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Lost in Translation: Can Exporting ADR Harm Rule of Law Development?

Cynthia Alkon*

I. INTRODUCTION

Imagine a country that is known for its natural beauty and tasty cuisine. It is also a land whose people have experience with repressive, authoritarian, and totalitarian leaders. It is a land with vast potential, but its people live with low rates of development, a struggling economy, and a government that is best known for its endemic corruption, not the services it provides its people. The international community decided years ago to provide foreign assistance in many forms, including rule of law development assistance. Yet, despite all of this help, the country still struggles. Lawyers, judges, and human rights advocates all complain that case overcrowding is a serious problem that blocks access to justice in the court system for both criminal and civil cases. There is no tradition or process to settle cases before going to trial. The question is raised “why don’t we pass a law to allow us to negotiate and settle our criminal cases through plea bargaining?” Soon a new law is passed and criminal defendants who once spent months, or years, waiting in pretrial detention for court dates now enter guilty pleas, which for many, means paying a fine and immediate release. The court system clears out, case backlogs reduce, the human rights situation improves as fewer defendants spend time in the poor pretrial detention facilities, and defendants no longer spend months waiting for trials that they have no hope of winning.

It sounds like a win-win solution. It is exactly what we would want to encourage and is a great example to show the value of alternative processes like negotiating cases. So, what is the problem? Imagine further that in this country plea bargaining is seen by the general public as state-sanctioned corruption. Newspapers and the media report that defendants are paying money to be released from jail or to have their cases dismissed. News also gets out that some defendants received better plea deals in exchange for agreeing not to file complaints about torture or ill treatment by the police. Instead of an alternative process that is supporting the formal legal system, the general public starts to look at plea bargaining as just another form of corruption and it seems to contribute to further eroding any remaining trust or confidence that the general public might have in their legal system. Unfortunately, this is not a fictional account. The situation described above is essentially what happened in the Republic of Georgia after the country introduced plea bargaining of criminal cases in 2003.1

* Associate Professor of Law, Texas Wesleyan University School of Law. Thank you to Professors Richard Reuben and Peter Reilly for their helpful comments and suggestions.

1. See Section V of this article for a discussion on when promotion of ADR programs may work against the development of the rule of law. For a more in depth analysis, see generally Cynthia Alkon,
Examples such as this lead to the question, can alternative dispute resolution (ADR) harm the development of rule of law in other countries? Rule of law assistance programs seem to think not, as they increasingly include forms of ADR in rule of law development work around the globe. However, as these programs increase, there is also an increasing need for better analysis of when and where to support ADR programs as part of the rule of law development assistance package in individual countries. Fighting corruption is one reason ADR and rule of law practitioners give to explain why ADR should be included in rule of law programming. At the same time, ADR scholars and practitioners recognize that corruption within ADR is a possible problem in societies with already high rates of corruption. However, there has been less attention to whether introducing an ADR process could damage or contribute to delaying the development of rule of law in countries with already highly corrupt formal legal systems and with low levels of public trust in the legal system due, in part, to the damage that endemic corruption may have already done to public attitudes. In these countries, a new ADR process or program, such as plea bargaining in Georgia, may be viewed as just another informal process operating outside the law, in the same way that corruption operates.


2. For the purposes of this article I am using the term alternative dispute resolution (ADR) to refer to the large variety of processes to resolve disputes that are not litigation and include negotiation, mediation, and arbitration. For an analysis of how these processes might contribute to rule of law development, see Cynthia Alkon, The Cookie Cutter Syndrome: Legal Reform Assistance Under Post-Communist Democratization Programs, 2002 J. DISP. RESOL. 327, 329-30 (2002) [hereinafter The Cookie Cutter Syndrome]. This article will focus more on negotiation and mediation due to the informal nature of these processes and the narrow concern that the informality and non-public nature of these processes may negatively impact legitimacy and therefore the development of rule of law. Arbitration could also be a concern, particularly due to the private nature of the proceedings, but in developing countries, for a variety of reasons that are beyond the scope of this article to address, arbitration tends to operate without the same level of public attention and focus as mediation and negotiation programs. However, there is a concern that arbitration could pose a problem in countries “where the arbitration system and administering agency is no less corrupt than the corrupt courts it was designed to replace or supplement.” Carrie Menkel-Meadow, Correspondences and Contradictions in International and Domestic Conflict Resolution: Lessons from General Theory and Varied Contexts, 2003 J. DISP. RESOL. 319, 341 (2003) [hereinafter Correspondences and Contradictions in International and Domestic Conflict Resolution].

3. For example, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) provides a long list of ADR programs in Latin America and the Caribbean. See USAID, USAID Dispute Resolution Activities in Latin America and the Caribbean, http://www.usaid.gov/locations/latin_america_caribbean/democracy/adr/dg_conflict2b.html#Colombia (last visited on Mar. 13, 2011).


6. This article will not address the situation in countries, such as Afghanistan, without even moderately functional legal systems as the analysis and concerns are necessarily different in such countries.
The question explored here is whether ADR processes introduced to aid in the development of rule of law to help build legitimacy with legal authorities and institutions could instead work against legitimacy or further undermine it. This article will question whether establishing a new ADR program is advisable in a country with endemic corruption that is struggling to keep, or maintain, a moderately functional legal system. In these countries, the general public may view informal practices that occur in private and without standard rules to be another form of corruption and promoting such practices could reinforce already existing attitudes about the lack of rule of law.

This article will begin, in Section II, with a brief explanation of rule of law development work. Section III will describe the role of legitimacy in developing rule of law. Section IV will discuss some examples of how ADR programs are typically included in rule of law development work. Section V will discuss when promotion of ADR programs may work against the development of rule of law, specifically when ADR might seem more like a new form of corruption or when it might reinforce already existing bad practices. Section VI will offer some questions for ADR and rule of law development practitioners to consider in deciding whether to introduce such programs to avoid harming or reinforcing already existing poor public attitudes regarding the legitimacy of the formal legal system. These questions include: whether the dispute is private in nature and without any larger public policy concerns; whether there are serious power imbalances between the parties; whether the public is likely to be interested in the case; whether the general public is likely to think the new process is another form of corruption; and whether the dispute is private in nature and without any larger public policy concerns.

This article will also not address customary law or traditional dispute resolution practices that function outside, and without any connection to, the formal legal system. For a more complete analysis of aid to these types of dispute resolution programs and their potential contributions see generally Doing Justice, supra note 5, at 30-55.

7. USAID recognizes the importance of legitimacy and states that it is one of the five “essential elements of rule of law.” USAID, GUIDE TO RULE OF LAW COUNTRY ANALYSIS: THE RULE OF LAW STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK, A GUIDE FOR USAID DEMOCRACY AND GOVERNANCE OFFICERS 2 (2010) [hereinafter GUIDE TO RULE OF LAW COUNTRY ANALYSIS], available at http://www.usaid.gov/ourwork/democracy_and_governance/publications/pdfs/ROL_Strategic_Framework_Jan-2010_FINAL.pdf. The other elements are, “order and security, checks and balances, fairness, [and] effective application.” Id. at 1-2.

The perception of law as legitimate and worthy of adherence underpins the rule of law. In societies where the rule of law is observed, virtually all citizens obey laws, even when doing so contravenes their personal interests. This willingness is not based solely on the threat of sanctions; it also arises from the citizens’ recognition that laws are arrived at in a manner set out in a constitutional order and subject to social input. Therefore, the laws represent the collective will.

Id. at 9.

