



The Interaction between Democracy and Development

Boutros Boutros-Ghali



Executive Summary



The Interaction between and Democracy Development

Executive Summary

Boutros Boutros-Ghali

Robert Badinter
Mohamed Bennouna
H.R.H. Princess Basma Bint Talal
Mohamed Charfi
Pierre Cornillon
Rosiska Darcy de Oliveira
Marrack Goulding
Guo Jiading
Han Sung-Joo
Abid Hussain
Attiya Inayatullah
Kéba Mbaye
Hisashi Owada
Bruce Russett
Nicolas Valticos
Alexei Vassiliev

Published in 2003

by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
7, place de Fontenoy, 75352 Paris 07 SP, France

Cover photos: © UNESCO, except for top photo: © Rapho/Emile Luider

Composed and printed in the workshops of UNESCO

© UNESCO 2003

Printed in France

SHS-2003/WS/24

Contents

Preface	5
I	The relationship between democracy and development 7
	The democratic imperative
	The concept of development
	The interaction between democracy and development
II	The construction of democratic development 13
	Democratic development and globalization
	Democratic development and international organizations
	The blockages and counter-blockages of democratic development
III	Recommendations and conclusion 29
	The impact of globalization on democratic development
	The juridical conditions of democratic development
	The socio-economic conditions of democratic development
	Conclusion
	Annexes
	Agendas of the meetings 39
	Members of the Panel 45

Preface

Over the years, UNESCO has participated in many debates concerning the themes 'democracy' and 'development' but, until recently, one question had yet to be probed in depth, namely, the relationship between democracy and development. In order to come to grips with this issue, in 1998 UNESCO established the International Panel on Democracy and Development (IPDD), chaired by Mr Boutros Boutros-Ghali and made up of leading international figures.

After discussing the conceptual framework and defining the key issues to be addressed, the Panel explored the nature of the link between democracy and development. It acknowledged that, while democracy and development had long been concepts largely foreign to each other, there is now widespread agreement that a close relationship exists between them. In particular, the Panel recognized that the sustainability of equitable development is closely bound up with democracy. It maintained that genuine democracy, characterized by the rule of law, respect for human rights and recognition of the intrinsic dignity of all human beings, cannot be maintained unless people enjoy a minimum standard of living, which in turn requires a minimum level of development.

The Panel's recommendations are being considered with a view to their incorporation in UNESCO's programmes relating to democracy-building. I wish to emphasize the closeness that exists between the recommendations and the priorities of the Organization's programme, whether in respect of the primacy given to basic education and the quality of its content, the promotion of cultural diversity,

freedom of expression or access to new technologies and the information society.

In the perspective of the Panel's work, a significant recent event occurred in September 2002 with the launch by the International Centre for Human Sciences at Byblos, Lebanon, of its new programme to promote comparative research on the nature of democracy and its development, with particular emphasis on the relationship between cultural perceptions and democracy. The Byblos Centre, which operates under the auspices of UNESCO, will foster interregional and international exchanges and cooperation, serving as a forum to disseminate the results of research conducted on the theme of democracy. The Centre will hereby contribute to the implementation of the international programme on democracy, in follow-up to the findings and recommendations of the International Panel on Democracy and Development.

The publication of this Summary is part of UNESCO's efforts to ensure a very wide circulation of *The Interaction between Democracy and Development* among Member States, National Commissions and traditional partners of the Organization, and I invite them to implement the Report's recommendations falling within their respective fields of competence.

I would like to thank Mr Boutros Boutros-Ghali, the Panel's Chairperson, and all its members for their conscientious endeavours and wise counsel.

Koïchiro Matsuura

Director-General of UNESCO

1. The relationship between democracy and development

In order to analyse this relationship, it is important first to specify what is meant by the democratic imperative, then to define the concept of development, and finally to analyse the interaction between democracy and development.

The democratic imperative

Democracy is a system whereby the whole of society can participate, at every level, in the decision-making process and keep control of it. Its foundation is the full observance of human rights, as defined by both the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Vienna Pacts and Declaration of 1993. And the promotion of those rights and the respect of differences and of freedom of speech and thought are indispensable preconditions for democracy. There can be no democracy without an independent judicial system and without institutions that guarantee freedom of expression and the existence of free media. The power to legislate must be exercised by representatives of the people who have been elected by the people. Laws must be implemented by legally responsible individuals, and the administrative apparatus must be accountable to the elected representatives. That is why a parliament that is truly representative of the people in all its diversity is indispensable for the democratic process. In this respect, the holding of free and fair elections by universal suffrage is a necessary, though not in itself sufficient, precondition for the existence of a democratic regime.

In short, democracy can be defined as a political system that is

capable of correcting its own dysfunctions. But a true democracy cannot be restricted to this institutional framework alone. It also needs to be embodied in a culture, a state of mind that fosters tolerance and respect for other people, as well as pluralism, equilibrium and dialogue between the forces that make up a society. Unlike traditional conceptions, which are exclusively restricted to the domain of the State, the concept of democratic culture requires all social, financial, governmental and non-governmental actors, as well as the relationship which links or separates them, to be taken into account. The concept of democratic culture faced with the computer revolution is therefore both new and complex. It deserves to be examined more closely so that public opinion everywhere can understand the challenge it represents.

Just as long as the equality of different civilizations, different ethnic groups and their values are not recognized — recognition is possible only in a democracy — there cannot be normal conditions either for development or for a dialogue between nations...

Alexei Vassiliev

These basic democratic principles constitute a fundamental source of common values that can be described as the common heritage of humankind. Without those values there can be neither democracy nor sustainable development. But the recognition of universal values does not mean that a veil should be drawn over the specific historical, religious and cultural characteristics that make up the genius peculiar to

each society and each nation State. For the general principles of democracy can be embodied in different ways, depending on the context. Thus, while democracy is the system in which “sovereign power lies with the people”, the methods with which it can be exercised can vary depending on the social system and economic development peculiar to each country. Those methods also tend to change depending on political, demographic, economic and social change.

Democracy cannot be conceived of without freedom, but it also entails the rule of law and the voluntary restrictions that result from it, in other words the existence of a common rule issued by those who have been chosen by the people to define its content.

More concretely, Panel members agreed that justice is a precondition of democracy. They also agreed that justice guarantees the exercise of democracy as it serves to enforce the principle of equality before the law, the right of all individuals to express their opinion within the society to which they belong, and the right to be heard and to put their case. Democracy is therefore viable only if it has a reliable and independent judicial system.

The free participation of citizens is a second precondition, since it allows them to exercise their right to freedom of thought and to be different. It also enables civil society to express itself not only within each nation, but also on the international scene — something which is becoming a necessity in an increasingly interdependent world.

