

P@X online bulletin

SUMMARY:

Editorial 1
José Manuel Pureza

P@X theory 2/4
Interview David Sogge
“Falar de segurança humana ajuda a contextualizar relações de poder”
José Manuel Pureza

P@x observatory 5/6

P@x studies
“Human security: still a valid concept?” 7/8
Karlos Pérez Armiño

“Human security concepts and policies: a critical approach” 9/10
Eunice Castro Seixas

“Guinea-Bissau: is it enough to reform security?” 11/13
Sílvia Roque

NEP's attic 14/18
Publications
Activities
Projects

P@X

Peace Studies Group coordination:
José Manuel Pureza

P@X online bulletin coordination:
Rita Santos e Sofia Santos
Editing and translation:
Rita Santos, Sofia Santos e Katia

Cardoso
Collaboration: *Sarah da Mota*

Peace Studies Group
Centre for Social Studies
School of Economics
University of Coimbra
Colégio S. Jerónimo, Apartado 3087
3001-401 Coimbra
Portugal

Tel: + 351 239 855593
Fax: + 351 239 855589

<http://www.ces.uc.pt/nucleos/nep>
nep@ces.uc.pt

Editorial

Whose security? This question revolutionised the realm of security studies in the 90s decade onwards and shook the old constructions that equated security with political-military defence of State boundaries and territorial sovereignty. This statecentric vision was then harshly denounced as shielding intolerable perversions, namely the silencing of high density insecurities experimented by individuals and peoples at the hands of oppressive and genocidal States. To a certain extent, the concept of human security, explored in this edition of P@x, expresses in this domain an identical turn to the one translated into the erosion of traditional of sovereignties as a result of the inclusion of human rights in the international



agenda.

About human security, some have claimed it to be somewhat similar to sustainable development: everyone mentions it but no-one knows exactly what it is. This broad consensus is effectively far more rhetorical than political and far more instrumental than real. As asserted by David Sogge in this edition, “the human security talk has helped Western policy elites, namely in the military, diplomatic and foreign aid branches, to regain legitimacy in domestic and in international fora, to forge pacts for mutual benefit and to bolster their budgets.” That is, the ambition to include

the struggle against fear and deprivation in the list of security priorities has not materialised into substantial changes in international power relations and has served essentially as a tool (yet another one) to control and discipline the turbulent periphery by the distraught centre. The colonial present has many faces and this can be yet another one.

In between, lay the transformations demanded in order to fulfil the essential political purpose announced by this seductive expression. And, as a sort of revenge of History, the question returns, now in a new version: whose *human* security?

José Manuel Pureza

P@X theory

Interview with David
Sogge, by José
Manuel Pureza

“Talk of human security helps frame power relations”

JMP - There is a general consensus around the belief that human security has meant a small revolution in the academic field. But what about concrete public policies? Namely in aid for development policies, what has been the actual impact of assuming human security as a goal?

DS - As a way of talking about problems and policies, human security has indeed gained a lot of attention. Many claims are made about its impact. It is said to have helped promote treaties to outlaw landmines and cluster bombs and to establish the International Criminal Court. There's been a suggestion that it inspired international activism that helped reduce the number of civil wars. They may not be wholly false, but these kinds of claims look exaggerated. They bring to mind the theme of the Angolan novel, “O Vendedor de Passados”, about a clever story-teller who composed fictional biographies and genealogies that flattered his status-seeking clients.

While it is true that aid spending in troubled places like Pakistan, Sudan and Congo (and of course Iraq and Afghanistan) has shot up in recent years, these are mainly crisis-driven things. There is little evidence that they, or similar episodes, have been policy-driven — let alone that they were driven by policies based on human security.

The paradigm's chief effects up to now have been institutional, promoting policy coalitions. Human security talk has helped Western policy elites, namely in the military, diplomatic and foreign aid branches, to regain legitimacy in domestic and in international fora, to forge pacts for mutual benefit and to bolster their budgets.

JMP - How can we measure human security? What kind of indicators are most adequate?

DS - Some of the best indicators may be developed just by asking what people themselves think is important. Of course local, subjective views aren't always reliable; people on Asian shorelines on the morning of 26 December 2004, before the tsunami hit, probably thought themselves secure. But meaningful indicators can often be found, and misleading ones avoided, by staying close to the ground. Official guardians of security can be poor sources. Official crime data usually reflect current priorities of politicians and the police, whereas victimization surveys provide much more realistic insight.

