

1

Corruption, People, and Power

People know they can make a difference when they come together in sufficient numbers and with a clear goal. Citizens, acting in coordination, can more effectively challenge governments, corporations, financial institutions, sports bodies or international organisations that neglect their duty towards them.

—*Brasilia Declaration, Fifteenth International Anti-Corruption Conference, November 2012*

It afflicts dictatorships and democracies, the Global North and the Global South; it impedes development; it threatens peacebuilding. But not until late 2010–2011, when people around the world raised their voices, did the blight of corruption move to the forefront of the international stage. During the so-called Arab Spring, citizens valiantly defied entrenched dictators to say “enough” to malfeasance, and they have been risking—in many cases, sacrificing—their lives to demand freedom, democracy, and dignity. Taking inspiration from the Middle East, several months later the Indignados (Outraged) movement emerged in Spain, and Occupy Wall Street followed suit in the United States. The latter proclaimed, “We are the 99% that will no longer tolerate the greed and corruption of the 1%.”¹

These protestors are giving voice to the sentiments of many people in the Global North, as reflected in the 2010 Global Corruption Barometer conducted by Transparency International, the global civil society coalition against corruption. It found that views on corruption are most negative in North America and Europe; 67 percent and 73 percent of people, respectively, in those areas said that corruption increased over

the previous three years.² Overall, the survey found that 70 percent of respondents claimed they would be willing to report an incident of corruption. In retrospect, these results presage the outburst of civil resistance that marked 2011. From India to the United States, citizens are making connections between corruption and unaccountability of state and corporate powerholders on the one hand, and excess, social and economic inequality, and the distortion of political and economic systems by special interests on the other hand.³

They understand a fundamental characteristic of corruption: it does not occur in a vacuum. To target corruption is to touch simultaneously the myriad injustices to which it is linked, from violence and poverty to impunity, abuse, authoritarianism, unaccountability, and environmental destruction. Thus, fighting malfeasance is not a superficial solution that avoids the underlying problem; it can be a direct attack on oppression, thereby impacting prospects for democracy, human rights, poverty alleviation, and postconflict transformation.

The Corruption-Poverty-Violence Nexus

The World Bank has identified corruption as one of the greatest obstacles to economic and social development, finding that graft undermines development by “distorting the rule of law and weakening the institutional foundation on which economic growth depends.”⁴ According to Transparency International, the global civil society coalition against corruption, a review of past and current efforts to reduce poverty suggests that corruption has been a constant obstacle for countries trying to bring about the political, economic, and social changes necessary for their development. The coalition concluded, “Across different country contexts, corruption has been a cause and consequence of poverty.”⁵

A 2004 report of the UN Secretary-General’s High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges, and Change concluded that “corruption, illicit trade and money-laundering contribute to State weakness, impede economic growth, and undermine democracy. These activities thus create a permissive environment for civil conflict.”⁶ A risk analysis from the 2011 World Bank Development Report found that “countries where government effectiveness, rule of law, and control of corruption are weak have a 30–45 percent higher risk of civil war, and significantly higher risk of extreme criminal violence than other developing countries.”⁷ The report also found that in surveys conducted in six postconflict countries and territories, citizens named corruption, poverty, unemployment, and inequality as the main drivers of violent strife.⁸ The official declaration of the Fourteenth International Anti-Corruption

Conference (IACC), held in November 2010, stated, “Corruption was identified as a facilitator and generator of civil conflict, as an inhibitor of peace-building, as correlated with terrorism, and as a facilitator of nuclear proliferation.”⁹ Finally, a European Commission checklist, on the root causes of conflict and early warning indicators, includes the corruption troika of bribery in bureaucracies, collusion between the private sector and civil servants, and organized crime.¹⁰

In addition to violent conflict, at an aggregate level, corruption has been found to be positively correlated with higher risks of political instability and human rights abuses.¹¹ Human Rights Watch cites a direct relationship between corruption and political violence, in which public officials use stolen public revenues to pay for political violence in support of their ambitions.¹² Corruption also creates an overall climate of impunity.¹³ Human Rights Watch and the Center for Victims of Torture tie corruption to repression, as it hampers government accountability while benefitting officials and security forces that commit abuses for financial gain.¹⁴ The Fourteenth IACC noted, “In trafficking, particularly of human beings, corruption is seen to play a facilitating role at every stage in the process, keeping the crime from becoming visible, buying impunity when a case is detected, expediting the physical movement of trafficked individuals, and ensuring that its victims stay beholden to the system that first victimised them.”¹⁵

