was also held by the two ASEAN members with non-permanent seats on the Council at the time – Vietnam and Indonesia.[49] ASEAN has also appealed to the leverage of China and India to promote reform in Myanmar. While ASEAN's acceptance of Myanmar as a member may have been predicated on concern for Chinese influence, the lack of political progress there in 2006 led then Secretary-General Ong Keng Yong to call for India and China to use their leverage to push for change in Myanmar,[50] though it is not clear that this plea resulted in action from either – particularly in light of China's strong international stance on the principle of non-interference.

Conclusion

Forty-four years since its founding, ASEAN's impact is still debated by scholars and observers. Its principles of non-interference, sovereignty, territorial integrity and consensus decision-making, the 'ASEAN way,' are criticized for a failure to achieve results in regional crises. Yet champions of the organization point to the relative stability and the virtuous circle of increasing integration and regional peace.

Secretary-General Surin Pitsuwan reflected in the 2011 World Development Report on the lessons that ASEAN has learned from these engagements – on ASEAN's

potential convening role, its ability to partner with other organizations and its growth in capacity. These lessons and experiences inform ASEAN's approach to crisis- and conflict-affected countries within its region. It's approach is also informed by the changing regional landscape and the rise of China and India, and ASEAN has made efforts to strengthen its relationship with both states through an ASEAN framework, developing partnerships and including these states in ASEAN-based regional groupings. Considerations both of its ability to negotiate with these two powers and its willingness and capacity to respond to regional crises and conflicts will weigh heavily in continued reflection on ASEAN's impact on regional instability and its engagement in crisis- and conflict-affected states.

Endnotes

[1]Brunei Darussalam joined in 1984; Vietnam joined in 1995; Laos and Myanmar joined in 1997 and Cambodia joined in 1999.

[2]Shaun Narine, ASEAN in the Twenty-First Century: A Skeptical Review, Cambridge Review of International Affairs, 22:3, 2009, pp 369 – 386.

[3]Kripa Sridharan, Regional Organizations and Conflict Management: Comparing ASEAN and SAARC, London School of Economics Crisis States Research Centre, Working Papers Series No. 2, Working Paper 33, March 2008.

[4]Elsina Wainwright, Conflict Prevention in Southeast Asia and the South Pacific, Center on International Cooperation, April 2010.

[5]Narine, supra note 2.

[6]Surin Pitsuwan, Remarks at the event "ASEAN Beyond 2015," at the Asia Society in New York, 18 May 2011.

[7]ASEAN, The ASEAN Charter, 2007, pg 3.

[8]Wainwright, supra note 4.

[9]At a May 2008 talk at the Council on Foreign Relations, Secretary-General Surin Pitsuwan noted that only 30 of 100 ASEAN agreements had been implemented.

[10]Narine, supra note 2.

[11]Sarinna Areethamsirikul, ASEAN as a 'Regional Community': Is it for Real under the ASEAN Charter?, Stanford Journal of East Asian Affairs, Winter 2008.

[12]Wainwright, supra note 4, page 17.

[13]Isabella Bennett and Julie Ginsberg, ASEAN: The Association of Southeast Asian Nations, Council on Foreign Relations, 1 November 2010.

[14]Ibid.

[15]Narine, supra note 2, p 376.

[16]Sridharan, supra note 3.

[17]Surin Pitsuwan as quoted in Lee Jones, ASEAN's Albatross: ASEAN's Burma Policy, from Constructive Engagement to Critical Disengagement, Asian Security, 4:3, 2008, pg 275.

[18]Surin Pitsuwan, ASEAN Experience in Crisis Prevention and Recovery, World Development Report 2011: Conflict, Security and Development, Overview, April 2011, pg 38.

[19]Jones, supra note 17.

[20]Ibid.

[21]Ibid.

[22]Lee Jones, Democratization and Foreign Policy in Southeast Asia: the Case of the ASEAN Inter-Parliamentary Myanmar Caucus, Cambridge Review of International Affairs, 22:3, 2009, pp 387 – 406.