Today's huge indicator industry has drawn attention to important matters. But might our submersion in these kinds of data, which are mainly descriptors of the poor and insecure, be a hindrance to understanding? The indicator industry produces very little about the structural relationships that continually reproduce poverty and insecurity. In the Millennium Development Goals for example, you will not find anything about inequality, either vertical or 'horizontal' (among cultural, ethnic or regional groupings), or about 'winners' and 'losers' over time. The MDGs and similar frameworks tell us nothing about domestic or international mechanisms that redistribute income and other resources. Subjective views, namely collective feelings of humiliation, are the combustible material fueling conflict and insecurity in many settings, yet very little work has been done to frame and to gauge them.

JMP - Is human security working, in concrete terms, as a basis for empowerment of local communities in the global south? Are those communities heard in the identification of their demands of human security?

P@X theory

Or is it usually an exogenous definition process?

DS - Hundreds of studies and testimonies have now accumulated about claims of “participation” and of “ownership” in all kinds of programmes and policies, especially those most relevant to human security. But these claims are seldom valid. Empowerment, certainly at local level, isn’t happening. Powerful outsiders or their national proxies continue to call the shots, and call them badly. They have given them new names and poured a participatory sauce over them, but they continue serving up the same policy formulas. These are the same old Washington Consensus formulas that have weakened public services, public order and the legitimacy of public politics.

For example, Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) — the flagship of the new, listening, responsive style of the foreign aid industry — almost never address the issue of decent employment. Yet “participatory” processes used to formulate PRSPs somehow never detected what public opinion surveys in Africa and Latin America have confirmed over many years, namely that people regard jobs as by far their most important priority. Similarly, studies of security sector reform — an excellent opportunity to narrow gaps between police and citizens and to improve human rights observance — show that citizen voice is usually neglected. Instead, new agents such as private security companies (the preference of many Western interests) are gaining priority.

JMP - Do you agree that there is a risk of perversion in using the concept of human security and therefore bring security to the forefront of the world's priorities? Isn't this a way of securitizing, in traditional terms, the aid for development field?

DS - Imperatives in the West to frame ideas and slogans about how to deal with non-Western peoples are of course an old

challenge, especially for elites. The aid-and-development industry has tackled this with enthusiasm, producing a rising stream of and approaches. Today this stream seems to have reached a point of over-production. There are now surpluses that can’t be sold and are being passed on to second-hand outlets and recycling industries.

Since first emerging in UN circles about 15 years ago, human security “talk” has become part of a common idiom. We hear that idiom spoken, in public anyway, by members of a powerful new policy coalition including both the aid industry and the military. Yet it is far from enjoying primacy. Rather its role is that of an auxiliary team player alongside two paradigms with far heavier political backing: “national security” and “collective security”.

JMP - Human security or human rights -- this seems to be the question. Don't you think that the use of the expression 'human security' means a lower level of demand of social transformation than the one included in a human rights --centred approach?

DS - Yes, those pressures for social transformation will be lower, certainly if the narrow version of the human security paradigm (‘freedom from fear’, focused on individuals and open violence) continues to eclipse the broader version, which embraces whole social categories and their social and economic rights (‘freedom from want’). The latter, with their redistributive implications, are not on the agenda of major western powers. That can be seen for example in the US State Department’s annual reports on human rights in non-Western countries.

Talk of human security, like talk about human rights in their restricted sense, helps frame power relations. It asserts a prerogative of the powerful to say whose rights are to be respected, whose not respected, and to say who shall be

P@X theory

system of domination now in place -- a risky thing, given that "stabilisation" practices have a way of triggering a lot of instability. Look at Afghanistan and Pakistan today.

JMP - With the so-called 'war on terrorism', it seems to have occurred a return to traditional security concepts and policies. Dis human security loose intensity within the framework of the global war on terror?

DS - Certainly. In European, and now even US military doctrine, we are witnessing 'mission creep' toward socio-economic engineering and 'nation-building'. New rules of engagement are today both hard and 'soft'. An announcement by the Pentagon two years ago seems to have escaped the notice of many: it proclaimed that "stability operations are a core US Military mission" that will henceforth enjoy "priority comparable to combat operations". In Iraq, this has been translated into sub-doctrines like "Employ money as a weapons system". The Obama administration is going to apply such "stabilisation" doctrines with greater intensity in places like Afghanistan . In Africa , where Western publics are told that both "energy security" and "terrorism" are at stake, the Pentagon is quietly assuming supreme command over American foreign aid and development designs. Given such trends, it is hard to imagine human security in its broad definition gaining any intensity, except for advertising and public relations purposes.

David Sogge has been working in the field of development aid for over thirty years. He is a visiting professor at the universities of Harvard and Princeton, and a researcher at the Transnational Institute, in Amsterdam. Amongst his most recent publications are "Give and Take. What's the Matter with Foreign Aid?", Zed Books, 2002 and "Selling US Wars" (with Achin Vanaik), London, 2007).