Corruption inhibits sustainable peace in multiple ways, some direct and others indirect. Corruption is often the venal legacy of violent strife and is embedded into the political, social, and economic fabric of the society. Cheyanne Scharbatke-Church and Kirby Reiling point out that war economies, by their nature, function through malfeasance; the parties in the conflict depend on fraud, bribery, and criminal groups to expedite the smooth functioning of the system.¹⁶ Arms traffickers and transnational organized crime add to the deadly mix by readily providing weapons. The global illicit arms trade is estimated at \$200 million to \$300 million annually, and Africa is the largest market. As a result, the continent tragically suffers the most casualties from it.¹⁷

Moreover, corruption can draw out or perpetuate civil or regional conflicts because it functions as an enabler; violent groups themselves engage in illicit activities to acquire weapons and supplies. Nowhere is this process more wrenchingly evident than in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), where approximately 3.5 million lives have been lost since the onset of war in 1998 and hundreds of thousands of girls and women have been systematically raped.¹⁸ The military, rebel groups, and various foreign allies have plundered the country’s diamonds, gold, timber, ivory, coltan, and cobalt, not only to finance their atrocities, but

ultimately to enrich themselves, which has become an end unto itself.¹⁹ Over the past decade, violent confrontations over the Casamance region have broken out among The Gambia, Guinea Bissau, and Senegal, and between Cameroon and Nigeria in the oil-rich Bakassi peninsula for an equal length of time. A US Agency for International Development (USAID) report concluded that corruption, more often than not, played a key role in fomenting and protracting these conflicts.²⁰

Furthermore, when corruption is endemic—whereby a complex system of graft permeates the political system, economic spheres, and basic provision of services in a country—it can stimulate social unrest and foment violent conflict. For example, in the Niger Delta, insurgent groups are amassing weapons and recruiting young men from an impoverished, angry, and frustrated population that experiences little benefit from oil wealth while living amid horrendous environmental destruction from its extraction and processing.²¹

In the postconflict context, corruption can function as an inhibitor of sustainable peace, the latter needing human security and stability to take root and flourish.²² First, graft can allow the entrenchment of the political status quo that operated during the conflict.²³ Second, it undermines the new government's legitimacy; rule of law; and capacity for reconstruction, economic development, and the provision of basic public services. For ordinary citizens, the horrors of war are replaced with grueling hardship, to which pervasive malfeasance adds another layer of tangible injustice, as is the case in Afghanistan. In a 2010 poll, 83 percent of Afghans said that corruption affects their daily lives.²⁴ As a result, the Taliban is recruiting new members from among the marginalized population oppressed by unrelenting graft and poverty. "People support armed groups to express their dissatisfaction with the government," contends an Afghan civil society actor.²⁵ At a 2012 US Senate committee meeting, General John Allen stated, "We know that corruption still robs Afghan citizens of their faith in the government, and that poor governance itself often advances insurgent messages."²⁶

Corruption can also be an enabler of state capture in postconflict or fragile democracies, fueling yet more violence and claiming the lives of civilians as well as those who try to fight it.²⁷ Tragically escalating in Central America, narco-corruption refers to the interrelationship between transnational drug cartels and state security forces, as well as the infiltration of organized crime interests into politics, governance, and the actual functioning of institutions, leading to countries such as Mexico and Guatemala being called narco-states. During the six years of Mexican president Felipe Calderon's tenure, the drug war claimed an

estimated 100,000 lives, while 25,000 adults and children went missing, according to leaked government documents.²⁸ The chief of the UN Office of Drugs and Crime has asserted, “Corruption, poverty, and poor criminal justice capacity make Guatemala extremely vulnerable to organized crime.”²⁹ Not coincidentally, the country is experiencing the worst violence since the cessation of the thirty-six-year civil war in 1996. Approximately 5,000 people are murdered each year due to organized crime and gangs, now compounded by Mexican drug cartels’ expanding south across the border.³⁰ By 2011, the World Bank reported that criminal violence was killing more Guatemalans than did the civil war during the 1980s.³¹ Narco-corruption, of course, is not limited to the Americas. According to a confidential source, the drug trade in Afghanistan also serves as the main source of financing for the private armies of local warlords, which are connected to parts of the postconflict government. The Taliban is in on the game as well, exchanging drugs for weapons.³² Anticorruption advocates point out that there cannot be genuine security and freedom for citizens when law enforcement is compromised by malfeasance.³³

Peacebuilding and Anticorruption Synergies

Up until quite recently, the linkages between anticorruption and peacebuilding could be characterized as a “tale of two communities.”³⁴ Traditionally, the former focused on technocratic and legislative policies and reforms, while the latter attempted to promote dialogue and reconcile competing groups and interests.³⁵ Yet they have much in common. First, they share overlapping challenges, including use of power, impunity, societal trust, and socially harmful notions, such as a zero-sum approach.³⁶ Second, the peacebuilding and anticorruption spheres both seek longer-term goals of social and economic justice; transparent, accountable governance; human rights; and equitable use of resources. Finally, they emphasize change at the sociopolitical level (for example, institutional practices, social norms) and at the individual level (for example, knowledge, skills, and attitudes).³⁷ Scharbatke-Church and Reiling aptly conclude, “As conflicts are riddled with corruption, peacebuilding work should be appropriately riddled with anticorruption efforts.”³⁸