[23]Chris Alden, 'A Pariah in our Midst': Regional Organisations and the Problematic of Western-Designated Pariah Regimes – the Cases of SADC/ Zimbabwe and ASEAN/Myanmar, London School of Economics, Crisis States Research Centre, Working Paper No. 73, May 2010 and Narayanan Gansan, Thai-Myanmar-ASEAN Relations: the Politics of Face and Grace, Asian Affairs, 2006.

[24]ASEAN, Statement by the ASEAN Foreign Ministers, Vientiane, 25 July 2005.

[25]Jones, supra note 22.

[26]Wainwright, supra note 4.

[27]Surin Pitsuwan, A Conversation with Surin Pitsuwan, Council on Foreign Relations, May 2008.

[28]It would do so by switching positions with Laos to move forward its turn from 2016 to 2014.

[29]ASEAN Secretariat, ASEAN Chair Issues Statement on Myanmar Elections, 11 November 2010.

[30]Pitsuwan, supra note 6.

[31]Wainwright, supra note 4.

[32]Pitsuwan, supra note 6.

[33]Ibid.

[34]Michael Vatikiotis, An ASEAN Success Story, Asia Security Initiative, March 2011.

[35]Jurgen Haacke as quoted in Trefor Moss, ASEAN: Losing Its Way?, The Diplomat, 22 May 2011.

[36]ASEAN, Chair's Statement of the 18th ASEAN Summit, Jakarta, 7 – 8 May 2011.

[37]ASEAN, Chair's Statement of the 18th ASEAN Summit, "ASEAN Community in a Global Community of Nations," Jakarta, 7-8 May 2011

[38]Desy Nurhayati and Abdul Khalik, Timor Leste Membership 'Unlikely in 2011,' The Jakarta Globe, 25 May 2011.

[39]Barry Wain, ASEAN Door Already Closed for Dili in 2010, Jakarta Globe, 5 May 2011.

[40]The full list of participants of the ARF is: Australia, Bangladesh, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Canada, China, Democratic Peoples' Republic of Korea, European Union, India, Indonesia, Japan, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, Mongolia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Timor-Leste, United States, and Vietnam.

[41]Fenna Egberink with Frans-Paul van der Putten, ASEAN, China's Rise and Geopolitical Stability in Asia, Cingendael, Paper No. 2, April 2011.

[42]Wainwright, supra note 4.

[43]Jones, supra note 17.

[44]Ibid. There has also been speculation of a similar motivation in granting Timor-Leste membership in recognition of the growing Chinese influence there.

[45]Narine, supra note 2.

[46]Pitsuwan, supra note 6.

[47]Pitsuwan, supra note 6.

[48]Michael Green and Derek Mitchell, Asia's Forgotten Crisis: A New Approach to Burma, Foreign Affairs, Volume 86, No 6, 2007.

[49]Security Council Report, Myanmar Update Report No. 2, 18 March 2008

[50]Jones, supra note 17.

OECD's Evolving Engagement on Development and Security

by Megan M. Gleason

Introduction

The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) is an international organization of states that seeks to "promote policies that will improve the economic and social well-being of people around the world."[1] It acts as forum for sharing policy experiences and good practices across a range of economic and development issues, particularly development cooperation through its Development Assistance Committee (DAC). The DAC brings together many of the world's largest bilateral donors to discuss development policy, identify best practices and lessons learned, and to improve the effectiveness of international assistance.[2] The DAC collects and synthesizes development data, provides analysis and guidance on good practice, and reviews member development policies and practices. Within the DAC, the International Network on Conflict and Fragility (INCAF) was created to improve international engagement and effectiveness in conflict-affected countries.

Crisis-affected and post-conflict states are a priority for OECD-DAC members. Nearly one-third of DAC's Official Development Assistance (ODA) was directed to these states in 2008, and the DAC, particularly through INCAF, has devoted considerable attention to issues around international engagement to crisis-affected and post-conflict states, including the development of guidance in areas related to international assistance in these environments. In addition, a number of DAC members have developed strategies and institutional arrangements for engaging in states affected by crisis. These states require a different approach to assistance than "normal" developing countries, the DAC argues, because they are characterized by a lack of either capacity or will to govern effectively. This understanding informs the OECD perspective on international assistance and has meaningful implications for its sense of how external actors should engage in these environments.

