

# GLOBAL LEADERSHIP DIALOGUES

Insights and Inspiration from Change Leaders



## UN System Scholar

### LORRAINE ELLIOTT

*Lorraine Elliott is professor of international relations in the Bell School of Asia Pacific Affairs in the College of Asia and the Pacific at the Australian National University (ANU), an ANU Public Policy Fellow, and an Associate with the Climate and Environment Governance Network (CEGNET) at ANU. She is also affiliated faculty in the Department of Conflict Resolution, Human Security, and Global Governance at the McCormack Graduate School of Policy and Global Studies at UMass Boston.*

*Elliott has conducted research on global environmental governance and regional environmental governance in Southeast Asia, climate security and human security in the Asia Pacific, and transnational environmental crime. She has contributed significant literature to the field of global governance and human security, publishing six books and more than 80 book chapters and refereed journal articles. She is currently a senior research fellow with the Earth System Governance programme and a convener of the Green Economy Working group of its Taskforce on Conceptual Foundations. She was previously a member of the Board of Directors of the Academic Council on the United Nations System (ACUNS) (2009–2012) and from June 2015, Chair of the Board of Directors for ACUNS (2015–2018).*

*As an academic, Elliott has engaged with universities around the world. From 2003 to 2005, she was reader in international relations at the University of Warwick. She has held appointments as a Highfield fellow at the University of Nottingham (2015), ANU public policy fellow (2014–2016), visiting professor at the University of Sheffield (2013) and the Free University of Amsterdam (2007), and visiting fellow at Balliol College Oxford (2002). She received her PhD in political science from Australian National University and a master's degree in political science from the University of Auckland.*

*Elliott visited UMass Boston in February 2015 to speak with students in the Global Governance and Human Security PhD program, as well as the team at the Center for Governance and Sustainability. During her visit, she sat down with Maria Ivanova, associate professor of global governance and co-director for the Center for Governance and Sustainability, for an interview for the Global Leadership Dialogues.*

*Lorraine Elliott at UMass Boston*

Volume 2, Issue 4

**CENTER FOR GOVERNANCE AND SUSTAINABILITY**

JOHN W. McCORMACK GRADUATE SCHOOL OF POLICY AND GLOBAL STUDIES  
UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS BOSTON

[www.umb.edu/cgs](http://www.umb.edu/cgs)



**You are an accomplished scholar who has been elected as the chair of the board of the Academic Council on the United Nations System (ACUNS). What do you consider the key milestones in your career? Give us a sense of what inspired you to become an academic, professor, and scholar in the field of global governance, environmental governance, and human security, which was a new field when you were entering it and shaping it.**

When I started my PhD in 1988, global environmental governance, or *global environmental politics* as it was called then, was such a new field that most people could not envision a career being built around those principles. I based my PhD and my first book on international environmental politics in the Antarctic. I had stumbled across this topic when I decided to go back to university as a PhD student. I had been away from academia for four or five years and had been working as a research assistant in a university and also in the private sector in London. I knew that I had always been happiest in a university context. I had worked as a researcher for Royal Commissions and Tribunals in New Zealand and was drafting a lot of those reports where somebody else got to put their name on the final document, which was not very satisfying. That was when I decided that I wanted to put myself back into the academic context, and I applied for a scholarship.

My initial proposal for my PhD was on the Australia, New Zealand, and United States Security Treaty (ANZUS), which I had written about when I was a master's student, but I was not really interested in that topic. Then a colleague from the Commission of Inquiry I was working with at the time, came back from a lunchtime meeting full of enthusiasm: I recall asking her what was going on, and she told me she had just been to a Footsteps of Scott Expedition meeting about research being conducted in the Antarctic. That was a lightbulb moment for me, because I

hardly knew about the Antarctic but was really inspired to learn about it. At the time, I was still in Auckland, New Zealand, applying to the Australian National University in Canberra. I did a little research and found a couple of people to speak with in Auckland who knew about the Antarctic. After that, I drafted a new proposal about why a treaty system that was developed around sovereignty issues and solving political problems had increasingly become the focus of

---

**I think there are tiny steps that feel like milestones all the time. The first time you get invited to present at a national conference, the first time you get invited to present at an international conference, the first time you get a small grant—these are all milestones.**



*Empty fuel drums have been found scattered in parts of the Antarctic, a place once left nearly untouched by humans.*

environmental debate. In fact, it was a global governance question about institutional change, although I did not know that at the time. It was exciting, and I loved working on it. The tricky part was that I was uncertain as to what that actually meant for a PhD program, so it took me a while to find my feet. That is part of the message I give to my younger colleagues now; it may take you a while to find your feet.