As regards human rights, the dialectic relative to the universality of those rights and, by contrast with the distinctive features of social systems, the universality of the historical and cultural traditions and the economic contexts in which they are embodied, was the subject of lengthy debate. At the end of the debate, Panel members nevertheless reaffirmed their espousal of the terms of the 1993 Vienna Declaration, namely that “while the significance of national and regional particularities and various historical, cultural and religious backgrounds must be borne in mind, it is the duty of States, regardless of their political, economic and cultural systems, to promote and protect all human rights and fundamental freedoms”.¹

The concept of development

There was a broad consensus on the analysis of development. Panel members were unanimous in asserting that development should be understood to mean the whole range of economic, social and cultural progress to which peoples aspire. That is the meaning of “sustainable human development” in the sense that the United Nations has given it.

1. The Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action, Part I, paragraph 5.

Sustainable development is, then, multidimensional. It is no longer restrictively understood to be narrowly economic or financial. In order to be complete, it also needs to be cultural and social, and more broadly to take into account all the factors that help individuals to fulfil themselves. The environment, social justice, democracy, education and the sharing of knowledge are closely connected with development. That is why the right to development has a natural place among human rights.

This broadening of the concept of development has many implications. For example, it changes, by making it more complex, the view people long had of the problem of poverty. While the economic dimension is still preponderant, it is no longer sufficient to enable the problem to be apprehended as a whole. Helping people to escape poverty and creating a dynamic of development presupposes the satisfaction not only of needs directly connected with survival but of a whole series of needs as regards health, housing and education. This also presupposes a reinforcement of the ability of individuals and groups to take part in and influence decisions affecting them. Panel members also stressed that “development” and “justice” are indissociable, as development needs to be able to rely on the existence of clear and fair laws and rules.

The interaction between democracy and development

Democracy and development are complementary, and they reinforce each other. The link between them is all the stronger because it originates in the aspirations of individuals and peoples and in the

rights they enjoy. Indeed, history shows that cases where democracy and development have been dissociated have mostly resulted in failure. Conversely, the interlinking of democratization and development helps both of them to take root durably. For if political democracy, in order to consolidate itself, needs to be complemented by economic and social measures that encourage development, similarly any development

democracies tend to be less politically unstable and, indeed, the combination of development and democracy tends to be very sustainable.

Bruce Russett

strategy needs to be ratified and reinforced by democratic participation in order to be implemented.

The interdependence of democracy, development and human rights was spelled out in the 1993 Vienna Declaration. Panel members pointed out that recognition of that interdependence of the right to democracy and the right to development is not something new. The United Nations Charter, international agreements, the 1986 Declaration on the Right to Development and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women all mention it. But the implementation of those rights, which have been endorsed by international law, entails both greater solidarity on the part of the international community and the respect by States of their international obligations.

Here again, Panel members saw the rule of law or the primacy of law as the thread that can link the construction and consolidation of democracy to the construction and consolidation of development, as well as the way of consolidating their common bedrock: the respect of human rights. It is a fact that, if human rights are to be guaranteed and if democracy is to work, communities and individuals, both men and women, need not only to have access to justice but also, before that, to be aware of the law and to understand it. Similarly, the lack of justice directly compromises development, first because it encourages mismanagement and corruption, and second because it discourages investment and economic exchanges. There can be no development in a context of arbitrariness or in the absence of the rule of law. In order to construct and to institutionalize, there needs to be a minimum degree of certainty: one needs to know what rule is applicable and how it is applied. It should be pointed out that the notion of the rule of law or the primacy of law has wider implications than the much more concrete notion of rule by the law, which refers to the authorities' daily enforcement of existing laws, whether they be good or bad, just or unjust. The rule of law, on the other hand, which is the contrary of arbitrariness, is based on the reign of the general principles of the law and on the concept of justice in society, hence its importance in relation to a democratic government. That rule of law entails, for power to be

exercised, legitimacy, transparency and accountability. Those three elements, which underpin the rule of law, are vital for both the democratic process and the process of development. But for that rule of law, which goes hand in hand with citizenship, to be able to establish itself within a society, a juridical culture needs to have grown up, and that is something which requires short-, medium- and long-term strategies to be prepared. For such a culture requires an apprenticeship, an education and the ability to understand legislation. It implies that everyone knows how justice works. But that knowledge is possible only if access to justice is equal and if it is the same for everyone. Unequal access to justice, depending on the socio-economic group to which people belong, depending on their ethnic group or their sex, for example, is in contradiction with justice and the rule of law.

The primacy of law is the basic framework for the exercise of power in three areas in particular. One of them is the legitimacy of the exercise of power; the second is the accountability of the exercise of power; and the third is the transparency of the exercise of power.

Hisashi Owada

Finally, democracy and development can together contribute to the consolidation of peace. Most of the time democracies settle their domestic disputes by peaceful means. Moreover, in addition to this preventive role, the democratic framework has often proved effective in settling international conflicts peacefully. Democracy is a factor of peace and therefore encourages development, which itself tends to consolidate the state of domestic peace and, consequently, international peace, since many wars originate from domestic conflicts. Democracy, development and peace form a trilogy, a common purpose.

While the relationship between democracy and development is now proven, it still needs to be clarified and defined, as do the impediments to the emergence of a sustainable democratic development.

// *The construction of democratic development*

The process of constructing democratic development throughout the world needs to be defined in relation to the international context, that is to say in relation to globalization, to international organizations, to the impediments that need to be faced and to the ways they can be overcome.

Democratic development and globalization

Is globalization a challenge, an impediment or an opportunity for the future? Without wishing to jump to conclusions about the nature of the upheavals inherent in globalization, Panel members recognized that this phenomenon, understood to mean increased political, economic and social interdependence between all countries in the world, is both a major challenge that humankind must face at the beginning of the twenty-first century and a fact of life to which the international community must adapt itself. Insofar as it multiplies the possibilities of passing on information, makes it generally available and intensifies trade, globalization can be a genuine asset for democracy and development. But it can also constitute a major impediment because, if globalization is not democratized, it may well change the nature of democracy. That is why globalization should be subject to democratic regulations in

Globalization ... is being driven by technology... we shall not be able to tackle globalization unless we understand what happens when the borderline between time and space becomes blurred.

Abid Hussain

economic and social matters. And it should be handled in such a way as to close the gap between poor and rich countries, between the most disadvantaged and the affluent, and also in such a way as to avoid creating a new form of discrimination between the IT-rich and the IT-poor, between those who are plugged into the internet and those who are not or will not be. Finally, it should be handled in such a way as to protect the wealth constituted by the world's cultural diversity.

... **O**nce development becomes a human right the State authorities that fail to guarantee it put their own legitimacy in jeopardy.