However, it is important to stress that the OECD is a grouping of states with varied perspectives on a number of aspects of engagement on development and security issues. There is also a considerable gap between policy and member state implementation, an issue explored in more detail below.

This paper provides an overview of OECD work around crisis-affected and post-conflict states beginning with its conceptual and normative basis and then moving to operational issues around multilateral cooperation, national ownership and leadership, and international aid and financing. It will then consider the OECD's cooperation with new actors both through facilitating South-South cooperation and engaging with emerging economies before considering some of the criticisms around the OECD and its engagement in fragile states.

Conflict, Fragility and Stability

OECD's work on conflict and crisis-affected states is guided by its understanding of peacebuilding, statebuilding, and the drivers of fragility and resilience. According to the OECD, statebuilding is "an endogenous process to enhance capacity, institutions and legitimacy of the state driven by state-society relations."[3] The process is shaped by history and is influenced by both internal and external pressures. Statebuilding is therefore seen as a deeply political process, which seeks to bolster the legitimacy and accountability of the state. Peacebuilding is closely related, but focused on reducing the risk of deterioration into conflict and supporting sustainable peace. The two processes are distinct but share the common goal of creating resilient, capable and legitimate states able to negotiate competing constituent demands on power and resources. Resilience speaks to the ability of a state to manage shocks and changes while preserving political stability and peace. Legitimacy provides the basis for rule by consent rather than force, and the OECD identifies four sources of state legitimacy: (i) process, (ii) performance, (iii) shared beliefs, and (iv) international sources.

Peacebuilding and statebuilding seek to address the causes of fragility to promote resilience and stability. According to

59

the OECD, a fragile state "has weak capacity to carry out basic functions of governing a population and its territory, and lacks the ability to develop mutually constructive and reinforcing relations with society. As a consequence, trust and mutual obligations between the state and its citizens have become weak."[4] A state's susceptibility to fragility is closely related to its historical experience, particularly in terms of the history of state formation, societal fractures, conflict, geography and legacies of institutions impacting governance and the state-society relationship. A fragile state exhibits conflicting claims on legitimacy and organization. In contrast, a resilient state has the capacity and legitimacy to govern, and demonstrates the ability to manage change and prevent the outbreak of violence through its political processes and the state-society relationship.

The OECD's 2011 Statebuilding Guidance identifies three elements of the state-society relationship: (i) the political settlement, (ii) the capability and responsiveness of the state, and (iii) social expectations and perceptions. The political settlement explains "how the balance of power between elite groups is settled through agreement around the rules of political engagement,"[5] and provides the channel for negotiating competing demands non-violently. Though the OECD acknowledges that this is an evolving concept, a key consideration for the political settlement is its degree of inclusiveness; while this compact is largely decided among elites, a settlement that fails to respond to the needs of wider society erodes state legitimacy.

The state's capability and responsiveness speaks to its ability and willingness to fulfill a number of key functions necessary for a resilient state, namely security and justice, revenue management, economic development, and service delivery. The functions are mutually reinforcing and related: "When one or more of the functions enter a cycle of deterioration, this is likely to have a negative impact on the other state functions and to contribute to fragility."[6]

Finally, a resilient state operates in line with prevailing social expectations and perceptions. While the guidance acknowledges that there is always a gap between normative expectations and what the state can realistically be expected to achieve and provide, it also calls attention to the expectations that often characterize fragile states: "the population typically either expects little from the state in terms of service provision (as a matter of capability), or sees the state as the source of repression or instability, or as the 'privatised' domain of elite groups."[7] Further, in crisis-affected or post-conflict states, expectations are often deeply divided, reflecting a lack of cohesion or widely varying experiences of state service and responsiveness.