Moving forward, the anticorruption realm needs to better comprehend postconflict dynamics when dealing with graft in such settings.³⁹ Indeed, there are promising developments on this front. One of the main themes of the Fourteenth International Anti-Corruption Conference in

2010 was “Restoring Trust for Peace and Security,” which examined “the dynamic linkages between corruption, peace, and security.”⁴⁰ As importantly, the peacebuilding community ought to fully address the corruption-violence relationship. Scharbatke-Church and Reiling assert that few peacebuilding agencies have developed capacities and programs that seek to impact “the vicious network of corruption and conflict.”⁴¹ Instead, peace agreements and international reconstruction actors have turned propagators of violence into postconflict winners. Organized crime bosses and warlords (sometimes one and the same) who used the conflict to reap profits are reconstituted as political and economic players. When they gain access to state resources, the opportunities for enrichment through corruption are vast.⁴²

One needs only to look at Afghanistan, the Balkans, DRC, and Sierra Leone to witness such outcomes. In Afghanistan the post-Bonn agreement government gave warlords high-ranking government positions, which played a role in the endemic corruption and unaccountable, poor governance that has come to characterize the war-torn country.⁴³ Some notorious commanders maintain militias under the guise of private security companies, which provide protection, in some cases under conditions of extortion, for NATO troops and external aid organizations.⁴⁴ These commanders have moved into business (both licit and illicit) and won seats under flawed elections or have proxies in the Parliament.⁴⁵ Turning to the Balkans, mafia structures in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo endeavored to tie up their power by gaining control over local political and economic processes.⁴⁶ In Africa, former rebel leaders in the DRC were appointed vice presidents. They were allowed to place cronies in senior positions in state-run companies, from which millions of dollars were embezzled.⁴⁷ In Sierra Leone, Foday Sankoh, the deceased leader of the Revolutionary United Front (RUF), indicted on seventeen counts of crimes against humanity in 2003, had initially been pardoned and appointed vice president. He was left in control of the diamond mines under the 1999 Lomé Peace Accord, which ended the country’s civil war. The agreement enabled the RUF to form a political party, gave it several cabinet seats in the transitional government, and granted all combatants total amnesty.⁴⁸

Adding Civil Resistance to the Peacebuilding-Anticorruption Equation

One crucial element needs to be added to the peacebuilding-anticorruption equation: civil resistance and the power of regular people to bring forth

change. Strategic nonviolent action scholar Stephen Zunes notes that when authoritarian or ineffectual governance is paired with endemic corruption, a vicious cycle can develop that leads to further delegitimization of authority and rule of law, which in turn reinforces authoritarian or ineffectual governance, impunity, poverty, and on and on.⁴⁹ The result is what nonviolent conflict educator Jack DuVall calls “fragmented tyrannies”—weak, fragile democracies or semiauthoritarian systems in which citizens live under conditions of violence, abuse, human insecurity, and fear perpetrated by multiple state and nonstate entities.⁵⁰ Zunes points out that civil resistance has the potential to activate an anticorruption cycle.⁵¹ Nonviolent social movements and grassroots civic campaigns can challenge the corruption-poverty-violence nexus, in turn creating alternative loci of power, thereby empowering the civic realm to continue to wage strategic civic campaigns and movements that continue to challenge the corrupt, unequal status quo.⁵²

Civil Resistance Defined

Civil resistance is a civilian-based process to fight oppression, impunity, and injustice through people power. It is also called “nonviolent resistance,” “nonviolent struggle,” “nonviolent conflict,” and “nonviolent action.” Civil resistance is nonviolent in that it does not employ the threat or use of violence, and popular in the sense that it involves the participation of regular people standing together against oppression. Maciej Bartkowski, a civil resistance scholar, summarizes it in this manner: “Whether overt or tacit, nonviolent forms of resistance are a popular expression of people’s collective determination to withdraw their cooperation from the powers that be. People can refuse to follow a coerced or internalized system of lies and deception, and thereby, intentionally increase the cost of official control.”⁵³

While the terms “civil resistance” and “people power” are often used interchangeably, I draw a distinction. Civil resistance generates people power. Thus, it constitutes the means, process, or methodology through which people can wield collective power. What exactly is this form of power? It consists of significant numbers of individuals organized together around shared grievances and goals, exerting social, economic, political, and psychological pressure and engaging in nonviolent strategies and tactics, such as civil disobedience, noncooperation, strikes, boycotts, monitoring, petition drives, low-risk mass actions, and demonstrations. The pioneering nonviolent struggle theorist Gene Sharp documented over 198 types of tactics, and movements and

campaigns, including those targeting corruption, are creating new ones continuously.⁵⁴