Then the most amazing piece of luck happened. The treaty parties had been negotiating for the Convention on the Regulation of Antarctic Mineral Resource Activities to come into legal force, which required the signatures of all of the original Consultative Parties. The governments of Australia and France, who helped negotiate this convention, decided not to sign because they believed the environmental aspects were more important than the political. This, of course, caused an extraordinary upheaval and it happened in the middle of my PhD. All of a sudden I had a really interesting case study.

So getting my PhD was a milestone. I come from a working class background; nobody in my family had ever been to university, let alone gone all the way through to a PhD. I think there are tiny steps that feel like milestones all the time. The first time you get invited to present at a national conference, the first time you get invited to present at an international conference, the first time you get a small grant—these are all milestones. Making full professor was a milestone, and I am the only woman professor in the history of my department, so that was definitely a milestone. I actually get an extraordinary amount of joy out of the achievements of my students. When my students make their own mark, in academia or other fields, I consider that to be a milestone of my career. That is now the most important part of my job: mentoring and continuing to maintain those relationships with some of my best and brightest PhD students who are just now carving out the most extraordinary careers for themselves. And I take pride that a little bit of what I did has helped that process.



Photo: James Lehane

*Lorraine Elliott is shown among colleagues at the launch of the Transnational Environmental Crime Project on July 19, 2011. From left to right, they are Sophie Saydan, Grant Pink, Rose Webb, Professor Lawrence Cram, Professor Lorraine Elliott, Professor Greg Rose, Kimberley Dripps, and Julie Ayling.*

---

**In the science-policy interface, you have different kinds of skill sets, and the challenge is figuring out how to bring those skill sets together and create a conversation, rather than a set of monologues with two sides talking past each other. That is a big challenge!**

**One of the major concepts these days that requires more exploration is the science-policy interface. What do we need to do as academics to engage in the policy world, and how are we influenced by that policy world, directly or indirectly? Can you share with us your definitions of the science-policy interface and your understanding of what the next steps in that field might be?**

Part of my practical experience in this area is a project that I have been running on transnational environmental crime. I put together a small research team with an international lawyer and a criminologist as research investigators, and we applied to the Australian Research Council for what they call a linkage grant. That means we have to have what they refer to as industry partner, which can be a government department, and in this case it was the Australian Government Department of the Environment. The Environment Department made both a financial commitment and in-kind commitment to that project. We received three years of funding, which has just finished. We were working incredibly closely with the environmental regulatory areas, the environmental enforcement areas, and informally with the Department of Customs and other agencies as well. We spent a year on small preliminary work trying to identify where that science-policy interface was. We asked ourselves what kinds of things met our own academic requirements and ticked those boxes, and what could actually be part of a conversation. We were not trying to replicate, and I think that was really important. In the science-policy interface, you have different kinds of skill sets, and the challenge is figuring out how to bring those skill sets together and create a conversation, rather than a set of monologues with two sides talking past each other. That is a big challenge!

The way that program was structured, the Department for the Environment would nominate members of its staff to be visiting fellows with our project at the university for three months at a time and to write working papers on a piece of research that both addressed interesting intellectual questions and provided feedback into the development of policy within the department. We were lucky in this because there was a champion in the department who was crucial to this—those kinds of ongoing and personal relationships can be incredibly important. This level of engagement has worked both ways. For example, I was the only academic invited to speak at the plenary meeting of the INTERPOL Environmental Crime Programme in Bangkok two years ago. I attended as an observer for the session on the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, convened by the UN Office on Drugs and Crime in Vienna. I took our project into the Australasian Environmental Law Enforcement and Regulators Network (AELERT) and into the Asian Regional Partners Forum on Combating Environmental Crime (ARPEC). So part of this was actually being willing to engage and to find those sites of engagement.