External Assistance to Fragile States

These conceptions have important implications for the form and objective of international assistance to fragile states, and OECD member states have adapted their strategies and institutions to respond to the needs of fragile states. In Canada, the Stabilization and Reconstruction Task Force (START) was developed to improve Canada's crisis response with a role in developing Canadian policy to strengthen engagement in fragile states across crisis. Canada's International Development Agency (CIDA) also stresses the importance of engagement in fragile states: "CIDA's programming in these countries seeks to enhance long-term development by improving the effectiveness of public institutions and society, fostering stability and security, as well as supporting the delivery of key services."[8]

Sweden has recently increased its support to fragile states, with aid to conflict and post-conflict countries expected to increase to 25 percent in 2011, up from 15 percent in 2007, reflecting their growing priority for Sweden's assistance.[9] In its 2008 communication on global development, Sweden identified fragile and conflict-affected states as one of six global priority challenges, outlining three focus areas, namely security sector reform, women peace and security, and bridging conflict and long-term development. In 2010 Sweden unveiled *Peace and Security for Development,* a policy outlining Sweden's engagement on security and development issues, stressing the importance of peacebuilding and statebuilding and underscoring the

unique challenges faced in countries affected by conflict. The OECD also provides guidance on the implications for international assistance to fragile states. Most importantly, they require that donors acknowledge the intrinsically endogenous nature of statebuilding and accept that their impact is necessarily limited. International actors should assess how they can positively contribute to statebuilding as well as the limits of their assistance. In developing country programs, donors are advised to (i) adapt assistance to fragile environments, (ii) agree on critical statebuilding priorities, and (iii) design assistance to support the state-society relationship. In doing so, these efforts should be guided by in-depth political and contextual analysis to ensure that assistance responds to the weaknesses driving state fragility. The OECD's guidance also identifies three entry-points for supporting the state-society relationship: (i) identify the causes of fragility as well as potential drivers of peace including conflict management mechanisms, (ii) identify opportunities to support inclusive political settlements, and (iii) support the key state functions for statebuilding.

International actors are encouraged to acknowledge that an idealized end state is a distant reality in many fragile environments. Instead, actors should adopt a long-term perspective and look for movement along the fragility-resilience scale. As the OECD's 2007 Fragile States Principles notes, "The long-term vision for international engagement in fragile states is to help national reformers to build effective, legitimate, and resilient state institutions, capable of engaging productively with their people to promote sustained development."[10]

Cooperation with Other Actors in Fragile States

While the OECD-DAC is a grouping of individual states and does not itself have an active programming role, its members assign high priority to both bilateral and multilateral engagement in fragile states, with approximately one-third of DAC member ODA channeled through multilateral institutions.[11] Most DAC members align their multilateral engagement to their bilateral strategies, though some do use multilateral fora to engage

in areas outside of their bilateral areas of support.[12] The DAC also engages in a process of peer review to assess member aid policies and provide recommendations for strengthening development assistance.

DAC members still face a number of internal coherence issues, limiting the impact of their engagement. Because engagement in fragile states spans across a number of government ministries, several OECD actors have developed "*whole of government*" *approaches* to ensure policy coherence in fragile environments across the political, security, development and humanitarian spheres. For instance Canada's 2005 International Policy Statement introduced a whole-of-government approach to unite diplomacy, defense, and development and START was designed to enhance Canadian engagement in crises, to bring together areas of stabilization expertise and to improve operational and programming effectiveness. CIDA has also developed an internal guide for assistance in fragile states.

These and similar efforts in other DAC member states are designed to improve bilateral engagement in fragile states as well as strengthen partnerships with multilateral organizations, which provide a number of advantages for international engagement in fragile states. Multilateral institutions are able to bring to bear significant resources towards a particular objective and can improve coherence and ensure a coordinated and effective response in fragile states. *Pooling resources* also allows for actors to share the risks of engagement in fragile states, including through Multi-Donor Trust Funds (see Financing section below for further information). However, the OECD acknowledges that multilateral engagement engenders risks for national and international actors and for the effectiveness of aid. For donors, channeling resources through multilateral institutions requires ceding control, it dilutes branding, and can generate concerns about value for money (seen most recently in the UK's multilateral aid review). In addition, donors question the efficacy of some multilateral institutions, with DAC donors calling for improved effectiveness.[13] The risks of fragmented aid and approaches extend beyond reduced value or coherence and can cause unintentional harm in fragile environments. Where aid instruments distort the political settlement or

bypass the relationship between the state and society, they can undermine statebuilding efforts in fragile states. To respond to these challenges and to improve development outcomes, the OECD has been at the forefront of the *global aid effectiveness agenda*. The Working Party on Aid Effectiveness, hosted by the OECD, brings together donors and developing countries to improve the impact of aid in reducing poverty and promoting development. Its 2005 high-level meeting endorsed the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, which articulated five principles for improving aid in developing countries: ownership, alignment, harmonization, results, mutual accountability. The 2008 high-level meeting endorsed the Accra Agenda for Action, which agreed on priorities and reforms to improve international aid and engagement by increasing national ownership, including through increased use of country systems; building stronger and more inclusive partnerships; and through improved delivery and monitoring of results.

