

UN SYSTEM TASK TEAM ON THE **POST-2015** UN DEVELOPMENT AGENDA



Peace and security

Thematic Think Piece

PBSO

The views expressed in this paper are those of the signing agencies and do not necessarily reflect the views of the United Nations.

May 2012



Following on the outcome of the 2010 High-level Plenary Meeting of the General Assembly on the Millennium Development Goals, the United Nations Secretary-General established the UN System Task Team in September 2011 to support UN system-wide preparations for the post-2015 UN development agenda, in consultation with all stakeholders. The Task Team is led by the Department of Economic and Social Affairs and the United Nations Development Programme and brings together senior experts from over 50 UN entities and international organizations to provide system-wide support to the post-2015 consultation process, including analytical input, expertise and outreach.

Peace and security

1. Introduction

The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) have transformed development cooperation over the last 10 years or so. They have become universally accepted goals that have framed or influenced the policies, programmes, projects or activities of governments, international organizations, civil society and the private sector. Yet, a number of weaknesses have emerged in recent years. One of them is the absence of goals related to peace, security, human rights and justice. The discussions on the post-2015 framework create an opportunity to include them.

Key messages

- Violence and fragility have become the largest obstacle to the MDGs
- The narrow approach of MDGs is problematic given the broadening of the concept of development that has occurred
- The narrow focus also ignores the interrelations among aspects such as security, justice and development
- The post-2015 agenda needs to take a comprehensive approach, guided by the Millennium Declaration, which included fundamental values (such as the freedom from fear of violence, oppression or injustice and equality) and goals on peace, security and disarmament; development and poverty eradication; human rights, democracy and good governance; and protecting the vulnerable
- The post-2015 framework should include separate goals related to peace and security and a clear, concise and measurable target on violence, which can be measured through indicators on battle-related deaths and intentional homicide

2. Violent conflict and development

Changing nature of violent conflicts

The nature of violent conflicts has changed dramatically in recent decades. The predominant form of violent conflict has evolved from national armies fighting each other

(inter-state wars); to armies fighting for independence, separation or political control (intra-state or civil wars); to various forms of violence, involving non-state actors such as rebels, gangs and organized crime. Unlike the Cold War current forms of violence often have no clear military, political or ideological objective.¹

These kinds of conflicts are not easily addressed with traditional instruments, such as diplomacy or military means. The drivers of violence often include a wide range of factors, including political, economic, social and environmental issues. They can include socio-economic inequalities, injustice, joblessness, natural resources management, human rights abuse, political exclusion and corruption. In many cases, it is difficult to define clear causes and the roles of different factors are interrelated and might morph into each other and change over time.

The multidimensionality of the drivers of the conflicts, also implies that addressing them requires a multidimensional approach that spans the development, political, security and justice areas. The different dimensions are interdependent. You cannot solve one without solving the other. Or in the words of the World Bank's World Development Report on Conflict, Security, and Development: "military-only, justice-only or development-only solutions will falter".²

Violent conflicts have large and long-term consequences for development

Violent conflict has become the largest obstacle to the MDGs. The consequences of violence on development are significant and long-term. Violent conflict causes death, disease and displacement, destroys physical and social capital, damages the environment, decreases school attendance and discourages investment.³ The effects are both immediate and long-term. A country that experienced major violence during the period 1981-2005 had a poverty rate on average 21 percentage points higher than a country without violence.⁴ Children in Burundi and Zimbabwe who experienced violent conflicts were significantly

1 William Reno (2011), *Warfare in Independent Africa*, Cambridge University Press

2 World Bank, *World Development Report 2011: Conflict, Security, and Development* (Washington D.C., 2011)

3 Paul Collier, V.L. Elliot, Håvard Hegre, Anke Hoeffler, Nicholas Sambanis and Marta Reynal-Querol (2003), *Breaking the Conflict Trap: Civil War and Development Policy*, Oxford University Press

4 World Bank, *World Development Report 2011: Conflict, Security, and Development* (Washington D.C., 2011)

shorter (stunted) than others, affecting their health, education and productivity throughout their lives.⁵