8. For the purposes of this article, a moderately functional legal system is one in which there are courts in place nationwide; where there are enough judges and lawyers to staff those courts; and where cases are regularly heard and decided in the courts nationwide, not just in the capital and a few major cities. In a moderately functional legal system there might be problems of case backlogs, but the key concern that defines a country as a moderately functional legal system is how the general public perceives the formal legal system and whether there is a widespread public perception that cases are routinely decided due to corruption and that power imbalances will inevitably define the outcome (with the powerful prevailing).

9. Another reason to exclude informal justice from the analysis in this article is that many of these processes occur in public and often include the village and/or all interested parties. Although these processes are not immune to charges of corruption, the open nature of the process means that they often do not risk reinforcing existing societal attitudes regarding corruption in the formal legal system. See Doing Justice, supra note 5, at 22.
whether there is funding to establish the newly established process; and whether there will be adequate monitoring of the new ADR process if it is implemented.10

These are exactly the kinds of questions that policy-makers, ADR scholars, and ADR practitioners give great thought to when they design ADR programs in developed democracies.11 These questions continue to be asked even after a particular type of ADR is firmly entrenched, such as mandatory mediation, and even after ADR has become the norm, not the exception, in the legal system.12 However, it often seems that serious consideration of these issues is somehow left behind in the process of travelling abroad and implementing programs in developing countries. This article encourages ADR practitioners and rule of law assistance providers to not allow the complexities of ADR processes, as they understand them at home, to be lost in translation as ADR programs are introduced into rule of law development programs in other countries.

II. RULE OF LAW DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

Rule of law development assistance in its broadest definition is foreign aid given to assist the development of the legal system in a given country.13 This type

10. These questions are regularly asked, in some form or another, by scholars, practitioners, and leaders in the ADR community in the United States when examining current ADR programs or discussing whether to introduce new ADR programs domestically. See, e.g., Carrie Monkel-Meadow, Whose Dispute is it Anyway?: A Philosophical and Democratic Defense of Settlement (in Some Cases), 83 GEO. L.J. 2663, 2670-71 (1995) [hereinafter Whose Dispute is it Anyway?] (suggesting three “key question[s]” in debating settlement and adjudication which are (1) When is it “legitimate” for parties to settle their disputes themselves; (2) When is consent “real” and when should it be allowed?; (3) When should other values win out over party consent and determine the forum for the dispute?); see also Trina Grillo, The Mediation Alternative: Process Dangers for Women, 100 YALE L.J. 1545, 1547-48 (1991) (analyzing the impact of mediation and mandatory mediation in child custody and divorce cases for less empowered parties, particularly women); Richard Delgado et al., Fairness and Formality: Minimizing the Risk of Prejudice in Alternative Dispute Resolution, 1985 Wis. L. Rev. 1359, 1391 (1985) (examining if the informal nature of ADR processes might disadvantage racial and ethnic minorities and suggesting that ADR processes are more appropriate between parties of equal status and power); David Luban, Settlements and the Erosion of the Public Realm, 83 GEO. L.J. 2619, 2658-59 (1995) (looking at how to better evaluate settlements and how settlements could include some of the public values of adjudication).

11. The debates for and against the use of ADR in a variety of contexts is lively, including the classic article: Owen M. Fiss, Comment, Against Settlement, 93 YALE L.J. 1073 (1984). Among the numerous articles responding to Prof. Fiss are some with discussions that are particularly relevant to illustrate the domestic debate surrounding issues raised in this article. See, generally e.g., Whose Dispute is it Anyway?, supra note 10; Luban, supra note 10; Michael Moffit, Three Things to be Against (“Settlement” Not Included), 78 FORD. L. REV. 1203 (2009); Amy J. Cohen, Revisiting Against Settlement: Some Reflections on Dispute Resolution and Public Values, 78 FORD. L. REV. 1143 (2009).

12. See Jean Sternlight, ADR is Here: Preliminary Reflections on Where It Fits in a System of Justice, 3 NEV. L.J. 289, 291-94 (2003) [hereinafter ADR is Here] (describing concerns and criticisms of ADR and offering “five insights” into ADR that recognize it is no longer a question whether to include ADR in the legal system in the USA due to the fact that ADR is already “an important part of our existing system of dispute resolution.”).

13. This article will not attempt to define rule of law. For a good brief explanation of the definitions in the rule of law development field and the difference between a "thick" and "thin" approach to rule of law, see PER BERGLING, RULE OF LAW ON THE INTERNATIONAL AGENDA: INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT TO LEGAL AND JUDICIAL REFORM IN INTERNATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, TRANSITION AND DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION 14-19 (2006) [hereinafter RULE OF LAW ON THE INTERNATIONAL AGENDA]; see also Rachel Kleinfeld, Competing Definitions of the Rule of Law, in PROMOTING THE
of assistance started with the Law and Development movement in the 1960s.\footnote{For a critical history, see JAMES A. GARDNER, LEGAL IMPERIALISM: AMERICAN LAWYERS AND FOREIGN AID IN LATIN AMERICA 31 (U. Wis. Press 1980). Some scholars state that this type of work actually began just after World War II. See, e.g., Lelia Mooney et al., Promoting the Rule of Law Abroad: A Conversation on its Evolution, Setbacks, and Future Challenges, 44 INT'L LAW 837, 840 (2010) [hereinafter Promoting the Rule of Law Abroad].} Rule of law development assistance grew dramatically in the 1990s as the Soviet bloc ceased to exist and grew further still into the beginning of this century as it was an integral part of the post-war development packages in Iraq and Afghanistan.\footnote{For more on rule of law and the negative impact this has on rule of law development assistance efforts, see, e.g., Promoting the Rule of Law, supra note 14, at 842-43; see Randall Peerenboom, Human Rights and Rule of Law: What's the Relationship? 36 GEO. J. INT'L L. 809, 840 (2005).} The United States, the United Nations, the European Union, the World Bank, and a growing number of other multi-lateral organizations and individual countries provide rule of law assistance as part of their overall development assistance packages. Donors provide rule of law development assistance for a variety of reasons including: to promote economic development;\footnote{See, e.g., How Democracies Emerge: The 'Sequencing' Fallacy, 18 J. OF DEM. 12, 12-13 (2007) (arguing against taking a sequential approach).} to improve human rights protections;\footnote{One question raised is whether democracy or rule of law should be aided together or whether rule of law is a necessary precursor to democracy. See Thomas Carothers, How Democracies Emerge: The 'Sequencing' Fallacy, 18 J. OF DEM. 12, 12-13 (2007) (arguing against taking a sequential approach).} to promote poverty reduction;\footnote{20. See generally JANE STROMSETH, DAVID WIPPMAN & ROSA BROOKS, CAN MIGHT MAKE RIGHTS? BUILDING THE RULE OF LAW AFTER MILITARY INTERVENTIONS (2006) [hereinafter CAN MIGHT MAKE RIGHTS?] (describing how rule of law assistance can be improved after future military interventions in post conflict reconstruction).} to develop or strengthen democracy;\footnote{21. Towards a New Consensus on Justice Reform, supra note 15, at 17 (discussing the rationales for criminal justice development aid).} to bring better safety and security to post-conflict countries\footnote{However, the type of aid provided may be different although it is offered for the same general reason. For example, the World Bank's poverty reduction development assistance is focused on formal judicial institutions, while the Asian Development Bank's poverty reduction development assistance is focused on community-based institutions including non-governmental organizations. Id. at 18.} and to promote peace-building and/or conflict-prevention.\footnote{Many donors do not have a singular type of work conducted by the program. Id. at 18.}
goal but include many, if not all, of the above reasons to explain their rule of law assistance programs.23

Rule of law practitioners understand that building the rule of law is long term work that depends on many elements.24 However, exactly how rule of law develops is not well understood.25 There have been few empirical studies on rule of law development and rule of law practitioners tend to operate more from a general understanding of what makes sense due to their past experience in other countries and less from clearly understood guidelines suggesting how to approach this type of development work.26 This distinguishes rule of law development work from more traditional development work, such as inoculation programs and bridge building that are more easily quantified, studied, and replicated and therefore, have clear guidelines about how to approach and accomplish their goals.