To complement these aid efforts, in 2007 the OECD adopted the Principles for Good International Engagement in Fragile States and Situations, also known as the Fragile States Principles. These ten principles were designed to promote stronger and more effective working relationships between national and international actors in fragile states and are intended to guide a holistic approach across humanitarian, security and development spheres. INCAF monitors the implementation of the Fragile States Principles, as well as the Paris Declaration, to analyze how well international actors are standing by their commitments.

In addition to pushing forward the aid effectiveness agenda, the OECD also hosts the Secretariat for the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding, which grew out of the Accra Agenda for Action as a platform for discussion between donors and fragile states on peacebuilding and statebuilding objectives and assistance. The Dialogue was launched in 2008 and held its first meeting in Dili, Timor-Leste in 2010, where members articulated a set of peacebuilding and statebuilding goals, and identified challenges to their achievement.[14] INCAF members participate in the Dialogue.

Ownership and Leadership

National ownership, and where possible leadership, is central to OECD understanding and approach in fragile states, evidenced by its inclusion as a key principle in the Paris Declaration. To support ownership, the OECD recommends *aligning international assistance with nationally identified strategies*. This alignment is viewed expansively and predicated on the political will to promote development. The Fragile States Principles acknowledge that this can be challenging in weak or fragile states, borne out by the experience of Sweden. SIDA's Action Plan on Aid Effectiveness calls for increasing the proportion of aid aligned with national priorities, as the preferred choice for development cooperation;[15] however, an evaluation by the Swedish Agency for Development Evaluation found that this alignment was more difficult in conflict-affected and fragile states. Low national capacity limited the scope for alignment, though in some cases Sweden's lack of alignment was deliberate and in response to the contrasting political agendas of these states.[16]

The Fragile States Principles advise that where alignment is not possible due to concerns related to governance or renewed conflict, "international actors should consult with a range of national stakeholders in the partner country, and seek opportunities for partial alignment at the sectoral or regional level."[17] The concept of ownership however, can create tensions when set against international norms, particularly with respect to issues related to human rights and governance. The OECD urges international actors to approach these tensions more honestly and to ensure that they are understood when approaching engagement in fragile states.[18]

According to the OECD, one key method to promote national ownership and leadership of transition assistance is through *capacity-building support to the core state functions* identified above, including domestic revenue management, service delivery and economic development. The state's ability to raise taxes to provide key services in support of development is key for state functioning as well as to strengthen the state-society relationship. It also enables the state to take a stronger

role in leading in its recovery. International Financial Institutions and bilateral donors have provided important support on tax reform and building taxation capacities in fragile states.[19] In addition, in 2010 the OECD Informal Task Force on Tax and Development was established to bring together OECD and non-OECD states, including emerging powers and post-conflict states. Its first meeting in 2010 was co-chaired by South Africa and the Netherlands. The OECD has also engaged in resource mobilization through its GOVNET to provide guidance on issues around taxation.

Donors can also support leadership by *providing budget support*, utilizing the recipient government's financial management systems, and thus supporting national ownership and the development of these key capacities. However, budget support can pose significant financial and reputational risk for donors, and this mode of support may not always be appropriate in fragile environments, particularly when there are governance or corruption concerns.[20] In these cases the OECD notes the possibility of phasing from off-budget to budget support with concurrent support to capacity development and partnership building with the government. Further considerations around aid financing are explored in the section below.