The efficacy of civil resistance is not a matter of theory or conjecture. People power campaigns and movements have a rich history of curbing oppression and injustice and a proven track record of success over violent resistance. A landmark book by Erica Chenoweth and Maria Stephan documents that, in the last century, violent campaigns succeeded historically in only 26 percent of all cases, compared to 53 percent in the case of nonviolent, civilian-based campaigns, even facing extremely brutal regimes.⁵⁵ Thirty of the nonviolent campaigns studied occurred in countries that ranked as autocracies (between -7 and -10 on the Polity IV scale), and all experienced severe repression.⁵⁶ Nonetheless, twenty-one of them (70 percent) succeeded, an even higher success rate than average for nonviolent campaigns facing other types of regimes.⁵⁷ Finally, subsequent analysis overall found a high correlation between nonviolent campaigns and a democratic outcome five years later.⁵⁸

Similarly, a quantitative analysis of transitions from authoritarianism to democracy over the past three decades found that civil resistance was a key factor in driving 75 percent of political transitions, and such transformations were far more likely to result in democratic reform and civil liberties than violent or elite-led, top-down changes. Of the thirty-five countries subsequently rated “Free” according to a Freedom House index, thirty-two had a significant bottom-up civil resistance component.⁵⁹ In contrast, the 2011 World Bank Development Report established that 90 percent of civil wars waged over the past decade took place in countries that had already suffered from civil war at some point during the previous thirty years.⁶⁰ In other words, nonviolent struggle not only has a greater chance of success than violent conflict; it lays the foundation for a more peaceful and fair aftermath. Thus, the historical record confirms what Gandhi understood decades ago: the form of struggle impacts the outcome. He wrote, “The means may be likened to a seed, the end to a tree; and there is just the same inviolable connection between the means and the end as there is between the seed and the tree.”⁶¹

Corruption was a source of public anger and one of the key grievances around which people mobilized in many of the nonviolent movements targeting authoritarian regimes, including the People Power Revolution in the Philippines; the nonviolent resistance to Serbian dictator Slobodan Milosevic, catalyzed by the youth movement OTPOR; the Rose Revolution in Georgia; and the Orange Revolutions in Ukraine in

2004 and February 2014.⁶² Well before the people power uprisings in Tunisia and Egypt, malfeasance was the target of citizen dissent in the region, part of a rich and relatively unknown history of civil resistance from the early 1900s onward.⁶³ In 1997, over the course of six weeks, the One Minute of Darkness for Constant Light campaign mobilized approximately 30 million Turkish citizens in synchronized low-risk mass actions to pressure the government to take specific measures to combat systemic corruption (see Chapter 10). In May 2006 a group of young men and women, communicating through text messages, launched the Orange Movement against political corruption in Kuwait. Their nonviolent tactics, including leafleting the Parliament, enlisted public support and participation, resulting in early parliamentary elections in which legislation to change electoral districts (to prevent corruption) became a major campaign issue and was later adopted.⁶⁴

Founded by Egyptian women in 2005, *shayfeen.com* (a play on words meaning “we see you” in Arabic) increased public awareness about corruption, fostered citizen participation, monitored the government, broadcast election fraud in real time via the Internet, and proved their activities were valid under the United Nations Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC), to which Egypt was a signatory. The campaign spawned the Egyptians against Corruption movement (see Chapter 10). Endemic corruption was also one of the main injustices identified by the historic, youth-driven April 6, 2008, general strike (Facebook Revolution), which evolved into the April 6 movement that played a catalytic role in the Egyptian January 25 Revolution. We Are All Khaled Said, the second key youth group in the revolution, originally came into existence in 2010 following the torture and death of the twenty-eight-year-old, who had posted a video on the Internet of police officers dividing up confiscated drugs and money among themselves.⁶⁵

Common Misconceptions About People Power in the Anticorruption Context

The capacity of everyday people to nonviolently bring forth political, social, and economic change controverts deeply ingrained notions about people and power—its sources, how it is wielded, and who holds it.⁶⁶ Three common, interrelated misconceptions about people power resistance regularly crop up in the anticorruption and development literature.

Myth #1: The need for a government or institutions willing to fight corruption. The underlying premise of this misconception is that citi-

zens cannot make a difference unless powerholders also want to realize change. It is common to find pronouncements such as, “Thus, the predisposition of the state to citizen engagement in governance is a central determining factor for the success of social accountability.”⁶⁷ If this were the case, then there would be little point for citizens to initiate efforts to tackle graft. In reality, people power has the capacity to create political will where it did not exist, apply pressure on recalcitrant institutions and governments to take action, and support those within the state or other institutions who are attempting to fight the corrupt system but have been blocked or threatened.