Kéba Mbaye

But although States are subjected to contradictory influences introduced by globalization, whether as a result of the omnipresence of multinationals or as a result of the appearance of normative or jurisdictional international institutions, their role in the construction of democracy and the choice of development policies will remain crucial. More than that, this is a case where there is an obligation on the part of States, which, if they did not meet it, would call their political legitimacy into question. The best ways of encouraging governments to pursue long-term policies in favour of development and democracy at a domestic level therefore need to be identified. Failing that, it will be difficult for such States to succeed in democratizing globalization.

At the same time, the increasing influence of non-governmental actors is a feature of modern democracies. Domestic and international non-governmental organizations (NGOs), local associations, local authorities such as those of cities and communes, financial institutions, universities and research centres, as well as private economic agencies, find themselves intervening more and more directly in the affairs of States. Their influence on democratic development is already considerable at both domestic

Development agencies recognize that economic growth, human development, environmental sustainability all require the full participation of citizens in the decision-making process.

*H.R.H. Princess
Basma Bint Talal*

and international level. Major international NGOs have long extended their action beyond national borders and tackled the world dimension of contemporary problems. The increasing — and often necessary — role played by non-State actors at domestic and international level should therefore be taken into account. It is one of the preconditions for the emergence at world level of a more participatory form of democracy. However, the degree to which such actors, who should be accountable, are representative remains to be defined. It is also necessary to ensure the transparency of relations between such non-State actors, nation States and the international community.

In another connection, the democratic handling of the relationship between the majority and minorities constitutes a major challenge. It is a question of establishing what needs to be done to ensure that the many loyalties of individuals and societies are, as is only natural, a source of enrichment and an inspiring model of tolerance, instead of being distorted and turned into real impediments to democracy. There is no getting away from the fact that in a number of countries the introduction of formal democracy has triggered clashes of an ethnic nature. This is the case with countries where the formation of political parties and election campaigns are influenced by ethnic considerations, which results in the return of a form of “tribalism”: the vote, which is supposed to be democratic, is conditioned not by political programmes concerning the population as a whole, but by loyalty to an ethnic, religious, cultural or linguistic group.

Another demonstrable fact is that there is obviously a very wide range of different situations: there can be minorities concentrated in one part of a territory or scattered minorities; there can be a strong majority and a multiplicity of minorities, or a numerically strong and well-balanced majority and minority; there can be an economically and politically weak majority and a powerful minority.

I think democracy has some difficulty in facing these problems of minorities, as can be seen today. But at the same time democracy is the only system capable of dealing with the problems of minorities in a peaceful, fair and just way.

Han Sung-Joo

These different situations require different constitutional and institutional responses. But whatever the particular configuration of a given situation, three principles must be respected.

At this point in time, democracy seems to be reserved for an elite inside each country.

Attiya Inayatullah

The first is that domination by the majority is not an adequate criterion for deciding whether or not a democracy exists, since people belonging to minority groups are entitled to be represented in parliament and at the level of central and local authorities. Several solutions are possible, depending on the situation, such as the granting of a certain territorial autonomy or the adoption of excep-

tional measures such as representation quotas. Such measures need however to be carefully assessed depending on the various contexts. Finally, it is important to satisfy the legitimate aspirations of minorities as regards their culture, their religion, their customs and their traditions, on condition they respect the Constitution and State institutions.

The second principle is that the political representation of minorities is not in itself enough to guarantee the harmonious existence of a multi-ethnic, multiconfessional and multicultural society; and a multiparty system, when introduced without adequate preparation, can accentuate divisions. In addition to the political institutions of democracy, areas of dialogue and cultural exchange need to be created that will gradually remove the boundaries between minorities and the majority, and between minorities themselves.

The third principle is that, while democracy requires cultural diversity and the rights of minorities to be respected, access to power should not be conditioned by considerations of an ethnic, cultural or religious nature.

Democracy is a constantly evolving process, and no country in the world can pride itself on totally applying its principles. Even the most advanced democratic regimes themselves need to try to adapt further in

... I do not know of a country today that has achieved genuine equality between men and women...

Rosiska Darcy de Oliveira

order to reach that goal. Equality of the sexes constitutes, in this respect, one of the challenges that no democracy has yet succeeded in meeting comprehensively. And yet that equality is a vital precondition without which democracy cannot be properly achieved. It is also a priority as regards development, given the major role played by women at every stage of the process of democratic development.

Democratic development and international organizations

Panel members felt that the role of international organizations, when faced with globalization, is one of the challenges that the international community is duty bound to meet at the beginning of the twenty-first century. They discussed the role that such organizations can play in the promotion of democracy, in social relationships within States and in inter-State relationships. They also took an interest in the internal workings of such institutions, while taking into account the broad principles of democracy to which they naturally claim to adhere.

International organizations are a cornerstone of the mechanism of cooperation for development. What is more, multilateral aid can effectively contribute to the promotion of democracy. So it is important to encourage development aid in new or restored democracies. Some Panel members wondered, however, whether it was legitimate to encourage democracy through external actors, as it is arguable that such action contradicts the United Nations Charter, which requires the sovereignty of States to be respected in accordance with the principle of non-interference. While all participants recognized that international relations should be based on mutual understanding, equality and non-interference, some of them also insisted on the fact that the increasing interdependence of States necessarily entails a certain erosion of national sovereignty. They stressed that the introduction of international procedures to protect human rights, as well as the adoption of the principle of good governance by development-oriented international organizations, reflect a less and less rigorous interpretation of the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States as laid down by the Charter.

It also has to be admitted that an increasing number of problems can no longer be resolved at nation-State level. They include problems connected with finance, the environment and drug trafficking. Indeed, the ever-mounting need to define and deal with problems at global level shaped the action of the United Nations during the 1990s, which was marked by a series of major international conferences on the Environment (Rio de Janeiro, 1992), Human Rights (Vienna, 1993), Population (Cairo, 1994), Social Development (Copenhagen, 1995), Women (Beijing, 1995) and Habitat (Istanbul, 1996).

Similarly, Panel members asked themselves whether it was advisable to make the provision of development aid by the United Nations conditional on a State's democratization efforts. For it needs to be established whether such conditionality clauses do not encourage the emergence of sham democracies. It is also debatable whether it is reasonable to insist on the same requirements being met by countries whose economy has been destroyed and whose institutions are weak or non-existent as by countries which refuse the democratization process.