---

**As an academic, I have always thought that our responsibility is to learn how to speak to multiple audiences, but it is hard to learn how to pick your audience and how to make that conversation meaningful.**

The big challenge in the science-policy interface is that we are very good at having conversations, but we know less about how those conversations lead to changes in policy outcomes. We also do not really know how those conversations might affect the way in which research is conducted without academics becoming “think tank” people or people who are simply writing policy papers that should be drafted by the policy community. As an academic, I have always thought that our responsibility is to learn how to speak to multiple audiences, but it is hard to learn how to pick your audience and how to make that conversation meaningful. In my own experience, it seems as though the science-policy interface has become stuck. We have this



*On April 25, 1945, at the San Francisco Conference, the first principles of the UN Charter were formulated.*

term, and we assume as long as we say what we are doing is the science-policy interface, that it has meaning. We need to revisit that to understand more effectively what is actually happening in this arena. It needs to be more than just the idea that we bring academics and policy practitioners together. We have always been doing that. What I want to know is what the interface dimension really is about.

#### **How do we find that out?**

In part, we find that out by analyzing and reviewing what we have done. We have to look at the experiences we have had to date to see where we think it has worked and where it has not. Effectively, we have to do a “lessons learned analysis.”

We also have to encourage people within the policy community to understand that academics have something to offer. In this regard, what has worked for us is providing space for people within the policy and practitioner community to spend a little time in the academic context, so they have an opportunity to reflect on the policy practice they are often caught up in on a day-to-day basis.

**You are the new chair of the Academic Council on the United Nations System (ACUNS), which is an institution that brings together academics and policymakers. What is the role of that institution in this arena? What are your plans for moving it forward? What do you plan to do differently as chair?**

The first point is yes, that is quite specifically and explicitly part of the ACUNS mission. It brings together people who are working on the UN system—studying and researching the UN system in all of its marvelous and sometimes frustrating complexity—with people and practitioners within the UN system. So it is partly about making information and research outcomes on the UN system available to those working within the UN system. It is also about figuring out how we access the knowledge about process, procedure, insight, and outcome from those who are international civil servants within the UN system. This is already being done in a number of ways through the ACUNS annual meeting, which this year will be in The Hague with the theme “The UN at 70.” It has been done through the well-regarded annual summer workshop that we run in conjunction with the American Society of International Law, which is specifically about bringing together younger scholars who are researching the UN system with early career practitioners within the UN system and within NGOs, who are very closely connected to the UN system. The UN Office of Management and Human Resources helps to fund that because they see it as a valuable experience for those early career practitioners from within the UN system. We also have a very active seminar series in New York, and we are looking to export that model to Geneva. In addition, we have a very active liaison office in Vienna.

So there is a lot of excellent work going on now, and my task is to build on that. There are a number of things that I am keen to do. One of them is to expand the way in which the community is able to converse within itself. For example, at this stage we do not have an online ACUNS discussion space where ACUNS members, whether they are institutional members or individuals within the UN system, would be able to actually engage with one another. We do have podcasts, book reviews, and quarterly newsletters on the website. So those are dissemination tools, but those tend to be one-way communications. I want to build on that process and create more communicative interactions among members. I am also eager to develop the way in which ACUNS goes global. We have summer workshops in some parts of the world, and we have our annual academic meetings in different parts

of the world. But, ACUNS is still seen as mainly a North American and European organization. I am the first person ever to chair the counsel from south of the equator, so I am looking at ways we can build partnerships with existing practices and institutions. I want to build ACUNS to, say, become relevant in the Horn of Africa, or to say, explore how studying the UN system is relevant in Southeast Asia.

The third thing that I really want to do is to think about building on what has already been done in terms of professional development opportunities for younger scholars. For example, we need to build a professional development component into our annual meeting to provide more space for PhD students and early career researchers. I am also working with Executive Director Dr. Alistair Edgar about the possibility of a book series. I have not been able to find a book series on the UN system, which means that the UN system becomes just one more example of international law and organizations. If we were to define something like “UN system studies,” we could then offer our members a platform through which to publish their research on the UN system.

