

6

Conclusion

211. As the Commonwealth enters the twenty-first century, it has an unprecedented opportunity to promote both democracy and pro-poor development not only as goals in their own right but as interdependent objectives. Democracy, as this Report has endeavoured to show, can work for pro-poor development. Concerted efforts at the local, national and international levels have the potential to transform the Fancourt Commonwealth Declaration on Globalisation and People-Centred Development into reality and to help developing countries achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

212. The Expert Group believes that Commonwealth countries and institutions are in a strong position to build on their existing achievements and further support democracy and pro-poor development in member states in significant and innovative ways. Urgent action is required to tackle not only the fragility of democracy but also the extremes of poverty and inequality that exist in many Commonwealth states. As has been discussed, the key reforms include:

- committing to democratic institutions and strengthening democratic culture;
- tackling corruption;
- ensuring democratic accountability of government revenue and expenditure;
- promoting free and fair trade;
- mobilising resources to finance development;
- encouraging democratic accountability, participation and transparency in international institutions; and
- guaranteeing peace and security.

213. The Expert Group stresses the value of developing a means of monitoring progress towards implementing the Recommendations made in this Report. It requests the Commonwealth Secretariat to develop an appropriate framework for providing progress reports to Commonwealth Heads of Government at their biennial summits.

214. This Report is a call for responsibility, partnership and concrete actions – from governments, from firms, from civil society and from the international community. Without responsibility on all these levels, development and democracy will remain rhetoric rather than become reality. While development and democracy are goals in their own right, they can and should be mutually reinforcing. To promote peace and prosperity, Commonwealth Heads of Government must commit to a new, deeper approach to development and democracy.

End Notes

¹ Rao 2002, 1, 68-70.

² Quoted in Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative 2001.

³ This list of capabilities appears in Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights 2002, para. 47. See also Rao 2002, para. 5-6; UNDP 1990, 9; and Sen 1999, Ch. 4.

⁴ Commonwealth Foundation 2002, 3.

⁵ Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights 2002, para. 48-51; Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative 2002, 2.

⁶ The 'Washington Consensus' refers to a set of ten market-oriented policy objectives including, among others: fiscal discipline, trade liberalisation, privatisation of state enterprises, openness to foreign direct investment, and competitive exchange rates. See Rao 2002, Annex IV.

⁷ This is the position of Joseph Stiglitz and many other analysts (Rao 2002, para. 123-133).

⁸ In addition to the Harare and Fancourt Declarations, the perspective on democracy in this Report reflects the discussion of democracy in a number of other sources. See UNDP 2002, 4; Foweraker and Krznaric 2000, 770-774; Rao 2002, para. 105; Boutros-Ghali et al 2002; and Singh 1999, 1. On the importance of participation and civic associationalism see Commonwealth Foundation 1999; Knight, Chigudu and Tandon 2002; and Narayan et al 2000, 266-277. On local democracy see Commonwealth Local Government Forum 2002. On social and economic rights see Donnelly 1989, Ch. 2. On gender see Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative 2002. On group rights see Kymlicka 1995.

⁹ As the ideas of both democracy and development have become broader, they increasingly overlap. Hence realising social and economic rights in practice may be part of the democratic ideal, but also contributes to development through helping provide basic capabilities. Similarly, capabilities such as equitable access to justice are often associated with civil and political rights.

¹⁰ The extension of democracy into these arenas is discussed further below. On the idea of 'arenas' of democracy, see Linz and Stepan 1996, 7-15.

¹¹ These figures are based on assessments of Freedom House democracy indicators. See Diamond 1997, 22; UNDP 2002, 15.

¹² UNDP 2002, 13; Foweraker and Krznaric 2002.

¹³ Narayan et al 2000.

¹⁴ Quoted in Commonwealth Local Government Forum 2002.

¹⁵ Data on development and democracy in the Commonwealth can be found in Appendix C.

¹⁶ Rueschemeyer, Stephens and Stephens 1992, Ch. 2; Diamond 1999, Ch. 3; UNDP 2002, Ch. 2; Rao 2002, para. 86-103.

¹⁷ Data for 1999 from UNDP 2002, 17-18. See also Rao 2002, para. 7-15.

¹⁸ World Bank 2002, 183.

¹⁹ Rao 2002, para. 37.

²⁰ The following data appear in Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative 2001, 4-15. See Appendices A and C for further data on poverty in the Commonwealth.

²¹ These figures are based on estimates by the Commonwealth Policy Studies Unit's project 'Indigenous Rights in the Commonwealth'. 'Indigenous peoples' refers to communities, peoples and nations that, "having a historical continuity with pre-invasion and pre-colonial societies that developed in their territories, consider themselves distinct from other sectors of the societies now prevailing in those territories, or parts of them", and that currently form non-dominant sectors of society and aim to preserve their ethnic identity, cultural patterns, social institutions and legal systems. See Bourne 2003, 3, 5 and Whall (forthcoming).

²² See UNDP 2003. The classification criteria are discussed in detail on pp. 347-349 of the report. There are some small differences between the presentation of data here and in the *Human Development Report*. Where UNDP labels progress as *slow or reversing* this report uses *slow*. Where UNDP classifies a country as being neither *top priority* nor *high priority* it labels the priority status as *other*, whereas this report uses *low priority*. See Appendix A for an outline of the classification system and for the full data used to construct these tables.