In any case, it is reasonable to assume that international aid would be much more effective if it were no longer accompanied by a form of sanction resulting from demands imposed from outside. It would be preferable for such aid to hinge on positive cooperation between donor and recipient, and to be rooted in the framework of comprehensive development, which would itself be based on three elements: the reinforcement of human capacities, the consolidation of institutions, and good governance. Moreover, in order to be sustainable, development must be supported by the political will of society as a whole, hence the need to establish a relationship of partnership and cooperation rather than one of confrontation. In this way, the whole of society will have the feeling of owning its own development. It is however important to ensure that in the long term aid does not create a relationship of dependence. This approach, by the way, is closely akin to the principle of respecting the sovereignty of States and is based on principles of equality and mutual advantages. Conditions imposed from outside, without any

veritable partnership being established or without the actual participation of the governments and peoples concerned, are counterproductive. But that does not mean that international aid should be totally unconditional.

We need to be able to ensure, in other words, that aid is not diverted by corruption, that it does not have the effect of increasing imbalances, and above all that it does not serve to reinforce the authoritarian power of undemocratic governments. Cooperation must therefore be based on the need for accountability and transparency on the part of both donors and recipients. In this sense, support for concrete projects, in specific areas such as education, scientific and technological development, health and even the development of human resources as regards governance, will encourage the emergence of internal conditions favourable to democratization.

At the end of their debate, Panel members agreed that the promotion of democracy and human rights should be a component of cooperation programmes within the United Nations system. For, through such programmes, international organizations can exert a real influence on democratic development strategies. They already play an appreciable role, not only in favour of a peaceful solution to conflicts, but in favour of respect for transparency, tolerance and cultural diversity.

As regards economic sanctions, on the other hand, a rigorous assessment of their consequences is imperative. First, it needs to be remembered that the purpose of such sanctions, as provided for by the United Nations Charter, is not to be punitive, but to bring illegal behaviour to an end and ensure that the rules of international law are respected once again. But there is no getting away from the fact that sanctions rarely achieve their aim, and that they chiefly affect the poorest and most vulnerable sections of the population. They then take on the nature of repressive sanctions. They slow down development and, what is more, particularly when they continue for a long time, they result in a decline in the living conditions of the people, as well as in their cultural environment, which can take on disastrous dimensions. Sanctions then constitute viola-

tions of human rights carried out in the name of human rights. Another perverse effect of sanctions can be an increase in crime, in particular smuggling, often to the benefit of the country's leaders. And above all sanctions have no effect in undemocratic societies because, in those societies, the population at large has no influence over its leaders. Sanctions tend to reinforce their power by creating, as a reaction, a feeling of collective solidarity.

Thus, sanctions may weaken democracy and make it more difficult to bolster political opposition to authoritarian regimes. The international community therefore has a responsibility here, which it must shoulder. First, it should analyse the actual impact of sanctions more accurately and define the application criteria of such sanctions more clearly; then it should devise other kinds of measures, such as "targeted sanctions", chiefly financial sanctions aimed at the bank accounts of the leaders of the countries concerned, which seem to be more effective than trade or economic sanctions, which affect the most disadvantaged sections of the population. Above all, the possibility of an international court of justice that would make it possible to prosecute those truly responsible for a grave violation of international law should be explored, it being understood that it is up to the Security Council, by virtue of its discretionary powers, to determine what violations constitute threats to international peace and security.

Moreover, the Panel pointed out that not only does the United Nations have the task of ensuring that the purposes and principles of the Charter are respected, but it is also one of the main bodies responsible for elaborating international juridical standards and, as such, should guarantee respect for the rule of law at world level. For the time being, however, it has to be admitted that international relations suffer from a democratic inadequacy and that they are above all conditioned by the relative power of the countries concerned. It seems difficult today to talk about international democracy, when the influence that a State can exert on joint decision-making depends strictly on its economic and military might, and, consequently, on its political will. What is more, the possibility of censure which is a fundamental element of democracy — a dissatis-

fied people can censure its representatives and its rulers — does not apply to international organizations.

The democratization of international relations remains nonetheless a priority in the age of globalization, since the lack of democracy at an international level is an impediment to the development of democracy at a domestic level and can even fuel various forms of extremism. Yet it is not a case of utopianism, as can be seen from the example of the European Parliament, which confirms that peoples can be represented beyond their national borders. The regionalization of international relations may — in the view of some participants — speed up the process of democratization, insofar as regional organizations are often able to act as a counterbalance to globalization. Checks and balances are indispensable for a proper working of democracy.

It may however be asked whether the United Nations has the required legitimacy to intervene in matters regarding democracy, when the Organization itself clearly suffers from a lack of democracy. The Security Council, the only body with the power to use military force and impose sanctions, is not a truly democratic organ in that only some States are represented on it and others have the right of veto. The General Assembly, which is the most democratic organ in the United Nations system insofar as its decisions are taken by a majority vote, is also the one that has the least powers and the least possibility of ensuring that its decisions are implemented. According to some Panel members, the General Assembly itself is not truly democratic, as its members represent States and not peoples. There is of course talk of reforms, but several speakers emphasized that those envis-

... **d**emocratization at the international level is important in the context of the ability of a world of nation-states to cope with the problems created by globalization.

Marrack Goulding

States' representation at the United Nations is flawed because that other branch of the State — which constitutes the legitimate and comprehensive representation of the people — parliament, is missing.

Pierre Cornillon

aged by the Security Council would not have the effect of making it more democratic. At the current stage of planning, the reforms would simply aim to bring its composition up to date by increasing the number of its members to include new economic and political powers. That might just ensure a better balance between developed countries and developing countries.

The United Nations' specialized institutions, on the other hand, have a more democratic composition. Furthermore, the democratic features of the system are to be found not in the framework of its coercive powers, but in other characteristic functions of democratic processes, such as the adoption of standards, mediation between Member States, the dissemination of information encouraging transparency and facilitating the settling of disputes, and an opening up to the participation of civil society. In any case, the role of the United Nations needs to be reinforced and the authority of the Security Council preserved. Despite major changes that have occurred on the international scene, the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter remain valid and should be firmly supported.

The blockages and counter-blockages of democratic development

As has already been noted, these impediments exist at both national and world level. In this respect, while there are a host of international impediments, as we have seen, States for their part should adopt a self-critical attitude, as there exist many internal causes of inadequacies as regards democratic development. Those who defend human rights and democracy, who are the first to combat this democratic inadequacy, are entitled, in that capacity, to security and immunity. Their protection should be a subject of concern for the international community insofar as they are frequently persecuted by their governments.