The gap in MDG performance between conflict-affected countries and other developing countries is large and increasing. No low-income fragile or conflict-affected country has achieved a single MDG. Fragile and conflict-affected states account for 47 per cent of the world population, but for more than 60 per cent of the caseload. For example, 60 per cent of the undernourished, 61 per cent of impoverished, 77 per cent of children not in primary school and 65 per cent of people without access to safe water live and 70 per cent of infant deaths occur in fragile or conflict-affected countries.⁶ Violence and fragility are not an isolated or small issue: 1.5 billion people live in countries affected by fragility, conflict or violence. 526,000 are killed each year by lethal violence. About 58 countries have a homicide rate higher than 10 per 100,000 people, with 14 countries exceeding 30 per 100,000 people. Many of them are in Latin America, but the list also includes the Democratic Republic of Congo, South Africa and Sri Lanka.⁷

Many conflict-affected countries seem to be stuck in a conflict trap of repeated cycles of violence. Countries that experienced violent conflict in the past have a high chance of experiencing a recurrence. About 40 per cent of countries coming out of violence relapse within 10 years and 90 per cent of countries that had civil wars in the 21st century had civil wars in the previous 30 years.⁸ Peacebuilding is about reducing the risk of relapsing violence. Countries need to reduce this risk, by addressing the root causes of violence and building resilient institutions and peaceful societies. A broad approach to development will also contribute to peacebuilding. A focus on, inter alia, justice, human rights, horizontal inequalities, jobs and inclusive politics will reduce the risk of violence.

5 Christopher Blattman and Edward Miguel (2010), "Civil War", *Journal of Economic Literature* 48(1), pp. 3–57; and Harold Alderman, John Hoddinott and Bill Kinsey, "Long term consequences of early childhood malnutrition", *Oxford Economic Papers*, 58, 2006, pp. 450–474

6 World Bank, *World Development Report 2011: Conflict, Security, and Development* (Washington D.C., 2011). See also Geneva Declaration (2011), *Global Burden of Armed Violence*, Cambridge University Press

7 Geneva Declaration, *Global Burden of Armed Violence*, Cambridge University Press, 2011

8 Paul Collier, *Wars, guns and votes*, Harper Collins, 2009; and World Bank, *World Development Report 2011: Conflict, Security, and Development* (Washington D.C., 2011)

On the other hand, sustained peace can bring rapid gains. Ethiopia more than quadrupled access to improved water after the war ended and Mozambique more than tripled its primary completion rate in just eight years. Primary education enrolment increased in Rwanda from 75 per cent in 2001 to 96 per cent in 2008 and under-5 mortality dropped from 206 in 1993 to 91 in 2010.

In sum, fostering development in conflict-affected states has become the development challenge of the 21st century.

3. A broad approach to development

The trend towards multidimensional violence has coincided with a broadening of the concept of development. The current set of MDGs is limited because it takes too narrow a view on development and ignores the interrelations among various aspects of development. The concept of development has been broadened over time, from a narrow focus on economic growth in the 1950s to an emphasis on basic needs in the 1970s to a broad view in the 1990s that emphasizes human development, human security and, more recently, freedom. This broadening has been partly based on the work by Amartya Sen, as reflected in the capabilities approach to development and his book, *Development as Freedom*.⁹

The widened concept of development or well-being is as much valid in poor as in rich countries. While Sen's work might have focused first on developing countries, the President of France created a commission on the measurement of well-being, knowing that "what we measure shapes what we collectively strive to pursue".¹⁰ The Stiglitz-Sen-Fitoussi Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress advocated for a broad concept of well-being, which includes political voice, governance (e.g. functioning democracy, free media, rule of law) and personal insecurity.