Rule of law development assistance programs include assistance to write constitutions; to draft laws; to train lawyers, judges, and prosecutors; to educate future lawyers; and to build courthouses and supply other infrastructure, including technology.27 For the purposes of this discussion, this article will more narrowly define rule of law development assistance to focus on assistance to formal legal institutions and not include areas such as police assistance missions or assistance to prison systems and administration.28 Rule of law assistance work has historically taken a “top down” approach and focused on the formal justice institutions in a country including judges, lawyers, prosecutors, and legislation.29 There has

23. Id. at 17-18.
24. For a brief history of the various areas that law and development scholars have focused on, including an analysis of how culture has been considered a key element in building the rule of law see Amy J. Cohen, Thinking with Culture in Law and Development, 57 BUFF. L. REV. 511, 517-38 (2009) [hereinafter Thinking with Culture in Law and Development]; see also Wade Channell, Lessons Not Learned About Legal Reform, in PROMOTING THE RULE OF LAW ABROAD 137, 141-43 (Thomas Carothers ed., 2006) [hereinafter Lessons Not Learned About Legal Reform].
27. Thomas Carothers has referred to this as the “rule of law assistance standard menu.” THOMAS CAROTHERS, AIDING DEMOCRACY ABROAD: THE LEARNING CURVE 168 (1999).
28. Those types of programs often include ADR components. For example, community policing programs often include negotiation training, and prison training often includes a variety of dispute resolution skills. For an account of an international training for police in Kyrgyzstan on non-violent dispute resolution, see Nina Sughrue, Training Police in Kyrgyzstan: The Hard Work of Peacebuilding, ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA BLOG, http://www.britannica.com/blogs/2008/02/training-police-in-kyrgyzstan-the-hard-work-of-peacebuilding/ (last visited Mar. 13, 2011).
29. See Beyond Rule of Law Orthodoxy, supra note 26 (questioning the assumptions in the “top down” approach to rule of law development). For another view of “bottom-up” legal development, with examples from Nepal, see Thinking with Culture in Law and Development, supra note 24, at 517-38.
been less focus on grassroots level work.30 Rule of law assistance work is delivered in a number of ways but usually includes international personnel based in the country, or visiting regularly, to oversee the implementation of the programs.31

The specific type of assistance provided to an individual country may vary depending on the circumstances in the country and, more importantly, the type and degree of political engagement that the donor nation or organization has with the recipient country.32 Rule of law assistance providers make frequent reference to the need to individualize assistance programs to ensure they are appropriate for the specific country.33 In response, there are now a number of assessment tools to assist donor nations and organizations to individualize their aid packages so that they are specific to the needs and level of development for each country.34 However, despite the improved resources and changes in rhetoric, the approach to providing rule of law development assistance still looks very similar in each country.35

III. LEGITIMACY AND RULE OF LAW

Although rule of law development practitioners are struggling to better understand the variety of dynamics at work to develop rule of law, it seems clear that one important part of rule of law is the attitudes of ordinary citizens towards their legal system and whether they believe it is a legitimate system,36 and therefore

30. See generally Beyond Rule of Law Orthodoxy, supra note 26.
31. See, e.g., RULE OF LAW ON THE INTERNATIONAL AGENDA, supra note 13, at 9.
34. See e.g., GUIDE TO RULE OF LAW COUNTRY ANALYSIS, supra note 7, at 29-41. The American Bar Association through the Rule of Law Initiative created a number of assessment tools including the Judicial Reform Index, the Prosecutorial Reform Index, the Legal Profession Reform Index and the Legal Education Reform Index. See American Bar Assoc., Publications, http://apps.americanbar.org/rol/publications.shtml (last visited Mar. 13, 2010).
36. See, e.g., Denis J. Galligan, Legal Failure: Law and Social Norms in Post-Communist Europe, in LAW AND INFORMAL PRACTICES 22 (Denis Galligan & Marina Kurkchyan eds., 2003) (stating that developing attitudes of respect for law “takes time and has to be developed piece by piece in different contexts, until the point may be reached at which it can be said that, by and large, a society has accepted law as a basis for social co-ordination”). Political actors also need to be engaged in the reform process. See Promoting the Rule of Law Abroad, supra note 14, at 844-45.

[T]he lack of progress in the area of rule of law is typically not simply a result of too few trained lawyers or courthouses, but is due to the fact that the most important political actors within the country have not adequately backed reform. In the end, a rule of law system is a reflection of the underlying socio-political contract that exists within a society.
follow the law.37 Due to this understanding that the attitudes of ordinary citizens matter in developing rule of law, rule of law practitioners identify changing the attitudes of the population at large as a goal, usually through “public awareness campaigns” or teaching law to non-lawyers.38

Legitimacy as a whole is a “key precondition” to people voluntarily complying with the laws and legal authorities.39 A leading scholar in this area, Tom Tyler, concluded that if people find that a law or legal authority is legitimate, they are more likely to comply with that law or legal authority.40 As I have discussed in a previous article, there are two aspects to whether a legal system has legitimacy.41 The first is whether people follow the law and the second is their attitudes toward the courts, law enforcement, and government in general.42 Members of the general public want authorities to make decisions that follow the rules and laws. The public perception regarding whether authorities are following the law will influence public opinion about the legal system.43 This means that legitimacy looks at both whether the law itself is perceived as legitimate and whether individual legal authorities or institutions are perceived as legitimate.44 It is this second part of legitimacy that is most relevant for the discussion in this article.

Id. at 845; see also Gillian K. Hadfield, Don’t Forget the Lawyers: The Role of Lawyers in Promoting the Rule of Law in Emerging Market Economies, 56 DePaul L. Rev. 401, 404-05 (2007) (discussing the importance of lawyers in implementing new laws in the context of economic development); Carothers, The Problem with Knowledge in PROMOTING THE RULE OF LAW ABROAD: IN SEARCH OF KNOWLEDGE 15 at 20 (Thomas Carothers ed., 2006) (“[C]learly law is not just the sum of courts, legislatures, police, prosecutors and other formal institutions with some direct connection to law. Law is also a normative system that resides in the minds of the citizens of a society.”).

37. Connected to this is the idea that people will follow the law if they believe everyone else. Marina Kurkchiyan, Judicial Corruption in the Context of Legal Culture, in GLOBAL CORRUPTION REPORT 2007 99, 103, available at www.transparency.org/publications/publications/gcr_2001 (last visited Mar. 13, 2011). Tom Tyler states that “the rule of law is based upon a willingness to defer to legal authorities.” Tom Tyler, Does the American Public Accept the Rule of Law? The Findings of Psychological Research on Deference to Authority, 56 DePaul L. Rev. 661, 668 (2007) [hereinafter Does the American Public Accept the Rule of Law?]. One theory of why people follow the law is “social control,” meaning that they follow the law to avoid punishment or to reap rewards. See, e.g., TOM TYLER, WHY PEOPLE OBEY THE LAW 19-23 (1990).

38. For a critical and more in-depth description of these types of programs and the underlying reasons for them see Brent T. White, Putting Aside the Rule of Law Myth: Corruption and the Case for Juries in Emerging Democracies, 43 CORNELL INT’L L. J. 307, 344-56 [hereinafter Putting Aside the Rule of Law Myth]. The term “legal culture” is often used, and projects often have the goal of a change in the legal culture. For a critical view of this approach see generally Thinking with Culture in Law and Development, supra note 24 at 518; see also, CAN MIGHT MAKE RIGHTS?, supra note 20, at 310-46 (arguing that “[I]nterveners must seek to create a rule of law culture [in post-conflict societies].”); see generally ADAPTING LEGAL CULTURES (David Nelken & Johannes Feest eds., 2001).