**You are a thought-leader in the fields of global governance and human security. At UMass Boston we have a doctoral program in global governance and human security. Can you give us your thoughts on these as concepts and as emerging fields? Where are these fields headed? Where is the space for new intellectual contributions?**

---

**Global governance is something we are aiming for—the idea that this is going to be a structure of governance that is more open, transparent, democratic, and accountable. I’m not sure we have that yet.**

Those are really big questions. I will preface my answer by saying that I have welcomed the opportunity to meet some of the students who are working in this program. The work they are doing is amazing, both in terms of the coverage of issue areas and topics, and in the way they are starting to think about how you conceptualize the intersection between global governance and human security. We often think

of global governance first in a very institutional sense, and we have a language we develop around that now. We talk about rule systems, steering mechanisms, sites of authority, agency, and complexity and legitimacy and a range of other questions. But for me global governance is not simply just an institutional process. Global governance also enables us to deal with questions of scale. As we talk about multilevel governance, we talk about agency beyond the state as well. So it is recognition that the way in which we govern something that we call a globalized world involves actors other than international organizations and states, and in fact the best governing may be coming out of private authority arrangements or hybrid government arrangements where governments and international agencies and others are working together. Along these lines, global governance gives us a conceptual framework to make much better sense of what is happening in the world of international politics; so I think it really adds something there.

**I often go back to the pillars of human security as they have been articulated through the UN system: freedom from fear, freedom from want, freedom to live in dignity. I think those are the key dimensions.**

The other thing about global governance that is absolutely crucial and is sometimes missed by scholars working in the field is that the process and practices of global governance are also sites of struggle over power, wealth, and knowledge. That key point is directly related to the

early work of Craig Murphy, who, of course, is associated with your Center for Governance and Sustainability. So I really think we cannot deny the fact that political agendas are a part of global governance both generally and in individual areas, but global governance is a way of giving us the intellectual and analytical tools to make more sense of what is actually an increasingly complex world. If we just look at what states do intergovernmentally, and if we just look at international organizations, we miss an awful lot. That is important because there is a normative dimension to global governance. Global governance is something we are aiming for—the idea that this is going to be a structure of governance that is more open, transparent, democratic, and accountable. I’m not sure we have that yet.

So I think there is a governance deficit, and that is where we can start to find those connections with human security. Again, human security is a policy agenda at one level. Nobody would say human security is a bad thing, or that we should not be worried about the security of people. I often go back to the pillars of human security as they have been articulated through the UN system: freedom from fear, freedom from want, freedom to live in dignity. I think those are the key dimensions of this. But I think human security can also offer a new way of thinking about the challenges of global politics, as they function at the global and local level: How do we govern? What kinds of steering mechanisms do we use? What kind of institutional arrangements do we need to have in place to ensure human security outcomes?

Related to this, we really need to consider that people live extraordinarily diverse lives, and we need to have tools that can help us understand questions of scale and the way in which people experience their insecurities. Frequently those who are most vulnerable and most marginalized are least able to articulate and contest their own insecurities. It will be interesting to observe whether this will lead us to bring together two closely related conceptual apparatuses



*The Millennium Development Goals, established in 2000 and set to expire in 2015, cover the eight areas illustrated.*

**So I think it will be critical to think about how the SDGs can be people-centered rather than people-oriented. That distinction is sometimes subtle, but it is absolutely crucial.**



*In September 1971, Chairman of the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment Keith Johnson (Jamaica) (left), United Nations Secretary-General U Thant (center), and Secretary-General of the Conference Maurice F. Strong (right), display the official conference poster at the United Nations Headquarters, New York.*

and frameworks, or if we will start to generate a new way of thinking about global politics. I maintain my conviction that global governance and human security are more than just topics and fields of study. I think that is going to be a very interesting process.

**In that context, there is currently movement toward the creation of a new set of global goals, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which will bring together the global governance and human security dimensions in a very concrete policy-driven way. I know your academic work is not in this field, but you are closely monitoring what is happening. Can you give us your sense of where the agenda about the SDGs stands? What is missing? How**

**should we think about these from an analytical perspective?**

We have been setting these types of goals for 30 plus years. We had the Millennium Development Goals, but before that we had the 1987 report of the World Commission on Environment and Development and before that the Stockholm Declaration of 1972. As I think about these milestones, I am concerned that we have not been able to get closer to sustainable development and human security than we currently are. I worry that there is a bigger question of why we are still setting goals.

That is not to deny the extraordinary commitment and work that people working within UN agencies, NGOs, and governments have done. There has been an extraordinary amount of activism and action. But when everyone is talking about the SDGs, I want to remind everyone that there is a history of how we got to this point, and there are some real gaps.

My second thought is that in reducing things to targets, there is a danger of dehumanizing—of reducing people and their communities into statistics to be measured or targets to be achieved. So I think it will be critical to think about how the SDGs can be people-centered rather than people-oriented. That distinction is sometimes subtle, but it is absolutely crucial. It goes along with thinking about people not just as the beneficiaries of aid or development systems, but about being empowered, authorized to speak their own insecurity. They need to be able to negotiate, and to test these kinds of goals.

To say this is all very well, but what does it mean to me on the ground? I think it is about questions of voice: Who gets to be heard and not heard, and why? How do we broach the topics like communicative ethics and dialogical

ethics? How would we think from the position of somebody who is the most disadvantaged and the most vulnerable? That is sometimes easier in the argument than it is in the doing, but it is absolutely crucial.

The third thing for me would be how we deal with issues of scale. We need to put in place governance structures that enable us to translate global goals and regional goals down to the way those are interpreted at a community level, or a household level. On top of that, it will be important that the SDGs are also living goals. We need to be able to take the lessons from what happens in a local community, region, or subnational region, and feed that back into a process of reevaluation and make those goals responsive to what is happening on the ground. That is really hard.

**The Scientific Advisory Board to the UN Secretary-General has been asking these very same questions and discussing the role of science in that equation. If you engage science in the reevaluation, rethinking, and measurement of goals and their implementation, then you bring that dimension in a much more dynamic way.**

It is important to stress the word *science* in that context means knowledge and that comes back to a very crucial question of whose knowledge. There is, of course, a space for expert knowledge, for knowledge about technology, but technology can take multiple forms. Technology does not have to be expensive and complicated, which goes back to the “appropriate technology” debates of the ’60s and ’70s. Sometimes it seems like we are going around in circles, and I wonder how we get out of this loop. But I am interested in that question about whose knowledge or science is actually valorized, or marginalized, and whether we are making the right sort of decisions around that.

**Sometimes it does feel like we are going in a circle, but you might also think about spirals rather than circles, and that you need those loops to get you through the spiral. If you think about it that way, there are critical choices in those spirals where it can be an upward spiral or a downward spiral—you can learn from history to get to an upward spiral, or not learn and find yourself in a downward spiral.**

There is an ecological metaphor there, about positive and negative feedback loops. It is about understanding this as an organic process, not as a linear process. If we add to this the idea of thresholds, there is a point at which the gathering of knowledge simply stays as the collection of data, or it tips you over into a new way of thinking because



*During his appointment as Secretary-General, Kofi Annan was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize jointly with the United Nations in 2001.*

the information and the analysis makes you aware of details you had not noticed before. So I think it is interesting the way that the ecological metaphors about positive and negative feedback loops, about nonlinearity, about thresholds, can actually be applied to the way in which we manage both the science-policy and knowledge-policy interface.

**On that note, we are entering, in a sense, a new era of the United Nations, one that is the UN at 70, but importantly there will be a selection of a new Secretary-General who will start his or her duties in January of 2017. Historically, the process of selecting a Secretary-General has been rather opaque, but with contemporary technology and the engagement of a global citizenry, it seems to be opening up. I have a few questions in this vein. First, what are the qualities that you think a new Secretary-General should possess to take the UN into this new era of engagement? And second, is ACUNS taking up a certain intellectual space in that era? What, if any, is the role of ACUNS in that process? And what could it be?**

I will answer the second question first. The ACUNS mission is to disseminate knowledge about the UN system. So the ways in which the Secretary-General is selected is part of that knowledge about the UN system. I have only had preliminary discussions, but there is no doubt that our members will be making observations about this. I

imagine it will be in our quarterly newsletter, on our website, possibly talked about through our podcasts and seminars. We will work to help people understand how the Secretary-General is selected. It is a curious process, and I think our activities will reflect our mission to shine light on how the UN system works. This is clearly a very important part of the UN system. By virtue of its mission, ACUNS will not take a policy stance on who this person might be or should be, but there is absolutely a role for the council members to analyze and illuminate the process. We bring together people who work on the UN system as researchers, practitioners, and scholars. There is no doubt that there will be opportunities for discussion. There will probably be panels on this at our forthcoming annual meeting in The Hague, which is, of course, meeting under the theme of “The UN at 70.” So I think there is intellectual space for us in terms of meeting our mission.

As for the other question, I need to stress here that I am answering in my own capacity, not at all as the chair-elect of ACUNS. So for me, part of what we need to think about as we enter the selection process is how we might describe the forms of leadership we have had in the Secretary-General up until now. I do not think we have had one model of leadership. We have had some very activist Secretaries-General—Kofi Annan is generally taken to be one of the most activist. There are dangers to being an activist Secretary-General, and I think we saw that as well because the more you engage, the more opportunities there are for things to go wrong. I would say that Ban Ki-moon has been a very different kind of leader, one who has tried very hard to make the Secretariat still an important component of the UN system, and to remind member states of the role of the Secretariat. That has been important. So an answer to the question of what kind of

person do we need? I think you put your finger on it, actually, when you talked about this being a new era of engagement. The UN is 70 years old. It is not the institution that it was in 1945, and nor should it be. We are in a different world, but I am not always certain that components of the UN system have adjusted as well. The parts of the UN system that have

---

**If you look historically, those people who dared to dream about votes for women, about the end of slavery (which has not actually ended), in democracy—those people were thought to be incredibly dangerous and utopian, and yet these are the sorts of things that we now take for granted.**



*Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon joined the crowd at the 2014 Climate March in New York.*

adjusted the best are those further away from the institutional core in New York—and I mean not just physically, but also intellectually. The core agencies, the Security Council, the Secretariat, the General Assembly have tended in some ways to lag behind those dimensions of change. So one of the leadership qualities that we are looking for in the Secretary-General

is somebody who can find ways to bring together the member states and the practice of multilateralism, which some member states are practicing more than others. If I'm being honest, I also think we may possibly need a younger Secretary-General, someone with intellectual energy and entrepreneurial skills. I think we need somebody who has diplomatic skills and sees himself or herself not simply as an international public servant but also as the head of a system that has to continue to work effectively if we are to achieve a better world for everyone.

Some people say that this is wishful thinking, but Oscar Wilde once said "a map of the world that does not include Utopia is not worth even glancing at." If you look historically, those people who dared to dream about votes for women, about the end of slavery (which has not actually ended) in democracy, those people were thought to be incredibly dangerous and utopian, and yet these are the sorts of things that we now take for granted.

Back to the question, I think it is time there was a woman Secretary-General. The list of capable women who could fill this role covers an amazing range of expertise. I think this would actually show that the UN is meaningful and relevant to a contemporary world. This might mean moving away from geographic rotation. There are, of course, political reasons for the rotation, but it is a longstanding debate in the UN. I was reading this about geographical representation and the need for talent 25 years ago. Sometimes those two coincide, and sometimes they do not. Again, this is my very personal view.

**Our students are gearing up for their careers in this "new world." What would your advice be as they are thinking about entering this very dynamic world of academia and policy, and this knowledge-policy interface. What skills do they need? What should they be thinking about as they launch their careers?**

That is the hardest question of all in some respects because there is a dimension in which you can plan a career, and there is a degree to which accidents happen. I would like to say first to be responsive to the accidents and opportunities that might come along from left field or right field or some other field. Be alert and aware that sometimes life might take a detour that you might not expect.

---

**I would like to say first to be responsive to the accidents and opportunities that might come along from left field or right field or some other field. Be alert and aware that sometimes life might take a detour that you might not expect.**

The second thing is the traditional advice we give people—particularly those moving into an academic career—to network and work with mentors. Specifically, in this area of human security and global governance, just remember there is scope for you to build an academic career around, like I did in pursuing my PhD. When I started my PhD in 1988, people told me it would not be possible to build an academic career working on international environmental politics, but I am a stubborn person. I dug my heels in because that is what I wanted to do, and that has been the core of my career trajectory.

Studying the global environment has been a way for me to engage with bigger questions related to global governance, global ethics, international relations, and human security, and it is important for your students particularly to know that these are not just topic areas. They need to think about where they will position themselves and how they will explain what they can add to a politics department, a center for public policy, or to an international relations department. Although global governance is thought of as coming out of an international relations background, one of the things that impresses me is the range of disciplinary expertise of your students. I think that has both constraints, in that many institutions still think in discipline terms, but it also has extraordinary opportunities. There are institutions that are multidisciplinary and have expertise in moving between the knowledge community and the practitioner community. Human security and global governance enables and prepares you to be able to do that much easier.

There is growing emphasis on this immeasurable thing called “impact” in a university context. We do not actually know what it means or how to measure it, but we have an idea that it exists. I think this kind of a program equips students to have that kind of value, and I think it’s important to remind them and encourage them to articulate that value. Also, as they move through their own academic

careers, they must remember that it becomes their responsibility to mentor the next generation of scholarship. They are not cogs in a machine; they are part of a community of scholarship, knowledge, and policy. As they become the professors, I would advise them that part of their career development and part of their job is to bring on the next generation of scholars and scholarship.



*Lorraine Elliott engaged with the Center for Governance and Sustainability team in February, 2015, to learn about current and future projects.*

## About the University

With a growing reputation for innovative research addressing complex urban issues, the University of Massachusetts Boston, metropolitan Boston's only public university, offers its diverse student population both an intimate learning environment and the rich experience of a great American city. UMass Boston's 11 colleges and graduate schools serve nearly 17,000 students while engaging local, national, and international constituents through academic programs, research centers, and public service activities.

Part of the five-campus University of Massachusetts system, UMass Boston is located on a peninsula in Boston Harbor, near the John F. Kennedy Library and Museum, the Massachusetts State Archives and Museum, and the Edward M. Kennedy Institute for the United States Senate. To learn more about UMass Boston, visit [www.umb.edu](http://www.umb.edu).

## About the John W. McCormack Graduate School of Policy and Global Studies

Named in honor of U.S. House of Representatives Speaker John W. McCormack, the McCormack Graduate School was founded in 2003 as an academic and research center in policy studies at the University of Massachusetts Boston. It is the go-to school for a world-class interdisciplinary education and values-driven research that seeks to explain and offer remedies for some of the most important social, political, economic, and environmental issues of our time. A dynamic institution with a teaching soul, the school trains the next generation of local and global leaders in conflict resolution, gerontology, global governance and human security, international relations, public affairs, and public policy.



UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS BOSTON

50 Years

## About This Series

Based on in-person interchanges, the stories told in the Global Leadership Dialogues Series offer insights into the professional work and personal experiences of notable professionals in the global governance field. The series provides in-depth perspectives on what these leaders think about key issues in global governance, what inspires them, and how they imagine the future.

## Citation Information

Please use the following citation for this brief:

Global Leadership Dialogues, Volume 2, Issue 4: "UN System Scholar: Lorraine Elliott" 2015. Center for Governance and Sustainability, University of Massachusetts Boston.

## Center for Governance and Sustainability

The Center for Governance and Sustainability seeks to bring academic rigor to real-world policy challenges in environment, development, and sustainability governance. It serves as information hub, analyst, and honest broker among scholars, students, and practitioners. Opinions expressed in the Global Leadership Dialogues Series are solely those of the interviewees and do not necessarily represent the views of the Center for Governance and Sustainability or the University of Massachusetts Boston.

All issues are available for download at [www.umb.edu/cgs/publications](http://www.umb.edu/cgs/publications) and [www.environmentalgovernance.org/publications](http://www.environmentalgovernance.org/publications).

### Center for Governance and Sustainability

Maria Ivanova and Craig Murphy, Co-directors

John W. McCormack Graduate School of Policy  
and Global Studies  
University of Massachusetts Boston  
100 Morrissey Boulevard  
Boston, MA 02125  
[cgs@umb.edu](mailto:cgs@umb.edu)  
[www.umb.edu/cgs](http://www.umb.edu/cgs)  
[www.environmentalgovernance.org](http://www.environmentalgovernance.org)

### Global Leadership Dialogues Series

Series Editor: Prof. Maria Ivanova  
[maria.ivanova@umb.edu](mailto:maria.ivanova@umb.edu)

A copy of this publication is available in alternative format upon request. Please go to [www.ada.umb.edu](http://www.ada.umb.edu).