Project Implementation Units (PIUs) create similar tensions for OECD donors. Their use is seen as necessary for delivering assistance, particularly in the immediate post-conflict period. However, the parallel structures they create bypass opportunities for strengthening state capacities, reduce national ownership and undercut the state-society relationship.[21] While OECD donors pledged in the Paris Declaration to reduce the use of PIUs, they remain in use as a tool for donors in fragile states, and in the Democratic Republic of Congo, their use has increased four-fold since 2006.[22] The continued use of PIUs demonstrates the challenge of managing these tradeoffs in fragile states.

Financing

Aid delivery channels have important implications for international engagement in fragile states. As the OECD notes, "Financing is about much more than the flow of resources: it affects behaviour, aid architecture, the power and influence of different groups, priorities and capacity development."[23] Recognizing the important role of aid financing in transition environments, the OECD has conducted analysis on transition finance, with guidance forthcoming. DAC members have also developed *specific funding instruments for countries emerging from conflict and crisis*.

While a number of recent financing innovations have improved access to and effectiveness of transition financing, significant challenges remain, hampering international efforts to support resilience in fragile states. There is a general recognition that standard aid instruments are too inflexible and cumbersome, particularly in the rapidly changing environments that typify transition contexts. The OECD argues that these instruments continue to reflect a *separation in the aid architecture* between humanitarian, security, development and defense – a separation that does not reflect reality in fragile states and creates hurdles for funding during a critical period for fragile states.[24] In addition, often *aid allocation decisions are determined by ODA eligibility*, without recognizing the role of non-ODA funding in transition environments. In contrast, the Netherlands Stability Fund includes both ODA and non-ODA funding, allowing funding decisions to be based on merit rather than on ODA eligibility.[25]

Financing tools also need to better reflect national ownership. "The current aid architecture does not promote effective and co-ordinated engagement with difficult government partnerships during the transition period, which increases the risks of funding being used as a political tool rather than as a response to needs."[26] This also reflects the need for a stocktaking on risk tolerance. The OECD argues that while fragile states present significant risks for donor engagement, they also present even higher possible rewards. The OECD acknowledges that donors are facing increased pressure to demonstrate results, but argues that

they should *accept a higher risk tolerance* and promote risk-taking in aid agencies, including through reviewing the incentive structures facing aid agency staff.[27]

The OECD points to the potential of Multi-Donor Trust funds (MDTFs) and other financial tools to share risk and improve aid impact. MDTFs can collectively share risk and reduce transaction costs. However, these funds are still hampered by a number of issues including delays in making funds operational, balancing delivery speed with capacity building and avoiding overlapping mechanisms.[28] In addition, bilateral donors continue to earmark funding, reducing fund discretion and flexibility. Four international peace and stabilization funds have been created, which have may be able to increase flexible access to funds.[29] However, their mandates overlap somewhat, presenting possible challenges in terms of coordination and division of labor.

In 2010, the OECD put forth a series of priority recommendations to improve transition financing:[30]

1. Adopt a long-term, non-linear approach to transition.
2. Clarify responsibility, encourage cross-sector co-operation and risk taking.
3. Improve the measurement of transition financing.
4. Identify realistic priorities.
5. Build better links between financing instruments and national ownership.
6. Improve the operation of pooled funding.

These recommendations seek to address the critical issues of aid financing during transitions from conflict, ensuring that funding is predictable, rapid, coherent and supports national ownership.

New Partnerships: South-South Cooperation and Partnering with Emerging Powers

The OECD engages in a number of activities designed to enhance South-South cooperation and its own engagement with emerging powers. Three that are particularly relevant here are the Task Team on South-South Cooperation, the China-DAC Study Group, and the policy of Enhanced Engagement.

The Task Team on South-South Cooperation was launched in September 2009 as a mechanism for "mapping, documenting, analyzing and discussing evidence on the synergies between the principles of aid effectiveness and the practice of South-South Cooperation." The group is hosted by the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness but is a southern-led initiative to drive learning and discussion on South-South cooperation, with a particular focus on middle-income countries. The Task Team brings together partner countries, donors, civil society, and regional and multilateral organizations.