41. Pleo Bargaining as Legal Transplant, supra note 1, at 378-80.

42. See generally WHY PEOPLE OBEY THE LAW, supra note 39; Tom Tyler, Governing Amid Diversity: The Effect of Fair Decisionmaking Procedures on the Legitimacy of Government, 28 LAW & SOC’Y REV. 809 (1994) [hereinafter Governing Amid Diversity].

43. People are more inclined to use corruption or other extralegal means to resolve cases when they do not believe the legal system will treat them fairly based solely on the merits of their case. Kurkchiyan, Judicial Corruption in the Context of Legal Culture, supra note 37, at 103.

44. See, e.g., WHY PEOPLE OBEY THE LAW, supra note 39, at 27-30, 45-50.
Countries with high rates of corruption tend to suffer from low rates of trust or confidence in their formal legal system. One scholar who has looked at these issues has categorized countries as either being countries with “positive myths of law” or “negative myths of law.” Individuals in societies with a “positive myth of law” tend to think that other people usually follow the law; that the law is a good thing and provides a fair way to resolve disputes; and that to break the law is “socially disgraceful.” In contrast, individuals in societies with a “negative myth of law” tend to think that everyone else is regularly ignoring or breaking the law. “Negative myth” countries also have high levels of distrust in officials and government bureaucracy.

Examples of “negative myth” countries include Russia, Armenia, and Ukraine. In negative myth countries, not only do people assume that everyone is regularly violating the law, they also put a negative spin on positive examples of courts or government officials following the law. They do not believe, for example, that judicial decisions are “ever made according to the official principles.” The challenge in negative rule of law myth countries is that people tend to see law as simply a game, and as something to work around or over, not to simply follow. Within these deeply rooted understandings of how law works people will interpret their observations about how the legal system works to conform to these “pre-existing beliefs.” This means that even if there is change in the formal justice system, people are likely to view these changes, at least initially, with great skepticism and cynicism.

In positive rule of law myth countries, scholars have found that procedural justice contributes to legitimacy. The studies on procedural justice have found that, for purposes of legitimacy, the process is more important to people than the

45. See, e.g., Marina Kurkchiyan, The Illegitimacy of Law in Post-Soviet Societies, in LAW AND INFORMAL PRACTICES 25, at 31 (Denis Galligan & Marina Kurkchiyan eds., 2003) [hereinafter The Illegitimacy of Law in Post-Soviet Societies] (citing studies of Russian distrust of the police and prosecutors).
46. Id. at 29-34.
47. Id. at 28. This is not to suggest that serious criticism and questions are not regularly raised in positive rule of law myth countries about the legitimacy and functioning of their legal systems. See, e.g., Nancy A. Welsh, The Place of Court Connected Mediation in a Democratic Justice System, 5 CARDOZO J. CONFLICT RES. 117, 121-24 (2004) [hereinafter The Place of Court Connected Mediation].
48. The Illegitimacy of Law in Post-Soviet Societies, supra note 45, at 29.
49. Id. at 31.
50. Id. (explaining that a nationwide survey in Russia reported that “83 percent of Russians regard the police as corrupt, 79 percent assume the law courts and the prosecutor’s offices are corrupt, and 71 percent believe that the high educational institutions are corrupt.”). Public opinion surveys in Armenia and Ukraine show similar levels of distrust. Id.
51. Id. at 33. This is consistent with egocentric biases, specifically confirmation traps and self-fulfilling prophecies. See, e.g., Robert S. Adler, Flawed Thinking: Addressing Decision Biases in Negotiation, 20 OHIO ST. J. ON DISP RESOL. 683, 713-17 (2005).
52. Id. at 33.
53. The Illegitimacy of Law in Post-Soviet Societies, supra note 45, at 43.
54. Id. at 45.
55. Putting Aside the Rule of Law Myth, supra note 38, at 335-36 (describing an example from Mongolia of the negative rule of law myth).
outcome. If people find the process was fair or just, then they are more satisfied with the system than if they do not. Procedural justice scholarship examined underlying attitudes and views about the legal process and concluded that people think that a dispute resolution process was fair if the following key factors were present: that they were able to speak and be heard; that they were treated with dignity; and that the authority or decision-maker was neutral and fair. Within positive rule of law myth countries, scholars have concluded that dispute resolution processes should include these basic components of procedural justice so that the process itself is viewed as legitimate and so the dispute resolution process does not undermine legitimacy for the legal system as a whole. Planners should examine how to include these components into proposed ADR projects under rule of law development programs.

IV. ADR IN RULE OF LAW DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

There are two basic categories under which practitioners implement donor-funded ADR programs. The first category is when ADR programs are closely tied to efforts to assist or support the formal legal system and to support specific rule of law development goals. This article will focus on the programs that fall into this first category. This article will not discuss the second category of ADR programs, often referred to as customary justice or informal justice, that donors fund to support other goals, not directly tied to the formal legal system, such as peace-making and customary dispute resolution processes.


59. See, e.g., Richard Reuben, ADR and the Rule of Law: Making the Connection, 16 DISP. RESOL. MAG. 4, 4; see generally WHY PEOPLE OBEY THE LAW, supra note 39; TRUST IN THE LAW, supra note 40; Procedural Justice, Legitimacy, supra note 57.

60. For an example of how to consider these factors in the context of plea bargaining, see Plea Bargaining and Procedural Justice, supra note 57, at 431. For a discussion of how to adopt procedural justice concepts into plea bargaining as part of a rule of law development program see Plea Bargaining as Legal Transplant, supra note 1, at 383-84, 416-17. The suggestion is that these components should be given serious consideration, not that each element of procedural justice should always be transported, in full, to every other culture where some factors, such as neutrality, may be less important. Clearly, every culture, or individual within every culture, will not necessarily agree that all of these components are important, just as the standard western style of mediation may not transfer easily to other cultures. See, e.g., Correspondences and Contradictions in International and Domestic Conflict Resolution, supra note 2, at 338 (discussing how mediation may not transfer well, particularly in countries and with disputes that may be better suited to looking back and less appropriate to the "forward thinking," problem solving approach of mediation). For a more detailed discussion of the theories, effects, and characteristics of procedural justice in the context of mediation, see Nancy A. Welsh, Making deals in Court-Connected Mediation: What's Justice Got To Do With It?, 79 WASH. U. L.Q. 787, 814-16 (2001).

61. Undoubtedly many of the projects under this second category could, if viewed broadly enough, be considered under the first category. But, under this second category implementers are not drawing a direct connection to developing rule of law but instead have other more immediate goals, such as addressing inter-ethnic conflict or providing dispute resolution processes in areas where courts are
ADR assistance is included in rule of law development programs in a variety of ways. One type of assistance is legislative assistance, which often includes direct involvement in writing or rewriting mediation or arbitration laws.\textsuperscript{62} ADR is also included in training programs for lawyers with negotiation and/or mediation skills training. Some assistance programs support training for community mediation programs established to compliment the formal legal system, although perhaps not directly court-connected.\textsuperscript{63} Some programs provide more systematic support to court-connected mediation programs, including funding mediator salaries. Some ADR assistance programs focus on adding negotiated settlements as an accepted part of the legal process.\textsuperscript{64} In many countries negotiated settlement of a case, whether directly between the parties or through a facilitated process like mediation, was not allowed.\textsuperscript{65} The process was that every case that came into the

---

\textsuperscript{62}One example is the mediation law in Kosovo that was passed in 2008. Law No. 03/L-057 On Mediation, Republic of Kosovo (2008), available at https://www.assemblykosovo.org/common/docs/lgjicj/2009_3-L057_en.pdf (last visited Feb. 9, 2011).

\textsuperscript{63}For an example of this type of program in El Salvador see generally William E. Davis, Razil K. Datta & Sergio I. Zegarra, Implementing ADR Programs in Developing Justice Sectors: Case Studies and Lessons Learned, 16 Disp. Resol. Mag 16 (2010).

\textsuperscript{64}A common example is assistance to develop plea bargaining for criminal cases. Alkon, Plea Bargaining as a Legal Transplant at 398-403 (describing rule of law assistance providers active in providing assistance to introduce plea bargaining).

\textsuperscript{65}This is not to suggest that a legal system can prevent informal settlement of cases before they are filed. But, once a case was filed there were, and in many countries still are, no formal processes that allowed for settlement of the case by the parties without a judicial decision. For an overview of the 2008 procedural system, see Germany's Legal System.}
court system went to trial and a judge or panel of judges ruled on it, sometimes after receiving specific instructions about how to decide the case.66

ADR is now commonly included as part of the analysis of how to approach rule of law development. In 2008, the United Nations (UN) published the UN Approach to Rule of Law Assistance, in which it stated its eight “Guiding Principles” for UN rule of law assistance and gave six factors under its “Framework for Strengthening the Rule of Law.”67 One of the “Guiding Principles” is that rule of law assistance should be based on the “unique country context,” which “must consider carefully” a country’s “rule of law system,” and should also include looking at both formal and informal dispute resolution systems.68 One of the categories under the UN “Framework” includes “effective and accessible mechanisms” for dispute resolution, “. . . including alternative or traditional dispute resolution mechanisms.”69

The stated reasons to incorporate ADR in rule of law programming include: to increase access to justice for the poor and disadvantaged; to decrease costs and time needed to resolve disputes; and to increase satisfaction in the dispute resolution process.70 In addition, perhaps the most often stated reason for including ADR in rule of law assistance programming is to help ease case backlogs.71 The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) states that efficiency “underpins all essential elements” in the rule of law.72 ADR programs are regularly praised for helping to relieve court backlogs. For example, in the Republic of Georgia, U.S. officials credit plea bargaining with relieving court backlogs.73 However, using reduced court backlogs as a metric of success is often without any analysis of the potential impact that the ADR program might have on larger attitudes within the country towards the formal legal system.74 This focus on efficiency is also often done without critical thinking about the possible impact it might have on how the formal legal system operates and public attitudes.75

66. In the Soviet Union this was referred to as “telephone justice” as judges would get telephone calls from the Communist Party, or other governmental institutions, instructing them how to decide particular cases. See e.g., Katheryn Hendley, ’Telephone Law’ and the ‘Rule of Law’: The Russian Case, I HAGUE J. ON RULE L. 241-42 (2009).
67. GUIDANCE NOTE OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL, supra note 33, at 1-2.
68. Id. at 3.
69. Id. at 6-7.
70. ADR PRACTITIONERS’ GUIDE, supra note 4, at 7. Interestingly, party control over the dispute resolution process is less often a stated reason to support the introduction of ADR, perhaps because party control is often not an existing value in many other legal systems, see infra note 82.
71. See, e.g., GUIDE TO RULE OF LAW COUNTRY ANALYSIS, supra note 7, at 37.
72. GUIDE TO RULE OF LAW COUNTRY ANALYSIS, supra note 7, at 14.
74. GUIDE TO RULE OF LAW COUNTRY ANALYSIS, supra note 7, at 37-38 (describing a mediation program in El Salvador that “has seen impressive results” due to mediating 40,000 cases and “84% have reached a resolution.”). No further information is given regarding what is impressive other than the sheer number of cases resolved.
75. For an example of those questions raised in the context of developing ADR programs in the U.S. see generally Wayne D. Brazil, Court ADR 25 Years After Pound- Have We Found A Better Way?, 18 OHIO ST. J. ON DISP. RESOL. 93, 94 (2002).
[T]hose who would insist on using only efficiency criteria to assess the value of ADR programs jeopardize the courts’ most precious and only necessary assets: public confidence in the integrity of the processes the courts sponsor and public faith in the motives that underlie the courts’ actions. We must take great care not to make program design decisions that invite parties to infer
Although USAID recognizes the importance of legitimacy as part of rule of law, it does not specifically recommend ADR programs to help build legitimacy. Moreover, the focus on efficiency often occurs at the expense of more nuanced thinking about how ADR might contribute to other goals, such as to improve or repair the relationship between disputants or creating interest based solutions that are not limited by the narrow options of a legal opinion or adjudicatory process.

There is, however, conflicting advice about whether ADR should be included in rule of law programs when there are problems of endemic corruption. Within the same USAID guide, ADR is recommended to “by-pass ineffective or discredited courts” as an “alternative forum” when the “civil court system has so many institutional weaknesses and failures . . . that there is no near-term prospect of successful court reform.” Conversely, the same guide recommends that “ADR can support and complement court reform” although ADR should not be used for this purpose if “[t]he courts reputation is sufficiently tainted to suggest that independent programs may enjoy more popular support.” The idea seems to be that the only question is whether the ADR program should be closely connected to the court, or entirely separate. Either way, ADR programs are recommended to help meet these other goals.

V. WHEN ADR PROGRAMS MAY IMPED THE DEVELOPMENT OF RULE OF LAW

Negative rule of law myth countries could be at particular risk for new ADR programs to harm or impede the development of rule of law. ADR programs could undermine the legitimacy of the formal justice system in two main ways. The first is that, due to the informal nature of ADR, these processes can seem more like a new form of corruption and less like a process operating under the law. Second, ADR processes can help to entrench bad practices, including corruption, precisely because they operate outside the formal legal system and therefore may not be subject to oversight or monitoring.

_____________

that the courts care less about doing justice and offering valued service than about looking out for themselves as institutions (e.g., by reducing their workload, or off-loading kinds of cases that especially taxing or emotionally difficult or that are deemed ‘unimportant.’

Id. at 124.


77. One reason for the confusion seems to be different views of whether ADR programs can help to support a poorly functioning legal system, or whether it is better to include ADR programs only as an addition to the already existing firm foundation of a well-functioning legal system. See Correspondences and Contradictions in International and Domestic Conflict Resolution, supra note 2, at 340 n.104; The Cookie Cutter Syndrome, supra note 2, at 334. This article is not focusing on this program design question, but simply the question of public perceptions of ADR programs and the impact this might have on legitimacy for the formal legal system.

78. ADR Practitioners’ Guide, supra note 4, at 10.

79. Id. at 9.
A. ADR as Corruption?

One of the potential advantages of ADR is its informality. Negotiations and mediations can take place outside of the narrow constraints of legal remedies and allow parties to be more creative and potentially arrive at solutions that better meet their underlying interests. However, it is this very informality that can be suspect, particularly in legal cultures where party control is not traditionally strong and where the judiciary has instead tended to take a more active role. Negotiations and mediations take place behind closed doors and often include a guarantee of confidentiality. In countries with high levels of corruption, and a tradition of the powerful taking care of themselves in private, these processes can seem like more of the same. Creativity can seem like another word for corruption in such societies known more for rigidity than creativity. For example, if the only possible punishment for crimes has been prison or jail time, a negotiated plea deal that includes simply paying a fine, but no jail time, can look more like corruption and less like creativity.

As the introduction to this article stated, The Republic of Georgia provides one example of this problem when they introduced American-style plea bargaining of criminal cases. Plea bargaining is negotiation of a criminal case, usually between the prosecutor and the defense lawyer. If the parties reach an agreement the defendant will give up his right to trial and enter a plea of guilty. In Georgia, as in the United States, these plea negotiations tend to take place behind closed doors. Georgia first introduced American-style plea bargaining into its criminal justice system as part of a more general package of anti-corruption legislation in 2003. Prior to this legislation, all criminal cases went to trial. While the trial procedures were not as long or as cumbersome as in the United States, there were serious case backlogs as the courts were unable to efficiently handle

80. See, e.g., id. at 6.
81. Id.
82. The Place of Court Connected Mediation, supra note 47, at 118 & n.8 ("In many other countries, meanwhile, parties' control over their cases is much more restricted. Judges, not litigants or their attorneys, determine the issues that will be explored, the discovery that will be conducted, the witnesses who will be called, and the questions that witnesses will answer.").
83. Formal court processes in many countries that fit into the “moderately functional legal system” definition do not open all court proceedings to the general public. The fact that the formal justice system is also not always open to the public can contribute to poor public perceptions of the legal system. This article does not intend to suggest that ADR processes are alone in being conducted in private and away from public view. See, e.g., Geoffrey Robertson, The Media and Judicial Corruption, in GLOBAL CORRUPTION REPORT 2007 108, 109 (Transparency International), available at http://www.transparency.org/publications/gcr/gcr_2007.
84. For a brief discussion of this in the context of plea bargaining, see Plea Bargaining as a Legal Transplant, supra note 1, at 405.
85. Id. at 362-68.
86. NICHOLAS G. HERMAN, PLEA BARGAINING I (2004). For a more detailed analysis of how plea bargaining works in the U.S. with a focus on issues that might be relevant in developing countries, see Plea Bargaining as a Legal Transplant, supra note 1, at 390-97.
87. HERMAN, PLEA BARGAINING, supra note 86, at 1.
88. Plea Bargaining as a Legal Transplant, supra note 1, at 362-68.
89. For a more detailed description and analysis of plea bargaining in Georgia, see Plea Bargaining as Legal Transplant, supra note 1, at 363-368.
90. Id. at 363-64.
the relatively large number of criminal cases. However, in the period just after the plea bargaining law was adopted, the only cases to use this new process were corruption cases. This was in a country with a long-standing practice of paying bribes to police officers and other officials to get cases dismissed. Perhaps not surprisingly, the general public in Georgia viewed plea bargaining with suspicion and there was much criticism that it was simply a new form of state-sanctioned corruption. The lack of transparency, combined with the fact that the outcomes looked very similar to pay-offs for case dismissals, seemed to harm the general public’s views of the formal legal system.

Another form of ADR that is regularly included in rule of law programs is court-connected mediation for civil cases. In countries that have not previously had court-connected mediation programs, these new processes can raise questions that suggest the already existing high level of distrust in the formal legal system. For example, if a country adopts court-connected mediation, and the judges appoint mediators, the parties may question the integrity of the mediator as they are closely linked to an institution that has limited legitimacy in the eyes of the general public. Related to the appointment issues could be issues regarding whether the parties themselves trust the mediator to treat all the parties fairly and to not try to exert pressure on one party, or the other, to accept a proposed agreement. Parties may be concerned about mediators accepting bribes or otherwise engaging in acts of corruption. Mediator styles can affect attitudes towards mediation. Highly directive or evaluative styles of mediation may reinforce attitudes that the parties have little control over the dispute. This could cause parties to question the neutrality of the mediator and whether the mediator has been influenced by
power, corruption, or both, in pushing for a particular settlement. If a mediation program is started and suffers from these problems, it would at least impact the attitudes of the parties towards the legal system, and if the news of problems spread or were reported in the media, the negative attitudes could spread to the general public.

**B. ADR can reinforce bad practices**

The private nature of ADR processes means that there is often little oversight and the process itself is often difficult to monitor. In countries with poor human rights records and where abusive behavior by government and law enforcement is still commonplace, the informality of these processes may prevent exposing and punishing bad practices. As mentioned earlier in this article, when Georgia first introduced plea bargaining, there was widespread criticism that many defendants got more lenient sentences when their guilty pleas were conditioned on their agreement to not file complaints that they had been tortured or ill treated while in custody.

ADR can also provide a way to easily dispose of cases that professionals in the formal justice system do not want to handle. In Central Asia, this has happened with sexual assault cases. Sexual assault and domestic violence cases are not aggressively prosecuted in Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, and Kyrgyzstan. Legal professionals regularly refer these cases to an informal ADR process referred to as “reconciliation.” Some cases are referred before they are brought to court and others are referred by the court system. The reconciliation process brings the victim and offender together to discuss resolution of the case. The “neutral” who is responsible for assisting the parties to arrive at an agreement is often a police officer with little or no mediation training, and is often the arresting officer. A common agreement is for the offender to pay the victim money and the case is dismissed. Sometimes the cases are referred directly to these informal processes and never brought to court. Although legal professionals throughout Central Asia praise this process for helping to clear court dockets, the impact on victims and the general public is far less positive. This process does not encourage victims to come forward and report crimes and it does not encour-
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100. For a discussion of how mediator styles can influence party attitudes towards the neutrality of the mediation process see Wissler, supra note 98, To Evaluate or Facilitate?
101. See discussion infra Section VI(C).
102. Plea Bargaining as a Legal Transplant, supra note 1, at 365.
103. For a more detailed discussion, see generally Cynthia Alkon, The Increased Use of “Reconciliation” in Criminal Cases in Central Asia: A Sign of Restorative Justice, Reform or Cause for Concern?, 8 PEPP. DISP. RESOL. L.J. 41 (2007) [hereinafter Reconciliation of Criminal Cases in Central Asia].
104. Id. at 104-06.
105. Id.
106. Id. at 79-100 (describing the individual processes and practices in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan).
107. Id. at 109-10.
108. On occasion more disturbing outcomes were reported, such as rape victims agreeing to marry their attackers. Id. at 41, 113-14.
109. Id. at 104-07.
110. See id.
age trust in the formal legal system. And, in societies that suffer from endemic corruption, these processes, with their monetary payments, can look like one more form of corruption.

VI. QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER IN DECIDING WHETHER TO INTRODUCE AN ADR PROGRAM

If ADR practitioners and rule of law assistance providers are considering supporting an ADR program in a country whose legal system suffers from poor legitimacy due to high public perceptions of corruption, serious consideration should be given to whether such a program will delay or harm the development of rule of law by reinforcing already existing poor public attitudes regarding the formal legal system and its legitimacy. Clearly, the challenge with this stage of the analysis is the problem with the continuing “lack of knowledge” regarding how rule of law develops and, related to that, how legitimacy develops.

Nevertheless, there are a few key questions that might aid rule of law and ADR practitioners in this analysis that are questions regularly asked in the context of developing ADR programs in developed democracies. The first is what type of dispute would go to this process? The second is who are the parties? The third question is how likely is it that it is, or should be, a matter of public interest? The fourth question is what is the public attitude towards the proposed ADR project? A fifth question is whether there is funding to establish the newly envisioned process? And, the final question, if the ADR program is in process or will be implemented, how will it be monitored?

A. What type of dispute?

Private civil disputes that have few, if any, public policy or larger political concerns might be disputes that would make sense to design an alternative dispute resolution program for, even in moderately functional legal systems with endemic corruption. It is unlikely that public policy cases, administrative cases, or even criminal cases, would generally fit into this category. However, family cases might fall under this category. The caution is whether it is a country with serious

111. Id. at 104-07.
112. Id. at 103 (discussing how corruption may impact the decision to send cases to reconciliation).
113. The studies of legitimacy define legitimacy, identify when it exists, and identify what may cause it to erode. These studies are less helpful in providing suggestions of how to build legitimacy. See, e.g., David J. Smith, The Foundations of Legitimacy, in LEGITIMACY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE-INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES 30, 54-56 (Tom Tyler, ed., Russell Sage Foundation 2007).
114. See, e.g., supra note 10 and accompanying text. There are clearly other questions that could be relevant regarding program design issues, such as whether parties should be provided legal representation. These questions are beyond the scope of this article. For an analysis of the issue of unrepresented litigants in ADR processes in the U.S., see Jean Sternlight, Lawyerless Dispute Resolution: Rethinking a Paradigm, 37 FORDHAM URB. L.J. 381 (2010) (criticizing the assumption that litigants always need lawyers more in litigation than in ADR processes, particularly as ADR may be “the only form of dispute resolution many disputants get.” Id. at 383).
115. Numerous scholars have expressed concerns about bringing certain types of disputes to informal dispute resolution processes, such as domestic violence cases, cases with racial or ethnic disputes, and cases that raise larger public policy interests. See, e.g., Grillo, supra note 10; Delgado et. al., supra note 10; Luban, supra note 10.
inequality for women and whether mediating these cases could exacerbate those inequalities. Land disputes might also be cases to bring to this type of process, but if the origin of the dispute is ethnic conflict or land seized during war, this might not be appropriate. However, in many countries the civil dockets are full of cases that would be appropriate to bring to an ADR process and that are overwhelming judicial resources.

This goal of easing case backlogs is, as stated above, a key reason for the development of many ADR programs as part of a larger rule of law development assistance package. Clearly, if the courts are so overcrowded that cases languish for years, or decades, this will also create, or exacerbate problems for legitimacy of the formal justice system. In these contexts, adding processes that can help move cases through the formal legal system more quickly could be a goal that enhances legitimacy and therefore rule of law. However, careful consideration should be given to whether there are other, more serious concerns, such as serious inequities between the parties, that might mean that an informal process, such as mediation, will not support the larger goals of improving legitimacy for the formal legal system. If dispute resolution programs are designed to help handle disputes that are filling the formal courtrooms, and if these disputes do not tend to have larger public policy or political concerns, then an ADR process might be appropriate, pending the answers to the next questions.

B. Who are the parties?

ADR practitioners generally advise caution and often advise against an ADR process when there are serious power imbalances between the parties. The challenge in many countries is for outsiders to determine if there are power imbalances and whether they are so serious that ADR processes are not advisable. In


117. Robert Mitchell, Land Rights Legal Aid, ONE BILLION RISING: LAW, LAND AND THE ALLEVIATION OF GLOBAL POVERTY 377 at 376-379 (Roy L. Prosterman, Robert Mitchell and Tim Hanstad eds. 2007) [hereinafter Land Rights Legal Aid] (explaining how it is preferable to resolved land dispute cases outside of court if there are not serious power imbalances as it is a more efficient use of legal aid resources, provides quicker relief to the client, creates “less friction between the client and the opposing party, with whom the client will continue to live and work in the same community” and “may allow all parties to save face.” Id. at 378)

118. USAID seems to recommend using alternative processes with land disputes with few stated reservations. See USAID, LAND AND CONFLICT: A TOOLKIT FOR INTERVENTION 10 (2005), available at http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/cross-cutting_programs/conflict/publications/docs/CMM_Land_ and_Conflict_Toolkit_April_2005.pdf (“[E]xperience has also shown that many types of land disputes are best managed outside the courts. Limited court capacity to process land claims efficiently and transparently is a serious constraint in many places. Thus, alternative dispute resolution processes, especially mediation and arbitration, can be useful . . . .”).

119. One reason for this is the assumption that a formal legal process will better protect the less powerful. See, e.g., Fiss, supra note 11, at 1076-78. Clearly this assumption may not be as accurate in a moderately functioning legal system.

120. One interesting study about postwar Japan criticized the use of mediation as it “reinforces the power structure of local society.” FRANK UPHAM, LAW AND SOCIAL CHANGE IN POSTWAR JAPAN 12
most of the types of countries that this article is discussing, if one of the parties is the government or a governmental agency, ADR processes are not appropriate.\footnote{121} In societies where women or minorities suffer from regular mistreatment, their cases are probably not best served by informal ADR processes, particularly if their gender or ethnicity is, or could be, a factor in the case, including how the mediator might view or treat them.\footnote{122} A related issue to who the parties are is determining whether they would prefer to resolve their dispute, through an informal or formal process.\footnote{123} Answering this question is not simple, and gaining a better understanding of how litigants prefer to settle their disputes within established legal systems, such as in the United States, is still an area scholars are researching and debating.\footnote{124} However, in establishing new ADR programs in moderately functional legal systems, the question of who the parties are should look both to whether they might be disadvantaged by an informal process and whether they might prefer, and be more comfortable, resolving their dispute in an informal process.

C. Is it, or should it be, a matter of public interest?

It can be difficult to define what is a matter of “public interest,” although certain categories of cases, like corruption cases against public officials and cases alleging police misconduct or torture, are the types of cases that are likely to fall within the definition.\footnote{125} And, corruption and police misconduct cases are precisely the kind of cases that can help to build, or erode, legitimacy in the formal legal

(\textsuperscript{1987}) (Unlike litigation, which would “not only bypass the current power structure but would destroy it whenever . . . the formal norms of the legal system were substantially at variance with those of the elite.”).\footnote{121} This is not to suggest that the formal justice system is not also subject to concerns regarding inappropriate use of governmental power such as exercising undue influence and lack of judicial independence. But, at least in the formal justice system the dispute is likely to be heard publicly and in a way that could, at least theoretically, be appealed. One example of this is the formal criminal justice system in Central Asia, including the lack of judicial independence, see \textit{Reconciliation of Criminal Cases in Central Asia}, supra note 103, at 59-66.\footnote{122} Mitchell, \textit{Land Rights Legal Aid}, supra note 117 at 388. (“\textquote{Mediation and other ‘neutral’ processes are often decidedly not neutral in cases involving [land] disputes between the poor and the non-poor (or between the poor and government officials) since such processes inevitably reinforce unequal relations that precede the dispute.”).\footnote{123} In countries where international actors provide development assistance focused on particular types of disputes, such as land disputes, a related factor is what impact the international actor, by their mere presence, may have on the process itself, thereby influencing which process the parties might prefer. In land disputes involving serious power imbalances one development professional observed that the process, whether it is mediation, arbitration, or litigation, is less important than the fact of international involvement. “Once an international actor is involved, rules are more closely scrutinized and respected, procedures are more closely followed. The international factor changes the fairness dynamic and rebalances the power equation . . . [i]t gives the weaker party a better chance than they otherwise would have had.” Email (February 16, 2011) from Eric Roman Filipink (on file with author).\footnote{124} See, e.g., \textit{ADR is Here}, supra note 12, at 296-300.\footnote{125} In discussing whether disputes of public interest within the U.S. should be resolved publicly or privately, Carrie Menkel-Meadow suggests that the question is less about whether the process is public or private and more about the entirety of the process, and whether it considers the interests of both the parties and those “likely to be affected by the outcome, including in some cases, the whole polity.” \textit{Whose Dispute is it Anyway?}, supra note 10, at 2686.
system and government. If those cases are decided in private, it could influence other potential litigants and perhaps impede them from bringing cases (and thereby addressing these issues).\textsuperscript{126} Using informal processes could also negatively influence the development of formal legal protections and ultimately slow, or stop, political or social change that a formal court process might stimulate.\textsuperscript{127} In countries whose formal legal systems already suffer from problems of legitimacy, a process that regularly resolves these cases in informal and private settings could reinforce the general public's view that power and corruption decide cases, instead of a law that is applied fairly to all. As discussed above, this was a problem in Georgia as plea bargaining negotiations were used with corruption cases and with cases alleging police misconduct and the general public viewed these case settlements as payments for favorable outcomes.\textsuperscript{128}

