



# DELHI POLICY GROUP

Program on Developing Durable Peace Processes & Partners

Conference Series Three

## Global Agendas: Peacemaking in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century

Program Director:  
Radha Kumar

Student Program  
Director:  
Anjali Puri

Coordinator:  
Sujata Raghbir

February 13-14, 2006  
India International, Committee Room No.1

### Summary Report

*\*Please note that this is a summary of points raised, not a consensus document*

This was the third conference in the Delhi Policy Group's program on "Developing Durable Peace Processes and Partners." The first conference looked at lessons learned from more and less successful peace processes in Northern Ireland, Israel-Palestine and South Asia, and resulted in the report, *What Makes a Peace Process Irreversible?* The second conference looked at key steps for negotiated settlements to lead to lasting peace, from tackling root causes to best practices in post-conflict stabilization and reconstruction, with a focus on Afghanistan, Sudan and Sri Lanka. The report from this conference, *Peace Agreements & After*, can be ordered from the Delhi Policy Group.

This conference sought to extrapolate big picture issues from the previous two conferences, and focused on Indian and European forecasts of the challenges ahead in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, and the scope for Indian and European cooperation in multilateral peacemaking and peace-building initiatives. In particular, the conference looked at:

- Ways in which India and Europe could cooperate more closely on strategies for peace and security at the institutional and/or regional levels;
- The UN Peace-building Commission, its structure, mandate and areas of work; possible recommendations;
- The eastwards shift in peace and security priorities, and the new dynamism of India and China;
- Whether, and in which ways, Indian and European models of pluralism and democracy – including on migration – affect our policies/ability to deal with the fallout from the war on terrorism, at home and abroad.



### *India-EU Cooperation on Peace & Security*

Over the past few years India and the EU have begun to consult on policies in South Asia. Indian officials describe the EU presence in this region as "benign and salutary"; EU representatives believe that there is much to





Program Director:  
Radha Kumar

Student Program  
Director:  
Anjali Puri

Coordinator:  
Sujata Raghbir

## DELHI POLICY GROUP

*Program on Developing Durable Peace Processes & Partners*

learn from Indian models of pluralism and democracy, especially in the emerging “clash of ideologies” that characterizes post 9/11 security scenarios.

Nevertheless, India-EU cooperation in peace and security is yet to acquire substance. Apart from general political dialogue, there are no institutional mechanisms for the two regions to work together, though they have pledged to consult at the UN. While there is some degree of consultation on South Asia, there is very little discussion, let alone consultation, on other regions of common concern, such as the Middle East or Central and East Asia, not to mention Africa, where India and European countries are active in peacekeeping, stabilization and post-conflict reconstruction.

The first priority therefore, is to look at ways in which the EU and India can develop cooperation under the UN, in addition to the conferences suggested by the Joint Action Plan of 2005. There are also other avenues for cooperation which need to be put on the agenda, such as a dialogue with NATO and under the ESDP; more effective policies to deal with terrorism; and working together on broader human security issues, such as the threat of hunger, poverty, illiteracy, natural disasters and epidemics such as HIV-AIDS.

### *UN Reform & the Peace-building Commission*

The Peace-building Commission has been ratified by the UN General Assembly, but is very much a work in progress. India, Pakistan and a number of European countries are likely to be on it – it will have 31 members – but it does not have financial resources of its own. Rather it will have a coordinating function, which will make it dependent on other UN departments unless careful streamlining of authority and access is ensured.

Significantly, the Commission will come into play with Chapter VII as well as Chapter VI operations.

Early warning functions have been ruled out because many developing countries fear they could be misused, *but risk reduction measures are included so the Commission will have some preventive functions.*

In its initial phase the Peace-building Commission is likely to deal chiefly with post-conflict stabilization and reconstruction tasks, to begin with in Africa. India and European countries are the most actively involved in a range of peacemaking tasks in Africa, from working towards the Millennium Development Goals to defense and state-building – apart that is, from the African Union, which will be a lead organization.

*It makes sense, therefore, for India and the EU to begin straightaway to explore, along with the African Union, how best they can coordinate their contributions to peace-building in the region, both on the ground, and at the policy and planning level via the Peace-building Commission.*





Program Director:  
Radha Kumar

Student Program  
Director:  
Anjali Puri

Coordinator:  
Sujata Raghbir

## DELHI POLICY GROUP

*Program on Developing Durable Peace Processes & Partners*

**Mandate:** The Peace-building Commission is a purely advisory body that reports to the Security Council. The Security Council will need to give the Commission's recommendations some policy authority if it is to succeed; the Commission could also be tasked with implementing missions as and when feasible.