One of the major impediments to the achievement of democratic development resides in the serious inequalities that exist in the way revenues and wealth are shared out. That is why the implementation of political freedoms will not be enough to ensure the

durability of democracy in the developing countries unless it is accompanied at the same time by strategies aimed at promoting economic and social rights. Similarly, in the developed countries, the existence of pockets of extreme poverty and the exclusion caused by it produce distortions in the exercise of democratic rights, by restricting and sometimes even preventing the victims of poverty from actually participating in political, social and cultural life. Social and economic inequalities not only undermine social harmony and political stability, but they are also contrary to the very spirit of democracy. Moreover, they encourage corruption and nepotism, both of which act as a brake to development. While economic globalization, when unrestrained, accentuates inequalities, poverty and exclusion, its proper management can be seen to be a necessary precondition for the promotion of individuals' economic and social rights.

In addition to economic and social impediments, democracy also has to face a series of other obstacles, such as religious fanaticism, racism and xenophobia. One of the effects of globalization has been to create cases of identitarian closure, which often find expression in mounting ethnic, national or religious extremism that is fuelled by political and economic frustrations experienced both individually and collectively. Seeking to find one's identitarian bearings is not in itself negative, but the impression of "colonization" that is felt when a "world culture" tries to impose itself, sometimes clashing with local cultures, can prompt exacerbated patterns of withdrawal behaviour which can even result in a total rejection of all other cultures and other ways of life. Identitarian closure of this kind finds

The diversity of history, culture and economic and social institutions should be the motive force that encourages mutual cooperation and development rather than creating reasons for mutual estrangement and confrontation.

Guo Jiading

It is globalization and unbridled neoliberalism which create exclusion, and which generate, through the vehicle of culture, certain extremisms.

Mohamed Bennouna

justification in the cultural breeding ground in which its specificity is rooted. Fundamentalist movements, which believe that they are the sole repositories of the truth, and that their truth overrides all other forms of truth, reject and condemn, sometimes violently, all differences whether they be religious, political or ethnic.

Education itself —which can and should play an important role in the apprenticeship of tolerance and respect for other people — sometimes encourages identitarian closure, or even extremist behaviour. It is therefore vital to ensure that education does not encourage rejection of other people or identitarian closure, but that on the contrary it encourages knowledge and respect for other cultures, other religions and other ways of being and living. A lack of general culture and premature specialization

result in attitudes that are receptive to extremist ideologies. Hence the importance not only of a high-quality general education at every level, but also of the educational role of the media.

The violation of fundamental rights affects women first and foremost, and that is something that can never be stressed enough.

Robert Badinter

As regards the major impediment to democracy and development — the very widespread and often considerable inequality between men and women — the Panel

stressed how urgent it was to implement the recommendations of the Beijing Conference. While women's rights are dependent on the universality of human rights, their implementation requires the specific discrimination that women suffer in various contexts to be identified and recognized. This calls for constant vigilance and, of course, the political will to get rid of such discrimination.

We cannot ask judges to be heroes in order to be just. They should be able to be just without being heroes.

Mohamed Charfi

In trying to identify impediments to the achievement of democratic development, the Panel gave further thought to the issue of justice, given that democracy can be defined as the rule of law, of a law that issues from the will of the people. Disappointment with democracy, which is notice-

able in some countries, often originates in the inability of the justice system to fight corruption and organized crime. Similarly, the lack of legal and jurisdictional guarantees covering investment and economic and trading exchanges can hinder development. Both the slowness with which court rulings are made — a slowness that is not found exclusively in the developing countries — and the shortage of honest and competent magistrates act as impediments to the implementation of democratic development.

Finally, an excessive concentration of power was also identified as an impediment to democracy. The solution could be decentralization, but it is no panacea and may, in some circumstances, have a negative impact on democratic development. It can, for example, encourage local feudalities or ethnocracies. What is more, it requires the responsibilities of the various authorities to be clearly defined, adequate budgetary resources to be made available at local level, and local authorities to be effective.

What we should try to do is bring decision-making closer to those who are affected by decisions. There is, then, good reason to define solutions that are suited to the various degrees of development, to the size of a country and to the composition of the population — in order to encourage the devolution of powers and enable the local authorities to operate with their ears closer to the ground. Nor should we ignore the emerging phenomenon of inter-State regionalization, under which agreements have been concluded between the towns, cities or regions of various countries, thus giving birth to new regions and helping to devolve power in various States.

After completing this review of the issues, Panel members examined methods that would make it possible to take up the various challenges and overcome impediments to the emergence of a veritable dialectic between development and democracy.

They ranked education as the most important of those methods. Once again freedom of expression, too, was seen as an essential precondition for the introduction of democracy and as a factor that guarantees its durability. It was pointed out that freedom of communication and, in particular, written and audiovisual commu-

There can be no veritable and sustainable democracy without a continuous effort to improve general education.

Nicolas Valticos

nication, plays a key educational role, as political decisions are largely determined by access to information sources and by the independence and reliability of those sources. Free, independent and accountable communication is, then, indispensable to democracy.

Again in the political field, the existence of representative parliaments which are democratically elected and genuinely reflect the diversity of the population, is the precondition for the elaboration of accepted and acceptable legislation, which is vitally necessary for social harmony.

Once again, too, the existence of a fair and independent justice system was regarded as a major precondition for the reinforcement of the rule of law, as the lack of such a system makes the operation of democratic institutions impossible and blocks the development process. That is why the separation of powers is one of the characteristics of democracy, insofar as it can guarantee the freedom and independence of the justice system. As we have seen, everything contributes to make the justice system one of the central pillars of democracy. The legitimacy of elections, for example, also depends on the existence of an effective justice system which is independent of the executive, and which, combined with the vigilance of the citizenry, can in addition reduce the need for the assistance, or even supervision, that international organizations offer when elections are held.

Transparency at every level of government services is also a precondition for the proper working of democracy and for an effective fight against corruption.

In addition to the protection of individual rights, the recognition of collective rights is an element that can reinforce democracy. The guarantee of economic and social rights envisaged by the United Nations Social Summit in Copenhagen in 1995 is an important element for democratic development, insofar as a social approach to development at global level is capable of reducing the inequalities that result from globalization.

In short, it is international solidarity which seems more necessary than ever if democratic development at national level is to be encouraged and consolidated.

After reading this summary of our debates once again, I would like to conclude by formulating some self-criticism in three parts.

The first remark I would like to make is that the working hypothesis we adopted saw the relationship between democracy and development solely in a context of peace, given that there can be no democracy or development in a conflict situation. It so happens that domestic and international conflicts have never been so numerous as they have been in the past few decades. What is their influence on neighbouring States and on all those who are not involved in hostilities? The key element is not so much the conflict situation as the political context that led up to it or ensued from it, as well as its impact on democratic development. While that development is at threat during the period leading up to the conflict and completely paralysed during the conflict, it will require some special measures during the period of “convalescence” that ensues from the conflict.