P@x observatory

Resources on Human security*

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (1994), *Human Development Report*.

<http://hdr.undp.org/en/reports/global/hdr1994/>

Acharya, Amitav (2001), "Human Security: East versus West?" *Working paper* n°17, *Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies Singapore*.

<http://www.isn.ethz.ch/isn/DigitalLibrary/Publications/Detail/?ots591=CAB359A3-9328-19CC-A1D2-8023E646B22C&lng=en&id=27522>

Comissão para a Segurança Humana (2003), *Human Security Now*.

<http://www.humansecuritychs.org/finalreport/index.html>

Debiel, Tobias, Werthes, Sascha (eds.) (2006), *Human Security on Foreign policy Agendas. Changes, concepts and cases*. Relatório do *Institute for Development and Peace*.

<http://inef.unidue.de/page/documents/Report80.pdf>

Evans, Paul M. (2004), "Human Security and East Asia: in the beginning" *Journal of East Asian Studies*, Vol.4, 263-284.

[http://www.ligi.ubc.ca/sites/liu/files/Publications/Human Security and East Asia.pdf](http://www.ligi.ubc.ca/sites/liu/files/Publications/Human%20Security%20and%20East%20Asia.pdf)

Floyd, Rita (2007), "Human Security and the Copenhagen School's Securitization Approach: conceptualizing Human Security as a Securitizing Move" *Human Security Journal*, n°5, Inverno, 38-49.

<http://www.peacecenter.sciencespo.fr/journal/issue5pdf/6.Floyd.pdf>

King, Gary, Murray, Christopher (2001), "Rethinking Human Security" *Political Science Quarterly*, vol. 116, n° 4, 585-610.

http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1082914

Paris, Roland (2001), "Human Security: paradigm shift or hot air?" *International Security*, vol.26, n°2, Outono, 87-102.

[http://aix1.uottawa.ca/~rparis/Paris.2001.IS.Human %20Security.pdf](http://aix1.uottawa.ca/~rparis/Paris.2001.IS.Human%20Security.pdf)

*with the collaboration of Sarah da Mota

P@x builders*

Human Security Network

Group made up of fourteen States with a common understanding of human security and committed to promote it through their Foreign Offices. Its main goal is to establish collective actions destined to the protection of the individuals and draw attention to human development issues on the part of the international community. Amongst their most reknown efforts are the universalisation of the Ottawa Convention on Landmines and the set up of the International Criminal Court.

<http://humansecuritynetwork.org/menu-e.php>

Human Security Report Project

State-funded project which devotes its attention to research and workshop organisation. It publishes the *Human Security Report*, *Human Security Brief*, electronic bulletins and the site *The Afghanistan Conflict Monitor* aimed at making accessible research on political violence.

<http://www.hsrgroup.org>

The Human Security Gateway

Product of the *Human Security Report Project* initiative, this online database contains several electronic and bibliographic references with the purpose of making accessible information and research on human security. In this platform, several reports, academic essays and press articles on human security are made accessible.

<http://www.humansecuritygateway.info>

UN Trust Fund for Human Security

This UN support fund funds projects of UN agencies with the purpose of promoting a greater operational impact of the human security concept. Less developed countries as well as war-torn scenarios, where people are less secure, are prioritised.

African Human Security Initiative

This project, run by the Nairobi Institute for Security Studies, intends to consolidate research on security issues in Africa, aiming at assisting the work and mission of the African Union. It is focused currently on the monitorisation of the criminal justice systems in a group of countries, whose analyses and briefing reports are available on the project's website.

<http://www.africanreview.org>

Canadian Consortium on Human Security

Academic consortium aiming at promoting research on human security, mainly conducted by Canadian Phds in several war zones. It disseminates an online publication with thematic analyses and expert opinion on human security.

<http://www.humansecurity.info>

*with the collaboration of Sarah da Mota

Human security: still a valid concept?

P@X studies

The concept of human security was introduced in the early 90s as a new paradigm centred on people's security, rather than on state security. Despite the fact that its dissemination was facilitated by the end of Cold War, the formulation of this paradigm resulted from the evolution during the previous decades both in the realms of development studies and security studies.