Formed in 2009, the China-DAC Study Group is a partnership between the International Poverty Reduction Centre in China and the OECD-DAC, which "aims to facilitate the sharing of experiences and promote learning on growth and poverty reduction."[31] The Group's work focuses on two themes: (i) China's economic growth and poverty reduction and the relevance of this experience for developing countries, especially in Africa, and (ii) China's cooperation with African countries.[32] The Concept Paper for the Group notes that "the Study Group aims to help improve the impact and effectiveness of aid and, through improved mutual understanding, provide a favourable basis for possible future trilateral activities among China, the international development community and other developing countries to promote growth and reduce poverty."[33] While the Group does not specifically address fragile states, its discussions have included issues pertinent to these environments including governance, transparency, state capture, and state breakdown.

In 2007, the OECD adopted a policy of enhanced engagement with five emerging economies: Brazil, China, India, Indonesia and South Africa. This policy seeks to increase interactions between OECD and these emerging powers by allowing these states increased participation in OECD's work, including through OECD committees, economic surveys, OECD statistical reporting and policy-specific peer review. To further this integration, the OECD released guidelines for its committees on 'deepening' enhanced engagement in 2010, advising committees to review their strategies to ensure a holistic approach to enhanced engagement. Emerging economies have become members and observers in a number of OECD bodies; however, the impact of this policy is not clear with respect to development cooperation and engagement in fragile states. Within the DAC, Indonesia and South Africa participate as observers of the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness, but this is the extent of enhanced engagement states participation in DAC bodies.[34]

Criticism

While the OECD has made important contributions to aid effectiveness and engagement in fragile states, its detractors call attention to its narrow membership – largely rich, industrialized Western nations – and question its future relevance in the face of shifting global dynamics and the rise of emerging economies. Policy dialogue on engagement in fragile states that fails to take into account the growing role of non-traditional or new actors runs the risk of narrow discussions that do not reflect current complex realities of international assistance in fragile states. They also run the risk that emerging donors will forge their own path rather than seek accommodation within existing modes of donor assistance and engagement in fragile states. Critics also call attention to the sometimes strained relationship between DAC and emerging donors, with the potential to undercut the good efforts outlined above.

There are also concerns related to how closely individual DAC members adhere to OECD guidance, with continued earmarking of aid and use of PIUs, limiting ownership of recovery efforts, and continued focus on upward accountability mechanisms to donors rather than mutual

accountability as envisioned in the Paris Declaration. The 2010 monitoring report for the Fragile States Principles finds good examples of progress, but also areas where donors have lagged including in relation to how the presence of international donors impacts capacity and government legitimacy. The report finds, "There is little evidence that international actors have attempted to assess these risks in a systematic way." [35]

The DAC's recent work promoting the importance of the political settlement and engaging politically also raises concerns about the implications for state sovereignty, including in terms of engaging both formal and informal powers in fragile states. While DAC donors have acknowledged the centrality of the political settlement, many are still grappling with operationalizing this perspective. It is unclear whether traditional donor mechanisms can align to support such nuanced political processes or whether they are best placed to provide this type of support, as compared to regional organizations that may possess a greater degree of legitimacy.[36]

Conclusion

While at an institutional level, the OECD does not have an active programming role in fragile states, it has acted as a leader in terms of policy guidance and the collection of good practices for international engagement. The OECD stresses the importance of the political settlement as the heart of stabilization in fragile states, emphasizing that donors have a limited role in an endogenous political process. However, fragile state engagement remains a high priority for OECD-DAC member states, several of which have developed new strategies and institutional arrangements to strengthen their bilateral and multilateral engagement in these environments.

The DAC provides key considerations for strengthening assistance for more effective and sustainable outcomes, including through guidance on national ownership and financing. Its recent efforts to engage with new actors reflect an appreciation of the growing role of emerging actors and the importance of facilitating south-south learning and cooperation. However, critics point to the

group's restricted membership and question the extent of member adherence to OECD guidance and their ability to implement the political settlement perspective they promote. While there are still considerable hurdles to providing effective and coherent assistance, including to implementing DAC guidance, the OECD and its members have made important efforts to strengthen engagement and support to crisis and conflict-affected states.

Endnotes

[1]OECD, About the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, http://www.oecd.org/pages/0,3417, en_36734052_36734103_1_1_1_1_1,00.html, accessed 3 May 2011.