My second remark concerns the North-South confrontation, which we dealt with only in passing. The problems of democratic development are very different depending on whether one is talking about developed —or overdeveloped— States, or developing States. We did not examine closely enough how democratic development differs in those various categories of States. While the broad principles of democratic development are universal, the fact remains that their application varies considerably, depending on whether one is talking about a State that has practised democracy for years or a State that has just gained independence.

My third remark is that we did not discuss the “people’s economy”, the economy of untaxed micro-companies which in the developing countries meet the real needs of poor people and constitute a driving force of democratization. It is obvious that this economy also includes the black market, and that it is sometimes hard to distinguish it from the criminal economy, which needs to be curbed. The Western world often finds it difficult to understand the

role played by that economy in the democratic development of a developing State. Instead of condemning or ignoring that economy on the grounds that it is only semi-legal and escapes the labour laws, would it not, on the contrary, be a better idea to encourage it? The micro-loans invented by Mohamed Yunus in Bangladesh are an example that deserves our attention.

Having said that, the people's economy in the developing countries and ways of assisting it cannot be discussed without stressing the role of women. The way roles are divided up between men and women can be observed throughout the world, and the Panel discussed the discrimination from which women suffer. But they play an especially important role in the development of the developing countries.

These remarks in no way detract from the value of the ideas that were exchanged during many hours of discussion by eminent experts from every continent. That only goes to show that the subject is far from exhausted, and that it deserves to have many other meetings devoted to it, particularly because one of UNESCO's *raison d'être* is to promote the culture of democracy, development and peace.

III. *Recommendations and conclusion*

The impact of globalization on democratic development

Considering the inevitable existence of the phenomenon of globalization at the beginning of the twenty-first century, a phenomenon that will probably gather momentum in years to come;

Considering the still incomplete state of knowledge and understanding of this phenomenon;

Considering, too, the probable extent of its positive or adverse impact on the values and concepts of democratic development, on the economy and finance, on ways of life and culture, at both local and national or international levels;

In accordance with the principle of the universality of human rights, the principle of compensatory equality between States and between individuals, and the principle of participation and non-exclusion.

The Panel recommends that UNESCO engage in an in-depth analysis of the impact of globalization on democratic development with a view to better understanding its consequences and helping to formulate policies that are designed to counter the excesses of globalization and amplify its positive repercussions.

That analysis should focus on the **impact of globalization and of the “liberalization” of international trade**, more especially on the national economies of developing countries and countries in transition. This entails a study:

1. of the standards capable of democratizing the globalization of the economy;

2. of the role of international economic institutions in the management of globalization;
3. of ways and means of spreading international solidarity at an economic and technological level.

That analysis should also focus on the **impact of the worldwide development of science and technology** (in particular the new technologies of knowledge and information) on people's living conditions, on bioethical legislation and on cultures. This entails:

1. evolving strategies which can enable the progress of science and technology to benefit the largest possible number of people, and particularly those who are the most marginalized;
2. preventing the gulf between rich and poor, both within and between States, from growing wider;
3. consolidating, given the globalization of the media and the Internet, positive values relating in particular to human rights, democracy, tolerance and openness towards other cultures;
4. discouraging the propagation of negative values, such as the acceptance of violence, prostitution, xenophobia and undemocratic values as part of everyday life.

Lastly, that study should analyse the **impact of globalization on the development of extremist movements**, in particular the phenomenon of aggressive identitarian closure produced by micro-nationalism and neo-tribalism, which manifests itself in a violent and aggressive rejection of any other culture or way of life, since such forms of religious, ethnic or ideological extremism are a direct threat to democracy. This entails:

1. **pursuing and stepping up the promotion of tolerance** by appropriate means, such as education, the media and meetings of teachers and young people of different cultural origins and with different experiences, with a view to strengthening cooperation as regards democracy and development;
2. **supplying technical assistance** so as to offer all pupils and students, whatever their level or field of study, an education in

comparative social science (history, religions, philosophy, etc.) so that they can acquire a general cultural grounding that encourages tolerance and respect towards others;

3. **continuing action in support of multilingualism** and multiculturalism, so as to foster the respect of linguistic and cultural identities and to prevent the social or economic exclusion of people on the grounds that they belong to a linguistic, economic, religious or cultural community.

The juridical conditions of democratic development

The Panel formulates recommendations on the three following issues:

- A. A reinforcement of justice and the rule of law;
- B. The effective defence of human rights;
- C. The development of free and responsible media.

A. A reinforcement of justice and the rule of law

The reign of justice and the rule of law are an essential precondition for the exercise of democracy and for viable development. This presupposes the existence of judicial and legislative institutions effectively operating on the basis of universally recognized principles, and more particularly of an independent judiciary.

In this respect, **the Panel recommends that UNESCO:**

1. should provide technical assistance to States so that they can consolidate their legal system on the basis of the principle of the rule of law;
2. should promote the dissemination of information and, through technical support, the enforcement of the principle whereby magistrates may not be removed from their posts and the establishment of institutions that guarantee the independence of the judiciary;
3. should develop its training activities for people in the legal profession (magistrates, arbitrators, lawyers, etc.) and for legislators;
4. should encourage the introduction of good governance so as to facilitate the effective conduct of public affairs and the fight against corruption;

5. should facilitate comparative research into institutions which encourage the decentralization of power, while at the same time avoiding the creation of local feudalities;
6. should support the elaboration of national and regional strategies aimed at developing a legal culture based on the principle of the rule of law;
7. should encourage States to give the indispensable priority to justice in their budgets;
8. should engage in a series of anthropological studies in order to identify and understand the various institutions, customs and behavioural patterns which, on the basis of those universal values, form the common heritage of humankind, and on which human rights are based;
9. should use the findings of these studies to create linkages between, on one side, customary or traditional practices as regards the settlement of disputes and, on the other, international standards in respect of human rights and justice;
10. should provide itself with the resources to extend education for justice both in the educational system and among the population, notably by explaining the mechanisms and workings of justice and the rights of individuals in relation to the legal system; and should encourage field research into access to justice, particularly on the part of underprivileged groups, women and the illiterate.

B. The effective defence of human rights

The effective application of and respect for civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights are essential prerequisites for the strengthening of democratic development.

Conscious as it is of the work already undertaken by UNESCO in this connection and of the conclusions of the debates held in connection with the 50th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, **the Panel recommends that UNESCO:**

1. should pursue and step up its work relating to human rights research, promotion and education at all levels and among the

various professional and social actors responsible for the application and safeguarding of those rights;

2. should increase the number of UNESCO Chairs in Human Rights, Democracy, Peace and Tolerance, with emphasis on the relationship between those four concepts;
3. should support and develop activities to inform and make people aware of their fundamental rights while at the same time allowing for the specific cultural and historical characteristics of the various States.