After its formulation, in 1994, by the UNDP, in which human security was interpreted as a necessary condition to achieve human development (and vice-versa), the concept received a warm welcome. On the one hand, it materialised the confluence of two disciplines traditionally apart, development and security studies respectively, once the perception of war causes gravitated increasingly around the issues of poverty and underdevelopment. On the other hand, human security displayed normative, progressive and transformative characteristics. The fact that it is based on the security of peoples, both individually and collectively, rather than on state security, presupposed a significant shift of paradigm, prioritising peoples' rights, freedoms and well-fare, in opposition to classical IR principles, such as national interest, state security and power inter-state relations. According to this perspective, human security cannot be achieved through geopolitical and/or armed confrontation, but rather through public policies based on a basic social contract, through which the State would be able to assure well-fare and human rights (including socio-economic ones), and, internationally, through multilateral cooperation and prevention.

Thought on human security soon fragmented into two distinct poles. On the one hand, the broad approach, coinciding with UNDP's initial formulation and seconded by Japan, which prioritises freedom from want, that is, the satisfaction of human development and a certain degree of well-fare (economic, sanitary, food and environmental security). On the other hand, the narrow focus, which

The advocates of the second perspective argue that the broad approach includes too many elements and thus is imprecise and hard to measure, as well as of little usefulness both as an analytical tool and mobilising flag. Hence the adoption of a narrower and more operative definition is advocated instead. However, it is worthy to underline that these potential deficiencies are not inherent to the human security concept *per se*. In fact, the design of indicators is a technical difficulty that can be easily overcome. Its operability, however, rests upon political will.

In the last decade, the narrow version of human security has gained prominence over the broad one. If the initial concept of human security reflected a balance between the two elements – physical security in face of threats and development – as time passed by the latter component has been watered down. This represents a set-back regarding the initial contributions brought about human security, namely the idea that people's security is not only endangered by violence, but also by other type of threats aimed at subsistence, such as misery and epidemics. Hence, in my understanding, the narrow focus is not able to capture the complex, systemic and multidimensional character of insecurities experienced by people in settings labelled as "complex political emergencies." Ultimately, the narrow version of human security presupposes the erosion of the transformative potential of human security by wearing away its link to economic, social and cultural rights, which constitute the main justification for welfare policies.

Moreover, as signaled by some authors, in the last years we have witnessed a certain co-option and distortion of the human security concept on the part of western powers, with the purpose of serving their foreign policies. Within the narrow framework, it has been recognised that the States have the "obligation to protect" its citizens and that failure to do so justifies coercive intervention on the part of the international community.

Keeping in mind the elements mentioned above, it is pertinent to ask whether the human security approach remains useful today. In my view, and despite recognising its limitations and pitfalls, this concept retains its potential, both analytically and in terms of social transformation. Its broad focus, in particular, enables analyses capable of questioning international institutions and policies inspired by the neoliberal tenet and distinguishing responsibilities concerning human inequalities and insecurities. However, in order to develop and fulfill its potential, it is necessary to deepen research on its theoretical and practical contents, exploring, for instance, its links with other analytical categories such as gender, human rights and human development. Thus, the design of suitable indicators would also be important, in order to expand the credibility and operability of this paradigm.

Karlos Pérez de Armiño

International Relations Professor, University of the Basque Country, and researcher at HEGOA-Instituto de Estudios sobre Desarrollo y Cooperación Internacional.

P@X studies

Human security concepts and policies: a critical approach

P@X studies

Introduced in 1994 by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP, 1994), the human security (HS) perspective has become a central normative reference in IR and in the political agenda of global governance. Nevertheless, HS remains a highly disputed concept both academically and politically (cf. Paris, 2001; Prezelj, 2008; Oberleitner, 2005). And, unfortunately, in this terrain, like in many others, there is a notorious gap between the academic debate and political circles, not only in Europe but also in America (Waeber, 2004: 17-18).

HS advocates encompass intergovernmental programmes of global multilateral institutions (UNDP), regional structures (EU), “middle powers” foreign policy agendas (namely in Canada, Norway and Japan) and international NGOs. Yet, even amongst these, different notions of human security are advanced and promoted (for instance, the European criticism to Bush’s war against terror, perceived as a distortion of HS).

In general, however, HS advocates advance the following benefit of this perspective: a) its focus on the individual, instead of the state; b) an ethics of responsibility towards the ‘distant other’; c) the promotion of universal values which articulate the ideas of “freedom from want” and “freedom from fear” in a comprehensive and multilayered perspective of security, allegedly more adequate to the post Cold-War and the Globalisation contexts; the fostering of a global cosmopolitanism, through multilateralism and international law; d) the empowerment of individuals to whom HS policies are aimed at; and finally e) peace building and reconciliation by means of international intervention, supposedly limited in time in post-conflict scenarios or “failed states” (Oberleitner, 2005; Kaldor, 1999).