⁹ Amartya Sen (1987), *The Standard of Living*, Oxford University Press; and Amartya Sen (1999), *Development as Freedom*, Oxford University Press

¹⁰ Joseph E. Stiglitz, Amartya Sen and Jean-Paul Fitoussi (2010), *Report by the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress* (www.stiglitz-sen-fitoussi.fr)

The human security concept also takes a broad view on development. The Commission on Human Security, co-chaired by Sadako Ogata and Amartya Sen, defined human security as the protection to the vital core of all human lives in ways that enhance human freedoms and human fulfilment. Human security means the freedoms from want and fear, bringing together development, human rights and security in one concept.¹¹

These are not just theoretical issues. They reflect concerns of people all over the world. The Arab Spring illustrates the need to broaden our concepts. Many countries in North Africa, for example, were making rapid progress towards the MDGs, but were lagging on political voice and suffering from inequalities and a lack of various rights and fundamental freedoms, including on assembly and expression.¹²

Development, human rights and peace and security are indivisible and interrelated. Each cannot be achieved without achieving the other. They should be viewed as interrelated dimensions of one goal whether called development, well-being or human security. They are interrelated conceptually as well as at the national level and the global level. Any deficit in one dimension, will have an impact on the other. Any deficit in one country, will also have an impact in other countries, whether this is through economic and financial linkages, migration, pollution, communicable diseases, climate change, terrorism, piracy, organized crime, narcotics, human trafficking or the arms trade. Progressive globalization keeps increasing the likelihood of these cross-border spillovers.

One important aspect of the interrelation between development and peace and security is through the capacity and legitimacy of the state. A key feature of the social contract between the state and its citizens is that citizens pay taxes to get public services in return, which include social services and security. Violence often undermines or breaks that contract. After the end of a violent conflict, the provision of social services by the state could play an important role in rebuilding the trust and legitimacy of the government and reinforcing a

¹¹ Commission on Human Security, *Human Security Now* (New York, 2003)

¹² See, for example, the statement by Ms. Navanethem Pillay, United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on “The Tunis Imperative: Human Rights in Development Cooperation in the Wake of the Arab Spring” at the United Nations Chief Executives Board on 28 October 2011

commitment to a peace process, in particular if unequal access to these social services was a driving force of the violent conflict in the first place. This aspect is often underemphasized.

4. A new framework for the post-2015 development agenda

The post-2015 agenda needs to take a comprehensive approach, guided by the Millennium Declaration¹³, which included a wide-ranging set of elements. It adopted fundamental values, such as the freedom from fear of violence, oppression or injustice and equality. And it identified the following key objectives: peace, security and disarmament; development and poverty eradication; protecting our common environment; human rights, democracy and good governance; protecting the vulnerable; meeting the special needs of Africa; and strengthening the United Nations.

In 2005, the Secretary-General, drawing on the UN Charter, argued that “the notion of larger freedom also encapsulates the idea that development, security and human rights go hand in hand.”¹⁴ The synergies and the three pillars were affirmed at the 2010 MDG Summit¹⁵ and in the 2005 World Summit Outcome: “We acknowledge that peace and security, development and human rights are the pillars of the United Nations system and the foundations for collective security and well-being. We recognize that development, peace and security and human rights are interlinked and mutually reinforcing.”¹⁶

The overall framework of the post-2015 development agenda could be framed along three broad set of goals, which coincide with the three main pillars of the UN:

Peace and security, which could include targets on personal security and democracy, political participation or inclusive politics.

13 General Assembly Resolution A/RES/55/2.

14 Report of the Secretary-General, In Larger Freedom: towards development, security, and human rights for all, A/59/2005 (New York, 2005)

15 General Assembly Resolution A/65/L.1, Keeping the promise: united to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (New York, 2010)

16 General Assembly Resolution A/RES/60/1, 2005 World Summit Outcome (New York, 2005), para. 9

Sustainable socio-economic or human development, which could include targets on poverty, jobs, food security and nutrition, health, education, energy and the environment.

Human rights, rule of law and access to justice, which could include targets on equality and non-discrimination.

Inequalities (often a factor behind violent conflicts) should be cross-cutting and should be addressed within each goal, ranging from socio-economic inequalities to political exclusion. The post-2015 framework should, for example, include indicators to measure health and education inequalities across regions (which could be a proxy for identity groups), by gender and by income bracket.

The post-2015 agenda could include a target on violence. The freedom from violence is a human right but also a development goal. The concept of violence is clear, it is concise and it is measurable. It can be measured through indicators on battle-related deaths and intentional homicide.

5. Conflict-affected countries and peacebuilding goals

A group of conflict-affected states (the “g7+”), together with development partners and international organizations, are advocating for the inclusion of a set of peacebuilding goals into the post-2015 agenda. They come together in the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding.