An unprecedented people power victory in Brazil illustrates this process (see Chapter 4). Following the failure of political reform bills, in 2008 a coalition of forty-four civic groups, including grassroots and church organizations, unions, and professional associations, formed the Movement Against Electoral Corruption (MCCE). It developed the *Ficha Limpa* (meaning “clean record” or “clean slate”) legislation, which would render candidates ineligible to take office if they have been convicted of the following crimes by more than one judge: misuse of public funds, drug trafficking, rape, murder, or racism. The bill was introduced to Congress through the Popular Initiative clause in the Brazilian constitution, by a massive petition effort that gathered over 1.6 million handwritten signatures. Digital and real-world actions, coordinated by Avaaz, pushed the legislation through Congress in spite of fierce opposition as many sitting representatives would be impacted once the law came into effect.⁶⁸ It was approved in June 2010.⁶⁹

Myth #2: A legislative framework, civil liberties, and access to information are necessary for success. Because of this myth, one encounters such deterministic statements as, “Formal democracy and the existence of basic civil and political rights is a critical precondition for virtually any kind of civil society activism that engages critically with the state.”⁷⁰ If this were the case, citizens living in less than ideal situations would be doomed, while those living in more beneficent contexts should succeed. Fortunately, this misconception is refuted by the historical record and comparative research discussed earlier, as well as my investigation on corruption. In spite of difficult circumstances, or perhaps because of them, bottom-up campaigns targeting graft and abuse are most often found in places that are not paragons of accountability and rights, and many of the struggles seek to achieve the very things cited as prerequisites. For example, Integrity Watch Afghanistan is empowering villagers in community mobilization and democratic decisionmaking under conditions of ongoing violent conflict, negligible rule of law,

human rights abuses, and limited access to information (see Chapter 8). The group trains local volunteers, chosen by peers, to monitor projects selected by the villages, in order to curb corruption and improve reconstruction and development (which can involve numerous players—from donors to foreign military, contractors, subcontractors, suppliers, national and subnational levels of the state, and nonstate entities). As a result, not only is graft reduced, people gain tangible results, such as schools, roads, and clinics. Moreover, relations with local state authorities often improve, and in some cases, the influence of warlords has been weakened as communities became more autonomous and confident to solve their own problems.⁷¹

*Myth #3: Governments need to give people civic space to make their voices heard.*⁷² There are many varieties of this notion, which leads to claims such as, “Countries where technological advancement and rising voices of citizens are more tolerated have greater civic participation and a more vibrant civil society.”⁷³ This misconception is based on the assumption that citizen engagement and action are dependent on governments to give them space, to allow them to express dissent, and ultimately, to refrain from repression. In the final analysis, this would mean that no matter what regular people do, they are ultimately dependent on the benevolence of the government, ruler, or authority. The reality could not be more different.

Comparative research on nonviolent versus violent struggles confirms that while the level of repression can shape nonviolent struggles, it is not a significant determinant of their outcome. The Chenoweth and Stephan study found that in the face of crackdowns, nonviolent campaigns are six times more likely to achieve full success than violent campaigns that also faced repression.⁷⁴ Nor do harsh attacks signify that people power has failed. In the corruption context, attacks can be a sign that the system is being undermined and vested interests are threatened. Successful nonviolent movements develop strategies to build resilience, such as the use of low-risk mass actions and dilemma actions, the latter putting the oppressor in a lose-lose situation and the civic initiative in a win-win situation.⁷⁵ The Dosta! nonviolent youth movement in Bosnia-Herzegovina was particularly adept at fusing humor with dilemma actions (see Chapter 10). Repression against such civic dissent can “backfire” by delegitimizing the oppressors, transforming public outrage into support for the movement or campaign, and shifting or weakening the loyalties of those within the corrupt system who do not approve of such harsh measures against peaceful citizens.⁷⁶

States—and violent nonstate actors such as organized crime and paramilitaries—will still try to limit political and civic space. But through civil resistance, citizens have the capacity to claim space, expand it, and use it. Thus, civic space is neither finite nor dependent on the goodwill of governments to grant it. The 2011 people power movements in Tunisia and Egypt are examples of how—in societies where authoritarian regimes choked off virtually all space—people carved it open, mobilizing and wielding nonviolent power to the extent that two brutal dictators were forced to step down after decades of rule.