**Preparedness:** If the recommendations of the Peace-building Commission are to be implemented, UN member countries and affiliated institutions need to prepare resources, especially human and technical skills required for post-conflict stabilization and reconstruction.

The EU has already, under the ESDP, begun to pay particular attention to rapid reaction capacities, in the military as well as in the civilian field so that the EU is positioned to take on peace-building tasks as and when – and where – required. A focal point of EU activity in crisis management is coordination of civilian and military instruments at its disposal. While the just concluded British Presidency focused on coordination in the planning process for crisis response, the Austrian Presidency is focusing on the coordination of various EU crisis management actors and instruments in the field once an operation has begun. The recently concluded Barcelona Report proposes an even wider resource net, focusing on human security, which would provide expertise on pretty much all aspects of forming an administration, from police to law courts, and would draw from NGOs as well as retired officials.

India has been slower to prepare for peace-building, but it already has UN peacekeeping and civil police training centers, and a large reserve of expertise in constitutional, administrative and state-building processes drawn partly from the post-colonial period, when India was quite actively involved in helping post-colonial state-building, and partly from the thousands of Indians that have participated in UN peacekeeping on both the military and civilian sides. These are skills that many Indian policymakers are looking to revive/adapt to the needs of newly emerging and/or vulnerable countries. At the NGO level, there is a wealth of experience for the Indian government to draw on, especially amongst women.

**Responsibility to Protect:** As much of the Peace-building Commission's recommendations will focus on post-conflict reconstruction, the emphasis in responsibility to protect could shift to rights of minorities and vulnerable groups at risk, in which special attention needs to be given to rights of women and children. At the same time, the Commission's risk reduction advisories can also deal with ongoing conflict situations, in which the responsibility to protect vulnerable groups remains. The issue is problematic because military interventions to protect will generally take place in weak countries, and will be driven primarily by the West.

**Human Rights Council:** The Human Rights Council proposed by the Secretary-General to replace the Human Rights Commission is a compromise document, which the EU supports and India does not oppose.



EU AT



# DELHI POLICY GROUP

*Program on Developing Durable Peace Processes & Partners*

Program Director:  
Radha Kumar

Student Program  
Director:  
Anjali Puri

Coordinator:  
Sujata Raghubir

India does not oppose the OIC's recommended addition either, to add "blasphemy" as a human rights violation; this is controversial in both Europe and the U.S.

## **Recommended:**

- The Peace-building Commission and member states could prepare a *roster* of institutions, organizations and policy experts in peace-building that could form nuclei for assistance and implementation missions.
- The time is ripe for an *India-EU conference on peace-building* that would bring together military, police, administrative, constitutional, human rights and civil society experts.

Such a conference would not only try to harmonize Indian and EU approaches to the Peace-building Commission, it would also seek to pool best practices' experience on post-conflict reconstruction from the field (including how to make and implement sustainable peace agreements). Its more ambitious aim could be to create cross-cultural teams of experts in peace-building between India and Europe.

- India and the EU could push for a wider role for *women* in risk reduction and peace-building processes.

**Questions:** Can the member-states set up a rolling fund for the Peace-building Commission, so that case by case emergency funds do not have to be drummed up, and ensure that the funds are not concentrated in New York? Can assistance to the Commission be classified as Overseas Development Assistance for funding purposes? Will/should the Democracy Fund at the UN be coordinated with the Peace-building Commission? Who will provide the secretariat and where?

## *Further Avenues for India-EU Cooperation*



India and the EU have a strategic partnership agreement, but it is more limited than the EU-China strategic partnership, which includes defense cooperation. Nor does the EU support India's bid for UN Security Council membership – an issue which the EU should discuss.

**Issue-based Joint Action:** The Kimberley process on conflict diamonds is an outstanding example of the way in which international cooperation removed a key contributor to conflict in Sierra Leone; and similar joint action programs, for example on the illegal oil trade in Angola, could help peace-building.

**Regional Cooperation on the Ground:** India and the EU could also work together in peace-building at a regional level – for example, EU countries





# DELHI POLICY GROUP

*Program on Developing Durable Peace Processes & Partners*

Program Director:  
Radha Kumar

Student Program  
Director:  
Anjali Puri

Coordinator:  
Sujata Raghubir

are working with 5 of Indonesia's neighbors in the Aceh monitoring mission – but the only comparable instance for South Asia would be Afghanistan.