The International Dialogue has proposed the New Deal on Engagement in Fragile States at the fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan (29 November-1 December 2011), which consists of five Peacebuilding and Statebuilding Goals (PSGs). The five goals are:

- Legitimate Politics - Foster inclusive political settlements and conflict resolution
- Security - Establish and strengthen people’s security
- Justice - Address injustices and increase people’s access to justice
- Economic Foundations - Generate employment and improve livelihoods

- Revenues & Services - Manage revenue and build capacity for accountable and fair service delivery

These goals are an “important foundation to enable progress towards the MDGs” and the members of the Dialogue agreed to “work towards full consideration of the PSGs in the post-MDG development framework beyond 2015 and, after Busan, towards the consideration of the PSGs by the 2012 United Nations General Assembly and other fora.”

The New Deal outlines an agenda for more effective aid to fragile states based on the five Peacebuilding and Statebuilding Goals, stronger alignment, mutual accountability through compacts, more transparency and investments in country systems, based on an increasingly shared approach to risk management.

The New Deal will be implemented in initially seven self-nominated pilot countries (Afghanistan, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of Congo, Liberia, Sierra Leone, South Sudan and Timor-Leste) and was endorsed by 35 countries (including the g7+ and many donor countries) and six international organizations, including the United Nations Development Group and the World Bank.

The g7+ members should take an important role in bringing issues around peace, security, justice and governance to the United Nations. They will be the most important advocate for these issues. They will need to seek support from other developing countries, several of which have also experienced periods of – or still are facing pockets of – violence. A number of developed countries, including those that signed up to the New Deal, would be allies in this effort.

Issues such as peace, security, governance, human rights and inclusive politics are not only relevant in a specific set of countries – whether categorized by region, income-level, human development or degree of “fragility”. They are universal issues and relevant for all member States of the United Nations. The g7+ is an important new interlocutor, which needs to be strengthened and encouraged. The members identify themselves as fragile and affected by conflict and the grouping is not based on criteria by someone else.

Another important input to the process is the proposal of the Governments of Colombia and Guatemala on Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) for the Rio+20 Conference on Sustainable Development. One important disadvantage of the SDGs, however, is that they are limited to a fairly narrow set of social, economic and environmental issues. Moreover, Rio+20 occurs too early to determine the post-2015 framework, which does not have to be agreed for another 2½ years. The intergovernmental discussions on the post-2015 agenda will not even have started at the time of Rio+20 in June 2012. Therefore, the SDGs cannot provide the new MDG framework for reasons of process and substance. The SDGs should be seen as an input into the process.

UN System Task Team on the Post-2015 UN Development Agenda

Membership

Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA), Co-Chair

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), Co-Chair

Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)

Department of Public Information (DPI)

Economic Commission for Africa (ECA)

Economic Commission for Europe (ECE)

Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC)

Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP)

Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA)

Executive Office of the Secretary-General (EOSG)

Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO)

Global Environment Facility (GEF)

International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)

International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO)

International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)

International Labour Organization (ILO)

International Maritime Organization (IMO)

International Monetary Fund (IMF)

International Organization for Migration (IOM)

International Telecommunication Union (ITU)

Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS)

Non-Governmental Liaison Service (NGLS)

Office of the Deputy Secretary-General (ODSG)

Office of the High Commission for Human Rights (OHCHR)

Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States (OHRLLS)

Office of the Special Advisor on Africa (OSAA)

Peace building Support Office (PBSO)

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)

United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)

United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD)
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)
United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (UN Women)
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)
United Nations Fund for International Partnerships (UNFIP)
United Nations Global Compact Office
United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)
United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT)
United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)
United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (UNISDR)
United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR)
United Nations Millennium Campaign
United Nations Office for Outer Space Affairs (UNOOSA)
United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS)
United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)
United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)
United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestinian Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA)
United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD)
United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination Secretariat (CEB)
United Nations University (UNU)
United Nations Volunteers (UNV)
United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO)
Universal Postal Union (UPU)
World Bank
World Food Programme (WFP)
World Health Organization (WHO)
World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)
World Meteorological Organization (WMO)
World Trade Organization (WTO)