[2] The members of the OECD-DAC are Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Korea, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, United States, and the European Union. The World Bank, International Monetary Fund and the United Nations Development Program participate as observers.

[3]OECD Statebuilding in Situations of Fragility: Initial Findings, 2008, pg 1.

[4]OECD, Supporting Statebuilding in Situations of Conflict and Fragility: Policy Guidance, DAC Guidelines and Reference Series, 2011, pg 21.

[5]Ibid., pg 31.

[6]Ibid., pg 24.

[7]Ibid., pg 35

[8]Canadian International Development Agency, Report on Plans and Priorities 2010-2011, Section 2.1.

[9]OECD, Sweden Peer Review, Development Assistance Committee, 2009.

[10]OECD, Principles for Good International Engagement in Fragile States and Situations, 2007.

[11]OECD, Managing Aid: Practices of DAC Member Countries, 2009.

[12]Ibid.

[13]OECD, supra note 12.

[14]International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding, Dili Declaration: A New Vision for Peacebuilding and Statebuilding, April 2010.

[15]SIDA, Action Plan on Aid Effectiveness 2009 – 2011, 2009.

[16]Swedish Agency for Development Evaluation, Evaluation of Sweden's Implementation of the Paris Declaration, 2010.

[17]OECD, supra note 11.

[18]OECD, supra note 4.

[19]OECD, Do No Harm: International Support for Statebuilding, 2010, pg 19.

[20]OECD, supra note 14.

[21]OECD, supra note 4, pg 85.

[22]OECD, supra note 21.

[23]OECD, supra note 14, pg 15.

[24]Ibid.

[25]OECD, supra note 14, pg 52.

[26]OECD, supra note 14, pg 18-19.

[27]OECD, Aid Risks in Fragile and Transitional Contexts: Improving Donor Behavior, April 2011.

[28]OECD, supra note 14.

[29]OECD, supra note 14. The four funds are the UN's Peacebuilding Fund, the World Bank's Peace and Stability Fund, the EC's Stability Instrument and UNDP-BCPR's Thematic Trust Fund.

[30]OECD, Transition Financing: Building a Better Response, booklet, 2010, http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/50/21/46338900.pdf, accessed 3 May 2011.

[31]OECD, The China-DAC Study Group, http://www.oecd.org/document/63/0,3746,en_2649_34621_44173540_1_1_1_1,00.html, accessed 3 May 2011.

[32]Since its inception, the group has held four events, one in each of its three focus areas – (1) agriculture, food security and rural development, (2) infrastructure, and (3) the enabling environment for enterprise development – as well as an initial event on development partnerships.

[33]OECD and the International Poverty Reduction Center in China, The China-DAC Study Group: Concept Paper, June 2009, pg 1.

[34]OECD, On-line Guide to OECD Intergovernmental Activity, http://webnet.oecd.org/oecdgroups/, accessed 3 May 2011.

[35]OECD, Monitoring the Principles for Good International Engagement in Fragile States and Situations, Fragile States Principles Monitoring Survey: Global Report, 2010.

[36]See also, Center on International Cooperation, Recent Evolution in Statebuilding: From Supporting Capacity-Building to Political Processes in Statebuilding in Situations of Fragility and Conflict, USAID, February 2011.

Related Publications from the
Center on International Cooperation

Annual Review of Global Peace Operations 2011

Power and Responsibility: Building International Order in an Era of Transnational threats
Bruce Jones, Carlos Pascual and Stephen John Stedman

A Plan for Action: A New Era of International Cooperation for a Changed World 2009, 2010 and Beyond
Managing Global Insecurity (MGI)

Is a Regional Pact to Stabilize Afghanistan Possible?
Tom Gregg
July 2010

Globalization and Scarcity: Multilateralism for a World with Limits
Alex Evans
November 2010

The Paradox of Proximity: India's Approach to Fragility in the Neighbourhood
Nitin Pai
April 2011

The G8 and the Threat of Bloc Politics in the International System
 Bruce Jones, Richard Gowan and Emily O'Brien
May 2011

Making Rio 2010 work: Setting the Stage for Global Economic, Social and Ecological Renewal
Alex Evans and David Steven
June 2011

CENTER ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION