

**Structural Fairness & Legitimacy Stress Initiative**

**Phase I Outreach Report**

**Author:** CARO International Relations Team

**Organization:** CARO

**Period Covered:** February 2026

**Status:** Outreach Paused — Consolidation Phase

3/16/2026

## 1. Executive Summary

Between early and mid-February 2026, CARO conducted a targeted, elite-level outreach campaign introducing a mechanism-level research question:

Can legitimacy erosion be treated as a detectable system condition (“legitimacy stress”) that serves as an early-warning layer for pre-escalation in democratic and multilateral governance?

The campaign was:

- Non-ideological
- Non-activist
- Non-prescriptive
- Mechanism-focused
- Individually targeted
- Sent one-at-a-time
- No attachments
- No follow-ups

Total institutions contacted: **15+**

Total named individuals contacted: **10+**

Early responses received:

- 2 neutral, agenda-based declines
- No substantive critiques
- No negative feedback

Campaign now paused for internal consolidation.

## **2. Campaign Design Principles**

The outreach followed strict discipline:

### **Framing**

- “Exploratory research question.”
- “Mechanism-level analytical framework.”
- “Not a reform proposal.”
- “Not normative.”
- “Not advocacy.”

### **Communication Discipline**

- One email per institution
- No CC
- No LinkedIn follow-ups
- No attachments
- No pressure language
- No follow-up after declines

### **Strategic Objective**

Not immediate collaboration.

The goal was:

- Conceptual exposure
- Testing intellectual legibility
- Seeding across epistemic communities
- Mapping agenda resonance

### **3. Institutional Coverage Map**

The outreach was intentionally diversified across five knowledge ecosystems.

#### **A. Multilateral & Global Policy Foresight**

##### **United Nations University – Centre for Policy Research (UNU-CPR)**

Status: Sent – Holding

##### **Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) – Strategic Foresight Unit**

Status: Sent – Holding

#### **B. European Strategic & Security Policy**

##### **Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI)**

Contacted: Dan Smith

Status: Sent – Holding

##### **Geneva Centre for Security Policy (GCSP)**

Contacted: Thomas Greninger

Status: Sent – Holding

##### **German Institute for International and Security Affairs (SWP)**

Status: Sent – Holding

#### **C. Forecasting & Decision Science**

##### **RAND Corporation (Forecasting pathway)**

Contacted: Philip E. Tetlock

Status: Sent – Holding

## **D. Canada — Governance & International Affairs**

### **Centre for International Governance Innovation (CIGI)**

Status: Sent — Holding

### **Munk School of Global Affairs**

Status: Sent — Holding

### **University of Ottawa — Centre for International Policy Studies**

Contacted: Roland Paris

Status: Neutral decline (agenda-based)

## **E. Elite Academic Institutions**

### **Yale University — Jackson School of Global Affairs**

Contacted: Stathis Kalyvas

Status: Sent — Holding

### **Sciences Po (France)**

Contacted: Bruno Palier

Status: Neutral decline (agenda mismatch)

### **University of Helsinki (Finland)**

Contacted: Matti Ylönen

Status: Sent — Holding

### **Uppsala University (Sweden)**

Contacted: Peter Wallensteen

Status: Sent — Holding

## **F. Context-Specific Governance Outreach**

### **Ali Riaz (Bangladesh, July Charter context)**

Status: Sent — Holding

## **4. Response Analysis**

### **Response 1 — Roland Paris (University of Ottawa)**

“I am not pursuing this question at present.”

Interpretation:

- No critique
- No disagreement
- Pure agenda timing
- Clean procedural decline

Impact:

- No damage to concept
- No reframing required

### **Response 2 — Bruno Palier (Sciences Po)**

“My research interests are disconnected from the one you mention.”

Interpretation:

- Agenda mismatch
- No conceptual objection
- No negative tone
- Clear professional boundary

Impact:

- No damage
- No structural adjustment required

## **Key Observation**

Both declines:

- Were polite
- Were brief
- Contained no criticism
- Indicated clarity of framing

This suggests:

- The idea is legible
- The pitch is disciplined
- The mechanism is understood
- Rejection is agenda-based, not content-based

## 5. Campaign Strengths

1. Clear, consistent framing across all institutions
2. No ideological leakage
3. No urgency language
4. No reform advocacy positioning
5. High-tier institutional coverage
6. Geographic diversification (US, Canada, EU, Nordics, Bangladesh context)
7. Entry into forecasting, foresight, conflict prevention, and governance scholarship

## 6. Risks Avoided

The campaign successfully avoided:

- Mass outreach dilution
- LinkedIn overexposure
- Attachment spam filtering
- Reform framing traps
- Democracy-activism categorization
- Pressure follow-ups

Discipline was maintained throughout.

## 7. Current Strategic Position

The concept is now:

- Placed in multilateral foresight ecosystems
- Placed in conflict prevention research circles
- Placed in elite academia
- Placed in forecasting science
- Placed in a transitional governance context

This represents **maximum credible saturation without overextension.**

## **8. Overall Assessment**

The outreach phase achieved its primary objective:

- The idea is now visible inside multiple serious institutional ecosystems.
- The framing has been tested and holds.
- There has been no reputational damage.
- Declines were procedural, not substantive.
- The campaign remains strategically intact.

Status: **Stable. Controlled. Undiluted.**