²³ Further analysis of the Millennium Development Goals appears in World Bank and International Monetary Fund 2003.

²⁴ The importance of an effective state and well-trained public officials is discussed in Singh 1999, 4-5. On the problem of corruption see Rao 2002, para. 108-117; Tanzi 1998, 571-573; Commonwealth Business Council 2002, 42-46; and Hawley 2003. See also the Report of the Commonwealth Expert Group on Good Governance and the Elimination of Corruption, Commonwealth Secretariat 2000.

²⁵ UNDP 2001, Ch. 4; Rao 2002, para. 205-208.

²⁶ Rao 2002, para. 197.

²⁷ Oxfam 2002a, 241; Rao 2002, para. 41.

²⁸ Rao 2002, para. 43-49; Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative 2001, 35-36.

²⁹ Commonwealth Secretariat 2001, 29.

³⁰ De Soto 2000; Rao 2002, para. 127, 131.

³¹ Rao 2002, 207.

³² Narayan et al 2000, 276-278.

³³ Oxfam 2002a, 8.

³⁴ Oxfam 2002a, 140-141.

³⁵ Quoted in Rao 2002, para. 154.

³⁶ Third World Network 2001, 23-24; Oxfam 2002a, 59.

³⁷ IMF and World Bank 2002, 23-25; Oxfam 2002b.

³⁸ McKinnon 2002, 7.

³⁹ Oxfam 2002a, Ch. 8.

⁴⁰ Lall 1997, Ch. 5.

⁴¹ Oxfam 2002a, 178.

⁴² See, for example, Commonwealth Business Council 2002, 26.

- ⁴³ The Commonwealth Business Council's principles and strategies for the promotion of corporate citizenship are set out in its publication 'Business in Society: Good Corporate Citizenship in the Commonwealth'. See also Commonwealth Business Council 2002.
- ⁴⁴ Rao 2002, para. 116.
- ⁴⁵ Peter Eigen quoted in Hawley 2003, 1.
- ⁴⁶ UNDP 2002, 68.
- ⁴⁷ Commonwealth Business Council 2002, 34-35.
- ⁴⁸ Dahl 1989, 328-332.
- ⁴⁹ On micro-credit schemes, see Rao 2002, para. 140.
- ⁵⁰ Johnson and Bartlett 2002.
- ⁵¹ Mistry 2001, para. 5.04.
- ⁵² Monterrey Consensus 2002, para. 20.
- ⁵³ Commonwealth Secretariat 1999.
- ⁵⁴ Singh 1999, 2-3.
- ⁵⁵ Commonwealth Secretariat 1997, xi; Hughes and Brewster, vii.
- ⁵⁶ Commonwealth Secretariat 1997, xi.
- ⁵⁷ Commonwealth Secretariat 2001, 24-25; Commonwealth Secretariat 2000.
- ⁵⁸ Rao 2002, para. 181.
- ⁵⁹ Rao 2002, para. 181; Birdsall and Deese 2002.
- ⁶⁰ International Development Association and International Monetary Fund 2003.
- ⁶¹ Birdsall and Deese 2002, para. 5.
- ⁶² Rao 2002, para. 181-184; Birdsall and Deese 2002, para. 17.
- ⁶³ These last two points appear in Khor 2002, 49-53. See also Akyüz 2002, 13.
- ⁶⁴ UNCTAD 2002, 214-215, 217.
- ⁶⁵ Rao 2002, para. 168.
- ⁶⁶ The Reality of Aid 2002, 128.
- ⁶⁷ UNCTAD 2002, 215
- ⁶⁸ Global Financial Governance Initiative 2002.
- ⁶⁹ HM Treasury 2002.
- ⁷⁰ UNCTAD 2002, 219; Rao 2002, para. 176-180.
- ⁷¹ International Development Association and International Monetary Fund 2003, 13.
- ⁷² UNCTAD 2002, 170, 191-193; Oxfam 2002a, 143-146; Wilks and Lefrançois 2002.
- ⁷³ Rao 2002, para. 171.
- ⁷⁴ Rao 2002, para. 173; Narayan et al 2000, 132-142; Mistry 2001, para. 5.58.
- ⁷⁵ Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights 2002, para. 205.
- ⁷⁶ Rao 2002, para. 180.
- ⁷⁷ UNDP 2002, 113-114. See also Rao 2002, para. 209-218.
- ⁷⁸ Some of these critiques appear in UNDP 2002, 113-114 and Khor 2002, 46-47.
- ⁷⁹ International Monetary Fund and World Bank 2003, 1-6.
- ⁸⁰ Rao 2002, para. 17 based on data from The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute.
- ⁸¹ UNDP 2002, 85.

⁸² Rao 2002, 67.

⁸³ Rao 2002, para. 81.

⁸⁴ Nield 1999; UNDP 2002, 94.

⁸⁵ Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative 2001, 38.

⁸⁶ Rao 2002, para. 20-25.

⁸⁷ Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative 2001, 36-38.

⁸⁸ Baksh-Sooden and Etchart 2002.

⁸⁹ International Network on Cultural Policy 2002, Executive Summary para. 6.

⁹⁰ Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative 2002, 3.

⁹¹ UNDP 2002, 94.