Beyond Structural Determinism

At the heart of all these misconceptions is an ingrained belief that civil resistance and people power achievements are structurally determined.⁷⁷ In other words, certain conditions are needed for success, and their absence is a harbinger for failure. The historical record, aforementioned research, this study, and a unique investigation conclusively prove otherwise. Utilizing Freedom House's database, begun in 1972—a regression analysis of sixty-four countries experiencing transitions to democracy—found that “neither the political nor environmental factors examined in the study had a statistically significant impact on the success or failure of civil resistance movements.”⁷⁸ Civic movements were as likely to succeed in less-developed, economically poor countries as in developed, affluent ones. Nor was significant evidence found that ethnic or religious differences limited possibilities for a unified civic opposition to emerge.⁷⁹ The only exception concerned the centralization of power. It was found that among the small number of decentralized regimes, “The more political power was dispersed to local leaders or governors throughout the country, the less likely it was that a successful national civic movement would emerge.”⁸⁰

A meta-case study analysis emerging from the development and democracy realm echoes these results. This ten-year research program on citizenship, participation, and accountability concluded that citizen engagement “can make positive differences, even in the least democratic settings—a proposition that challenges the conventional wisdom of an institution- and state-oriented approach that relegates opportunities for citizens to engage in a variety of participatory strategies to a more ‘mature’ democratic phase.”⁸¹

In conclusion, civil resistance and people power can succeed even in unfavorable conditions. Skills—in planning, tactical innovation, and communications, and in building unity, strategy, self-organization, and

nonviolent discipline—play a critical role in overcoming obstacles. These capacities can change adverse conditions, thereby altering the political, social, and economic terrain on which the struggle takes place.

Notes

1. Occupy Wall Street website, <http://occupywallst.org/> (accessed September 30, 2013).
2. “People See Corruption Getting Worse but Are Ready to Get Involved, Says Biggest Transparency International Global Public Opinion Survey,” press release, Transparency International, December 9, 2010, www.transparency.org.
3. Thomas Friedman, “Two Peas in a Pod,” *New York Times*, November 8, 2011, www.nytimes.com.
4. “Fraud and Corruption: Frequently Asked Questions,” World Bank, <http://web.worldbank.org> (accessed September 30, 2013).
5. Civicus, “Poverty and Corruption” (Working Paper #02/2008, Transparency International), <http://www.civicus.org>.
6. *United Nations, A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility, Report of the Secretary-General’s High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges, and Change*, UN Doc a/59/565, December 1, 2004, 20–21, www.unrol.org.
7. *World Bank Development Report 2011: Conflict, Security, and Development* (Washington, DC: World Bank, 2011).
8. Emma Batha, “FACTBOX: World Bank Report Highlights Links Between Conflict and Poverty,” Thompson Reuters Foundation, April 11, 2011, www.trust.org.
9. Fourteenth International Anti-Corruption Conference, “The Bangkok Declaration: Restoring Trust,” November 13, 2010, <http://14iacc.org>.
10. “European Commission Check-List for Root Causes of Conflict,” Conflict Prevention Section/External Relations, European Commission, <http://www.ceipaz.org>.
11. Philippe Le Billon, “Buying Peace or Fueling War: The Role of Corruption in Armed Conflicts,” *Journal of International Development* 15 (2003): 413–426.
12. “Corruption, Godfatherism, and the Funding of Political Violence,” Human Rights Watch, October 2007, <http://hrw.org>.
13. Daniel Kaufmann, “Human Rights, Governance, and Development: An Empirical Perspective,” in *Human Rights and Development: Towards Mutual Reinforcement*, ed. Philip Alston and Mary Robinson, 352–402 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).
14. Arvind Ganesan, “Human Rights and Corruption: The Linkages,” Human Rights Watch, July 30, 2007, <http://hrw.org>.
15. Fourteenth International Anti-Corruption Conference, “Bangkok Declaration.”
16. Cheyanne Scharbatke-Church and Kirby Reiling, “Lilies That Fester: Seeds of Corruption and Peacebuilding,” *New Routes Journal of Peace Research and Action* 14, no. 3–4 (2009): 4–9.
17. “Eradicating Arms Trafficking Will Further Peace in Central Africa, Say UN officials,” United Nations News Centre, March 19, 2010, www.un.org.