India and the EU could of course collaborate in similar missions in other regions – India should, for example, be an observer in the Quartet for the Israel-Palestine peace process – but as India and the EU lack institutional relationships that could develop interoperability, it would be difficult for them to work in joint peacekeeping missions.

**Partnership for Peace:** An obvious avenue for India-EU (and U.S.) cooperation would be NATO's Partnership for Peace Program, which Russia is a member of. This avenue is yet to be explored, but could run into obstacles such as the one the EU and Russia encountered in negotiations on Russian participation in EU led crisis management operations: Russia asked for balancing rules on its participation in EU-led operations with rules on EU participation in Russian led crisis management, a step for which the EU is not yet prepared.

Oddly enough, peace-building cooperation through NATO might prove to be more difficult to sell in India than in Europe, though NATO is transforming and there are clear advantages to discussing regions of common interest, such as Afghanistan and Central Asia. Another option would be to go China's way, and become a Dialogue Partner with NATO.

One step to peace-building cooperation could be cooperation on disaster management capabilities – NATO has been involved in disaster management during the tsunami (where India too was involved), Hurricane Katrina, and the Kashmir earthquake, while the Indian armed forces have a long experience in disaster response.

**Counter-terrorism and Rule of Law:** India and the EU have a common concern in countering terrorism while maintaining the rule of law. While both have improved cooperation in sharing intelligence, and are working together to track the funding sources of terrorist groups, they are yet to talk wider policies to combat/defuse terrorism, which includes tackling its varied roots and root causes (the two are not always the same; the longer insurgencies last, the greater the proliferation of their roots, and the more complex the requirements of response).

*The Delhi Policy Group's peace processes program plans to build its August 2006 conference around this theme, democracy and terrorism, looking both at the immediate needs of countering terrorism and tackling root causes, and at the longer-term issues of containing/marginalizing its impact – a set of issues that has acquired salience in Europe following the Madrid and London bombings and the Paris riots, and in India following the peace processes with Pakistan and within India. The conference will look at Indian and European models of democracy and pluralism, which are significantly different, and ask what each offers by way of lessons learned on preserving democracy in the wake of 9/11 and the war on terrorism.*





# DELHI POLICY GROUP

*Program on Developing Durable Peace Processes & Partners*

Program Director:  
Radha Kumar

Student Program  
Director:  
Anjali Puri

Coordinator:  
Sujata Raghbir

## *A New Asian Dynamism?*

China, Japan and India have shown new dynamism in global institutions for peacemaking, peacekeeping and peace-building. While all three have bilateral strategic relationships with each other, and with ASEAN, there is as yet no Asian security architecture, though the East Asian Summit, in which 16 countries participated (India's participation was ensured by Japan, Australia and the U.S.), is a step in that direction, building further on the steps made by the ARF and the Shanghai Cooperation Organization.

The Asia-Pacific and South-East Asia region is still in a fluid situation – and India and China's new dynamism is likely to affect the regional balance of power in as yet unmeasured ways. Thus far, Asian countries have agreed to cooperate on maritime security and transnational crime; though India seeks to expand the areas of cooperation through organizations such as BIMSTEC. India believes that the revival of traditional links with East Asia will advance the peace processes in India's North-East; the Indian government is also now looking to the Andaman Islands as a gateway for its "Look East" policy.

The end of the Cold War, and especially the 9/11 attacks, turned U.S. and European attention away from the Asia-Pacific and East Asia, leaving a strategic gap that China seeks to fill. The EU is a member of ARF, but is not proactive – it needs to become more so.

**Recommended:** India-EU strategic dialogues need to look specifically at the rapidly changing situation in Asia; perhaps a separate India-EU round table on this subject could be initiated.

**Conclusion:** As the above summary indicates, this was a rich and productive conference. Several follow-on ideas were proposed: a Track II India-EU strategic dialogue on the issues that were raised at the conference (to be coordinated, if possible, by the University of Munich); an India-EU round table later this year (organized by the Centre for European Policy); an Indian conference on women in peace-building.

**Acknowledgements:** The Delhi Policy Group would like to thank the Austrian Presidency, the EC Delegation to India, the India International Centre and the British High Commission for their support to this conference.