Related to the concern about whether the case itself is one of public interest, is the public interest in how cases are resolved. Within the United States mediation was "inspired by the principles of democracy."\textsuperscript{129} This meant that early mediation proponents looked to the role that individual citizens could have in resolving their disputes directly while being able to control the outcomes.\textsuperscript{130} However, if an ADR program is designed primarily with the goal of efficient case resolution, it may miss out on other goals, such as greater democratic participation of citizens in their justice system. Ultimately this could negatively impact how the general public views the new ADR program and that negative view could extend to the formal legal system that is implementing it.\textsuperscript{131} These concerns have been raised within the context of mandatory mediation programs in the United States.\textsuperscript{132}

\begin{flushleft}
\textbf{D. What is the public attitude toward the proposed ADR project?}
\end{flushleft}

Before starting a new ADR project there should be a clear understanding of what the general public's attitude might be towards the project.\textsuperscript{133} Is it likely to be greeted with skepticism and cynicism? It seems likely that if those questions were asked in Georgia it would have been clear that the public would greet the intro-

\textsuperscript{126} For a discussion of the potential problem of "secret settlements" of dispute with wider public interest in the U.S., see, e.g., Luban, supra note 10, 2648-58.
\textsuperscript{127} For a study of how disputes going to informal dispute resolution processes might have slowed change in Japan, see generally Upham, supra note 120 (examining disputes in specific case studies including environmental, women's employment discrimination, and industrial policy). See also ADR is Here, supra note 12, at 296 (discussing the ability of dispute resolution to impact society).
\textsuperscript{128} Plea Bargaining as a Legal Transplant, supra note 1, at 365-66.
\textsuperscript{129} The Place of Court Connected Mediation, supra note 47, at 135.
\textsuperscript{130} Id. at 135-36.
\textsuperscript{131} Richard C. Reuben, Democracy and Dispute Resolution: The Problem of Arbitration, 67-SPG L\textsc{aw} \& C\textsc{ontemp}. P\textsc{robs} 279 at 314-18(2004).
\textsuperscript{132} See, e.g., The Place of Court Connected Mediation, supra note 47, at 136-43. "Yet, change should be tempered by context, and even as the judicial system changes, it should reflect the values of our democracy. Our courts draw their legitimacy from their accountability to, and the responding support of, a democratic people." Id. at 143.
\textsuperscript{133} However, it is not enough to merely ask questions. Part of the project planning phase should include a clear way to incorporate what is learned about public opinion into how the project is implemented. Unfortunately, Nepal provides an example of a country where USAID arranged for a poll to gain a better understanding of how the general public viewed their human and legal rights, and then did not incorporate those findings into any of the programmatic work. Thinking with Culture in Law and Development, supra note 24, at 549-50.
duction of plea bargaining with distrust. That knowledge could have helped to change how the law was structured and prevented the need for the later reforms.\textsuperscript{134} Connected to this is the need to understand, in general, what the public attitudes are towards the legal system, including the levels of trust and perceptions of corruption. This should be a standard part of the rule of law assessment process.

Although there is better formal acknowledgement of the need to design rule of law assistance programs in a way that is appropriate to the actual level of development in the country, there is still insufficient information gathered before programs are designed.\textsuperscript{135} The standard assessment process involves an assessor flying into the country and spending a few days or weeks interviewing a standard group of nationals and internationals.\textsuperscript{136} Then the report or project proposal is prepared, and based on those documents projects are started.\textsuperscript{137} While many of the people conducting these assessments are highly experienced in rule of law development work, they are not necessarily highly experienced in the particular country. And, often the only information gathered is anecdotal. If there is likely to be a poor public reaction to the new ADR program, and if the program design has already addressed those concerns, then a public education campaign to explain how the new program would work could help to counteract the poor public perception. However, public education campaigns cannot substitute for poor project design or lack of rule of law.\textsuperscript{138}

\textbf{E. Is there funding to establish the new ADR process?}

If a new program is put into place, but is not funded, it invites the participants to “self-fund” or look to corruption to make it “work.” When international assistance providers encourage countries to adopt legislation providing for new processes, they often do not include adequate, or any, funding provisions. One example of this is in Kosovo. Kosovo passed a Mediation Law in 2008.\textsuperscript{139} The international community, including the European Union, the World Bank, and the United States, all supported adopting the law to allow Kosovo to introduce media-
The Mediation Law did not give a clear timeline for implementation, and did not provide details for mediator training, certification, and selection. The failure to work out these details at the time the legislation was passed has led to implementation delays. It has also required rule of law development assistance providers to fund mediation training. In the immediate future it is unclear who will pay the mediators once they are trained, certified, and licensed, and it is also unclear how much they will get paid. In a society with serious corruption problems, the failure to sort out how much mediators will get paid, and who will pay them, invites public skepticism about the legitimacy of mediation and questions about whether the mediators are corrupt.

F. Will the ADR program be measured or monitored?

One of the challenges in many moderately functioning legal systems is the lack of information at all levels of society, including in the formal court system. This information void creates problems on a number of levels. Therefore, if an ADR program is introduced, monitoring should be part of the design of the program and the results should be publicly available. Currently there are ADR programs funded by USAID, such as a family mediation program in Egypt, that do not include monitoring, and that do not even gather basic statistics about their work. It might be that these programs are a stunning success on all levels, but without clear monitoring it is impossible to know if they are helping or impeding the development of rule of law. Monitoring should gather basic information including: the types of cases and whether they are settled; what the participants think of the process, including whether the process met basic procedural justice.
standards; and whether there are concerns about corruption by those using the process.

Gathering this information would help with future program planning, and if the results are made public they could help to address potential problems of public perception with the program. Releasing information that shows high satisfaction rates among participants, high rates of trust in the process, and low rates of complaints of corruption, could help to counteract the tendency in negative rule of law myth countries to dismiss positive developments as aberrations. Greater monitoring and publicly releasing this information could play a role in developing greater trust by the general public in the ADR process.

If, however, the monitoring results show that the ADR program is not working, for example due to high dissatisfaction rates among participants or concerns about corruption, then it would give the ADR implementer an opportunity to either address these concerns or, ultimately, to stop the program before it does more damage.

VII. CONCLUSION

This article has focused on the question of whether introducing ADR into a moderately functional legal system, in the context of a country struggling with endemic corruption, could harm the overall development of rule of law by damaging or further eroding legitimacy in the formal legal system. The intention of this article is not to suggest that ADR has extraordinary powers to cause harm, but rather to encourage greater analysis and thought before introducing new processes. As this article has discussed, the informal and private nature of ADR can appear to be another form of corruption in societies already struggling with serious and endemic corruption. Rule of law assistance providers and ADR professionals who are responsible for planning projects that include ADR as part of a rule of law development program should not overlook this possibility or oversimplify the process.

The reasons ADR is introduced into rule of law programs are important. Increasing access to justice, decreasing costs and time for litigation, increasing satisfaction with the court system, and decreasing case backlogs are all admirable goals. However, as we know from experience in the United States, ADR processes are not without potential problems. ADR professionals and scholars in the United States continue to ask questions and study how ADR processes are impacting the legal system, litigants, and the wider society. These questions are equally, or perhaps more important to ask when considering introducing a new ADR program into a moderately functional legal system. Rule of law assistance providers should not assume that the reason for introducing the ADR process is strong enough to avoid taking the time to consider these factors as part of a process of trying to determine whether introducing the proposed ADR program will contribute to building the rule of law. Programs that are introduced without considering public opinion, and without regard to legitimacy and current public attitudes towards the legal system, run the risk of working against the goal of developing rule of law.