18. The statistics cited have been sourced from Global Witness and UNICEF. See “Same Old Story: A Background Study on Natural Resources in the Democratic Republic of Congo,” Global Witness, June 2004, 5, www.globalwitness.org; “UNICEF, V-Day Put Rape in Democratic Republic of the Congo Front and Center,” UNICEF press release, April 12, 2008, www.unicef.org.
19. Global Witness, “Same Old Story.”
20. “Conflict Prevention and Anti-Corruption Overview,” USAID West Africa, September 2007, www.usaid.gov.
21. *Niger Delta Human Development Report* (Abuja: United Nations Development Programme, 2006), <http://hdr.undp.org>.
22. Martti Ahtisaari, “Violence Prevention: A Critical Dimension of Development Conference” (presentation, World Bank, Washington, DC, April 6, 2009).
23. Philippe Le Billon, “Thought Piece: What Is the Impact? Effects of Corruption in Post-Conflict” (paper for the Nexus: Corruption, Conflict, and Peacebuilding Colloquium, the Institute for Human Security, the Fletcher School, Tufts University, Boston, MA, April 12–13, 2007), <http://fletcher.tufts.edu>.
24. Craig Whitlock, “Pentagon Says Instability in Afghanistan Has ‘Leveled Off,’” *Washington Post*, April 29, 2010, www.washingtonpost.com.
25. Confidential source.
26. Frank Vogl, “Afghan Corruption Imperils Future Success,” *USA Today*, February 10, 2013, www.usatoday.com.
27. State capture occurs when vested interests influence and manipulate the policymaking, political, and bureaucratic processes for their own advantage.
28. William Booth, “Mexico’s Crime Wave Has Left About 25,000 Missing, Government Documents Show,” *Washington Post*, November 29, 2012, www.washingtonpost.com.
29. “UNODC Assists Guatemala to Tackle Organized Crime,” United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime (UNODC), March 17, 2010, www.unodc.org.
30. Stephen S. Dudley, “How Mexico’s Drug War Is Killing Guatemala,” *Foreign Policy*, July 20, 2010, www.foreignpolicy.com; Mariana Sanchez, “Drug Gangs Fuel Political Violence,” Al-Jazeera International video report, September 9, 2007, <http://bravenewfilms.org>.
31. *World Bank Development Report 2011*.
32. Jerome Starkey, “Drugs for Guns: How the Afghan Heroin Trade Is Fueling the Taliban Insurgency,” *The Independent*, April 29, 2008, www.independent.co.uk.
33. Fourteenth International Anti-Corruption Conference, “Bangkok Declaration.”
34. Raymond June and Nathaniel Heller, “Corruption and Anti-Corruption in Peacebuilding: Toward a Unified Framework,” *New Routes Journal of Peace Research and Action* 14, no. 3–4 (2009): 10–13.
35. *Ibid.*
36. Scharbatke-Church and Reiling, “Lilies That Fester.”
37. *Ibid.*
38. *Ibid.*, 3.
39. June and Heller, “Corruption and Anti-Corruption in Peacebuilding.”
40. Fourteenth International Anti-Corruption Conference, “Bangkok Declaration.”

41. Scharbatke-Church and Reiling, "Lilies That Fester," 5.
42. Phyllis Dininio, "Warlords and Corruption in Post-Conflict Governments," *New Routes Journal of Peace Research and Action* 14, no. 3–4 (2009): 27–29.
43. Ibid.
44. Antonio Giustozzi, "Afghanistan: Transition Without End," Crisis States Research Centre, London School of Economics and Political Science (Crisis States working papers series 2, no. 40, November 2008), <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/22938/>.
45. Aryn Baker, "The Warlords of Afghanistan," *Time*, February 12, 2009, www.time.com; Tom Peter, "A Changing of the Guard for Afghanistan's Warlords," *Christian Science Monitor*, October 27, 2010, www.csmonitor.com.
46. Karen Ballentine and Heiko Nitzschke, "The Political Economy of Civil War and Conflict Transformation," Berghof Research Centre for Constructive Conflict Management, Berlin, April 2005, www.berghof-handbook.net.
47. "Congo's Elections: Making or Breaking the Peace," Africa Report, International Crisis Group, no. 108, April 27, 2006, www.crisisgroup.org.
48. Kendra Dupuy and Helga Malmin Binningsbo, "Buying Peace with Diamonds?" Centre for the Study of Civil War Policy Brief, International Peace Research Institute, July 2008, www.prio.no.
49. Stephen Zunes, panel presentation at the Thirteenth International Anti-Corruption Conference, Athens, October 31, 2008.
50. My colleague Jack DuVall coined the term "fragmented tyrannies." Personal communication with author, Washington, DC, July 2008.
51. Zunes, panel presentation at the Thirteenth International Anti-Corruption Conference.
52. The civic realm refers to the collective nonstate, bottom-up initiatives and relationships in a society, including nonviolent civic campaigns and movements; civil society organizations (CSOs); nongovernmental organizations (NGOs); community-based organizations (CBOs); civic coalitions and alliances; unions; professional organizations; grassroots networks, committees, and collectives; local citizen groups; activists, community organizers, and last but not least, citizens.
53. Maciej Bartkowski, ed., *Recovering Nonviolent History: Civil Resistance in Liberation Struggles* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2013), 5.
54. Gene Sharp, *Waging Nonviolent Struggle: 20th-Century Practice and 21st-Century Potential* (Boston: Porter Sargent, 2005).
55. Erica Chenoweth and Maria Stephan, *Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2011).
56. The Polity IV scale is a conceptual scheme that examines "concomitant qualities of democratic and autocratic authority in governing institutions, rather than discreet and mutually exclusive forms of governance." It delineates a spectrum of governing authority from what are termed fully institutionalized autocracies through mixed, or incoherent, authority regimes to fully institutionalized democracies. The Polity Score is based on a 21-point scale ranging from –10 (hereditary monarchy) to +10 (consolidated democracy). For additional information, see www.systemicpeace.org.
57. Erica Chenoweth, "A Skeptic's Guide to Nonviolent Resistance," *Rational Insurgent*, March 9, 2011, <http://rationalinsurgent.wordpress.com>.