C. The development of free and responsible media

The essential role which the freedom and independence of the press and other media have to perform in the sustainable establishment of democracy is bound up with the fact that they make it possible to express different points of view, to disseminate information and to hold open debates on public affairs.

However, that press and those media must behave responsibly, since the proliferation of scandal sheets and obtrusive advertising tends to detract from the credibility of the news and causes the public to lose interest in public affairs.

In this respect, **the Panel recommends that UNESCO:**

1. should pursue its programmes to support the development of free, independent and responsible media, in particular through the training of journalists and presenters;
2. should ensure widespread dissemination of its existing and future works on the necessary interrelationship between freedom, independence and responsible behaviour on the part of the press and the new information media, particularly the Internet;
3. should encourage the adoption of legal provisions which exclude the loss of liberty and imprisonment for violation of press or audio-visual laws;
4. should provide technical support for the establishment of such institutions as independent press councils, in order to keep prostitution and procuring out of the press and the new media;
5. should proscribe any confusion between information and

advertising and reaffirm the collective responsibility of those running the media for their professional code of ethics.

The socio-economic conditions of democratic development

A. The elimination of poverty and social exclusion

The main impediment to democracy is extreme poverty. Continual efforts to obtain the essentials for survival and the relentless struggle against the evils associated with poverty, hunger, disease and violence make it extremely difficult to take part in political and social life, even at the local or community level. It will not be possible to eliminate the exclusion from political and social life that is the fate of marginalized groups unless poverty is gradually eliminated, thanks to sustained participation in the life of the community and to the ability of individuals and groups to ascertain their rights and to influence decisions affecting them.

In this respect, **the Panel recommends that UNESCO:**

1. should support grass roots training programmes in cooperation with the United Nations and specialized institutions;
2. should engage in a campaign to alert political and economic decision-makers to their responsibility and the relevance of these programmes;
3. should prepare a comprehensive study on exclusion and marginalization by identifying their causes in different contexts on the basis of quantitative and qualitative indicators and of successful ventures of a similar kind;
4. should develop training programmes for managerial and administrative staff and continue its vocational and technical training programme;
5. should undertake studies on the impact of conditionalities connected with international aid and on the adverse effects of sanctions on democratic development.

B. The dissemination of a democratic culture

The practice of democracy hinges on the existence of institutions

enabling members of society to participate in decisions that concern them, on an attitude of mind, a spirit of tolerance and respect for others, and on a wide-ranging ability to accept divergences of opinion and differences. The development of a genuine democratic culture is a prerequisite for the reinforcement of political, social and economic democracy.

The Panel therefore recommends that UNESCO:

1. should strengthen its action with a view to developing endogenous capacities and setting up appropriate institutions at local level, so as to enable individuals and groups to exert a more direct influence on decisions affecting them;
2. should support new forms of partnership in civil society with the involvement of various social actors at different decision-making levels;
3. should help to elaborate national strategies to promote democratic culture, through education and the mass media, particularly among young people;
4. should develop and distribute, notably through new information techniques, informational and educational materials for decision-makers and people with social responsibilities;
5. should stimulate debate and reflection on the issue of the democratization of globalization;
6. should pursue its reflection on the concept of “democratic culture” and on the conditions under which it can be developed.

C. The mobilization of non-governmental actors

The major role played by non-governmental social, economic or political actors in connection with democratic development is a new phenomenon. Such organizations, along with civil society, can have an effective impact at national and international level in promoting development and giving it a more human dimension.

The Panel recommends that UNESCO:

1. should develop strategies to support civil society and NGOs, so as to encourage the organized participation of the greatest possible number of people in public life and thus to foster the population’s control of political and bureaucratic institutions;

2. should, in the framework of its action strategies, pursue its collaboration with non-governmental actors as partners and multipliers of UNESCO's action and as a source of new initiatives;
3. should encourage the accountability of NGOs and transparency in relations between NGOs and States, and vice versa;
4. should support the development of civil society organizations at national and international level, in order to foster the democratic participation of the population in political and economic decisions;
5. should study the contribution which international non-governmental organizations (INGOs) make to the democratization of international relations;
6. should pursue and step up its cooperation with parliamentarians and their representative organizations, in view of the essential role which they play in the exercise of democratic rights and the definition of development policies.

Conclusion

Throughout its work, as in its recommendations, the Panel has striven to define the main challenges that humankind, in the early twenty-first century, must take up in order to embark at last on the road to sustainable and democratic development. In so doing, it does not claim to have been exhaustive, and hopes that the issues it has raised will be the subject of more detailed study.

That is why the Panel expresses the wish that UNESCO will be able to pursue and develop this work. A detailed study of some of the themes discussed in the course of its debates might subsequently form the subject of UNESCO publications and usefully fuel further discussion, for which there remains considerable scope.

A*nnexes*

Agendas of the meetings

First meeting: 4-5 May 1998

1. Links between democracy and development

Is democracy a precondition for development? What kind of political organization is most conducive to development?

- The relationship between economic and political reforms;
- Factors that encourage democracy and development;
- Role of the United Nations system in the development of democracy;
- Role of non-governmental actors and civil society.

2. Globalization and the international community

How does globalization affect democratic States? How can development be facilitated in a global context?

- The impact of globalization on democracy and development;
- Transnational actors and democracy;
- Democracy and development;
- Democracy at international level: the democratization of international and transnational relations.

List of questions

Democracy and development

- Why has interest in the relationship between democracy and development emerged at this particular time?
- Why was it earlier thought that the developing countries were not ready for democracy, and that they would have to make considerable progress on the economic front before democracy could work?
- Why are authoritarian regimes now being urged to change, whereas they were tolerated in the past?

- Is there a relationship of cause and effect between democracy and development?
- Does the market economy stimulate political activity and encourage democracy?
- Is democracy not only desirable but also necessary for the market economy and, conversely, can it act as an impediment to economic growth?
- Is democracy essentially a by-product of development?
- Which is more important in a post-conflict situation — democracy or development?
- Which is more important in a post-authoritarian situation — democracy or development?
- What impact does gender discrimination have on democracy and on development?
- If a poor farmer or unemployed worker were asked to choose between democracy and development, what would his answer be?

Democracy, development and international relations

- Does globalization signal the end of domestic democracy?
- What is the future of democracy now that some of the most powerful socio-political forces in the world extend beyond the boundaries of the nation-State?
- How can global problems such as the environment and international crime be solved within the framework of democracy?
- Why has the increase in the number of democratic States not caused a corresponding increase in inter-State democracy?
- How can the reluctance of democracies to extend their model of governance to inter-State relations be explained?
- Why has political theory regarded democracy as a model of governance that can be applied only within State boundaries?
- If all States became democracies, would international relations be founded on democratic principles?
- Can a State be fully democratic in a world that is not democratic?
- Do democracies have more peaceful relations among themselves than with autocratic regimes?
- If all States were democracies, would there be no more wars?

- Does international peace depend on the gradual increase in the number of democratic States and the democratization of the international community?
- What impact does the presence of undemocratic States in the international system have on democratic States?
- Does the globalization of domestic issues encourage authoritarian rather than democratic solutions?

Second meeting: 8-9 February 1999

1. Impediments to democracy and development

The Panel has identified a series of impediments and threats to democracy and development, as well as means which could be used to overcome them. How can UNESCO help to develop those means more effectively?

1. Social and economic inequalities:

- How can economic and social rights be promoted in the context of globalization?
- What are the political, economic, social and cultural measures that can encourage both democracy and development?

2. Identitarian closure:

- How should we combat the social and political exclusion and the discrimination caused by extremism?
- How should we combat extremism itself?

3. Lack of justice:

- What measures should be encouraged in order to reinforce the rule of law?

4. Lack of education:

- How can the lack of access to formal education be remedied?

2. The culture of democracy

The Panel felt that true democracy goes beyond the purely institutional framework and refers to a state of mind and an attitude of tolerance and respect for other people, which encourages pluralism and a balance of power by stressing the need for participation by citizens. In this connection, the members of the Panel drew attention to the importance of developing a democratic culture:

1. What are the elements which define a democratic culture?

2. What are the institutional, cultural and other factors which encourage or impede the development of a democratic culture?

3. How can a society be encouraged to adopt democratic principles?

**3. How can UNESCO orientate its programmes
in order to encourage:**

1. *Participation*
2. *Pluralism*
3. *The reinforcement of democratic institutions*
4. *Decentralization*
5. *The development of civil society*

Third meeting: 3-4 April 2000

- 1. Democratic development versus economic sanctions.**
- 2. International aid and democratic development.**
- 3. Decentralization and democratic development.**
- 4. Minorities and democratic development.**
- 5. The rule of law and development.**
- 6. General discussion of the Recommendations presented to the Director-General of UNESCO.**

Members of the Panel

ROBERT BADINTER (France). Senator; President of the OSCE Court of Conciliation and Arbitration; Professor Emeritus, Paris University I (Panthéon-Sorbonne); Minister of Justice (1981-86).

MOHAMED BENNOUNA (Morocco). Ambassador, Permanent Representative of Morocco to the United Nations; Judge, International Criminal Tribunal, The Hague (1998-2001).

H.R.H. Princess **BASMA BINT TALAL** (Jordan). Chairperson of the Jordanian Hashemite Fund for Human Development; founder and head of the Jordanian National Commission for Women.

BOUTROS BOUTROS- GHALI (Egypt). Chairperson of the Panel. Secretary-General of the United Nations (1992-96); Secretary-General of the International Organisation of the Francophonie (1997-2002); diplomat, jurist and scholar.

MOHAMED CHARFI (Tunisia). Professor Emeritus (Law), University of Tunis; former President of the Tunisian League of Human Rights; former Minister of Education, Higher Education and Scientific Research.

PIERRE CORNILLON (France). Honorary Secretary General and former Secretary General of the Inter-Parliamentary Union (1987-98); specialist in parliamentary diplomacy and comparative parliamentary law.

ROSISKA DARCY DE OLIVEIRA (Brazil). Professor, Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro; President of the Leadership Center for Women, Rio de Janeiro; former President of the National Council on the Rights of Women, Brazil.

MARRACK GOULDING (United Kingdom). Warden of St Antony's College Oxford; Diplomatic Service (1959-1985); UN Under Secretary-General for Peacekeeping (1986-93) and Political Affairs (1993-97).

GUO JIADING (People's Republic of China). Executive Vice-Chairman, China National Committee for Pacific Economic Cooperation; Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China (1952-1997).

HAN SUNG-JOO (Republic of Korea). President of Korea University and Professor of Political Science; Director, Ilmin International Relations Institute, Korea University; Republic of Korea's Minister of Foreign Affairs (1993-94).

ABID HUSSAIN (India). Professor Emeritus of the Indian Institute of Foreign Trade; served in the Indian Administrative Service; former Commerce Secretary, India; former Ambassador; former Vice-Chairman, Rajiv Gandhi Foundation.

ATTIYA INAYATULLAH (Pakistan). Former Minister for Women's Development and Population Welfare; President of the International Planned Parenthood Federation (1995-99).

KÉBA MBAYE (Senegal). Honorary Chief Justice, Supreme Court of Senegal; former Vice-President, International Court of Justice (1982-91); former Vice-President, Curatorium of the Academy of International Law, The Hague.

HISASHI OWADA (Japan). President of the Japan Institute of International Affairs; Professor of International Law and Organization at Waseda University; Senior Advisor to the President of the World Bank; joined the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan in 1955.

BRUCE RUSSETT (United States of America). Dean Acheson Professor of International Relations and Director of United Nations Studies at Yale University; Editor of the *Journal of Conflict Resolution*.

NICOLAS VALTICOS (Greece). Member of the Academy of Athens; corresponding member of the Institut de France; International Labour Office (1949-1981); former Secretary-General of the Institute of International Law.

ALEXEI VASSILIEV (Russian Federation). Director of the Institute for African and Arab Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences; President of the Center for Civilization and Regional Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences.

In 1998, the Director-General of UNESCO established the International Panel on Democracy and Development (IPDD) to advise the Organization on shaping its future programme with more emphasis on the principles of democracy and development.

Over a period of three years, from 1998 to 2000, the IPDD, chaired by Boutros Boutros-Ghali, held three meetings. The Panel's Report to UNESCO, entitled *The Interaction between Democracy and Development*, is the verbatim record of the deliberations of the Panel's sixteen members. The Panel, whose recommendations and conclusion are set out in this Summary, discusses the challenges and obstacles confronting democracy and development and the relationship between the two.

The Panel's stimulating debates suggest answers and invite further questions on subjects ranging from globalization and the unequal distribution of income and wealth, through education, religion, culture, the media, the role of civil society, sovereignty, justice and the rule of law to fundamentalism, extremism and identitarian closure.

We have tried, through these panel discussions to offer UNESCO practical suggestions, by answering the following questions:

What should be done to promote democracy?

What should be done to bring out the link that exists between democracy and development?

What should be done to take into account the fact that nowadays problems of democracy and development are not just national problems, but that they have an international and global dimension?

What is the impact of that globalization first on the phenomenon or process that democracy and development represent, and second on the relationship between democracy and development?

Boutros Boutros-Ghali