58. Ibid.

59. Adrian Karatnycky and Peter Ackerman, *How Freedom Is Won: From Civic Resistance to Durable Democracy* (New York: Freedom House, 2005).

60. *World Development Report 2011*.

61. M. K. Gandhi, *Hind Swaraj or Indian Home Rule* (n.p., 1938), chap. 16, <http://www.mkgandhi.org>.

62. For research on civil resistance and the history of nonviolent social movements, see the following: Peter Ackerman and Jack DuVall, *A Force More Powerful: A Century of Nonviolent Conflict* (New York: Palgrave, 2000); Adam Roberts and Timothy Garton Ash, *Civil Resistance and Power Politics: From Gandhi to the Present* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009); Sharp, *Waging Nonviolent Struggle*; Maria Stephan, ed., *Civilian Jihad: Nonviolent Struggle, Democratization, and Governance in the Middle East* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).

63. For additional information, see Mary King, *A Quiet Revolution: The First Palestinian Intifada and Nonviolent Resistance* (New York: Nation Books, 2007); Stephan, *Civilian Jihad*.

64. Hamad Albloshi and Faisal Alfahad, "The Orange Movement of Kuwait: Civic Pressure Transforms a Political System," in *Civilian Jihad: Nonviolent Struggle, Democratization, and Governance in the Middle East*, ed. Maria Stephan (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 219–232.

65. Ernesto Londono, "Egyptian Man's Death Became Symbol of Callous State," *Washington Post*, February 8, 2011, www.washingtonpost.com.

66. For an in-depth examination of misconceptions about civil resistance and people power, see Kurt Schock, *Unarmed Insurrections: People Power Movements in Non-Democracies* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005), 6–12.

67. *Reflections on Social Accountability: Catalyzing Democratic Governance to Accelerate Progress Towards the Millennium Development Goals*, United Nations Development Programme, 2013, 9, www.undp.org.

68. According to Congresso em Foco, a watchdog website, in 2010, 147 of the 513 members of the Chamber of Deputies of Congress (29 percent), and twenty-one out of eighty-one senators (26 percent), faced criminal charges in the Supreme Court or were under investigation.

69. UKAid, "Active Citizens, Accountable Governments: Civil Society Experiences from the Latin America Partnership Programme Arrangement," Department of Foreign and International Affairs, n.d., www.aidsalliance.org.

70. *Best Practices in the Participatory Approach to Delivery of Social Services* (Addis Ababa: Economic Commission for Africa, 2004), 8.

71. Lorenzo Delesgues, Integrity Watch Afghanistan cofounder, personal communication with author, April 2011.

72. Civic space is the arena for public expression and dissent.

73. David Sasaki, "The Role of Technology and Citizen Media in Promoting Transparency, Accountability, and Civic Participation," Technology for Transparency Network, May 27, 2010, 13, <http://globalvoicesonline.org>.

74. Maria Stephan and Erica Chenoweth, "Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict," *International Security* 33, no. 1 (Summer 2008): 7–44.

75. Dilemma actions put the oppressor in a situation whereby the actions it takes will result in some kind of negative outcome for it and some kind of positive outcome for the nonviolent campaign or movement. For information about dilemma actions, see Srdja Popovic, Slobodan Djinovic, Andre J. Milivojevic, Hardy Merriman, and Ivan Marovic, *A Guide to Effective Nonviolent Struggle* (Belgrade: Centre for Applied Nonviolent Action and Strategies, 2007), chap. 12.

76. Backfire occurs when an attack creates more support for or attention to whatever is attacked—in this context, civic initiatives targeting corruption and abuse. For information about backfire, see www.bmartin.cc/pubs/backfire.html.

77. Schock, *Unarmed Insurrections*.

78. Eleanor Marchant, *Enabling Environments for Civic Movements and the Dynamics of Democratic Transition*, Freedom House, 2008, www.freedomhouse.org.

79. Ibid., “Overview.”

80. Ibid., “Principal Findings.”

81. John Gaventa and Gregory Barrett, “So What Difference Does It Make? Mapping the Outcomes of Citizen Engagement” (Institute of Development Studies, Working Paper 2010, no. 347, October 2010, 54), www.ntd.co.uk.