These promises, however, have remained unaccomplished. In fact, its own assumptions may be regarded as one of the main reasons for those broken promises. One of the critiques aimed at Human Security is based on the de-construction of the idea of “forces of good” and “middle powers”, which clearly mask the hegemonic nature of the global cosmopolitanism promise (Rosamond and Monroe, 2008). Therefore, Human Security emerges as an “assemblage of governance”,

Therefore, Human Security emerges as an “assemblage of governance”, which acts through some biopolitical dispositives within the humanitarian sphere, regime changing scenarios and peace-building and state building missions in failed states (Duffield, 2004; Duffield e Waddell, 2006). These devices create “marginalised categories” (Rosamond and Moore, 2008), forms of “naked life” (Agambem, 1995) or “non-secure life” (Duffield, 2007) which, in turn, legitimise a development intervention formally aimed to be depoliticised (understanding politics in association with citizenship individual rights).

If the other mainstream HS critique is aimed at the liberal individualism and universalism in which HS is based on (e.g. the perspective of human rights, Flores, 2006), the forms of exclusion which these policies have created define themselves not only through the denial of peoples and communities rights, which go beyond individual rights understood within liberal thought, but also through the denial of those very same individual rights. In the periphery of the international system, HS contributes to the creation and the reinforcement of these forms of external exclusion.

Despite the criticisms and the unaccomplished promises, this conception of HS still enjoys broad support. What can we do then to make Human Security more human and global? As a social sciences researcher and health professional, I can only say that we can always be critical. To be critical means to understand that HS does not exist as an abstract concept separated from the political and social reality. Instead, it is built, sustained and contested through the social interaction fostered by the intervenients in the process, namely individuals (Rosamond e Moore, 2008). This is why criticism is worth it (Smith, 2002).

It is important to make an effort to analyse the way the mainstream idea of HS may exclude and create less secure lives, despite its apparently benign rhetoric as if it was part of an “empire” that denies itself (Chandler 2006). A question therefore emerges, as suggested by Waddell (2006) - what kind of security are we really talking about?

Security for whom? Security from what? And at what cost?

Eunice Castro Seixas

PhD candidate at CES/FEUC programme, "Pós-Colonialismo e Cidadania Global" ["Post Colonialism and Global Citizenship"]. Her research interests include humanitarian and development aid in the peripheries of the international system.

References:

Agamben, Giorgio (1995/1997), *Homo Sacer: le pouvoir souverain et la vie nue*. Paris: Seuil, trad. Marilène Raiola.

Bergman Rosamond, A. and Moore, T. , 2008-03-26 "Middle Powers, Securitisation and Gendering of Foreign Policy" *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the ISA's 49th Annual Convention, Bridging Multiple Divides*, http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p252199_in dex.html.

Chandler, David (2006), *Empire in Denial: The Politics of State-Building*. London: Pluto Press.

Duffield, Mark. (2007), *Development, Security and Unending War: Governing the World of Peoples*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Duffield, Mark (2004), "Carry on killing: Global governance, humanitarianism and terror", in *Regional Histories of Security and Violence*. DIIS, Copenhagen Press.

Duffield, Mark; Waddell, Nicholas (2006), "Securing Humans in a dangerous world", *International Politics*, 43(1), 1-23.

Flores, Joaquín Herrera (2006), "Colonialismo y violencia. Bases para una reflexión pos-colonial desde los derechos humanos". *Revista Crítica de Ciências Sociais*, 75, 21-40.

Kaldor, Mary (2001), *New and Old Wars: Organised Violence in a Global Era*. New edition with new foreword, Polity

Press/Stanford University Press.

Oberleitner, Gerd (2005), "Human Security: A Challenge to International Law?", *Global Governance*, 11,185-203.

Paris, Roland. "Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?", *International Security*, Vol. 26(2), http://mitpress.mit.edu/journals/pdf/isec_26_02_87_0.pdf.

Prezelj, Iztok (2008), Challenges in Conceptualizing and Providing Human Security. *HUMSEC Journal*, 2 www.humsec.eu/cms/fileadmin/user_upload/humsec/Journal/Prezelj.pdf.

Waddell, Nicholas (2006), "Ties that bind: DfID and the emerging security and development agenda", *Conflict, Security & Development* 6(4), 531-55.

Waever, Ole (2004), "Aberystwyth, Paris, Copenhagen: New 'Schools' in Security Theory and their Origins between Core and Periphery", *International Studies Association*, Montreal, 17-20 de Março.

Smith, Steve (2002), "The concept of Security in a Globalizing World", *37th University of Otago Foreign Policy School* .

UNDP (1994). Human Development Report, Novalorque: United Nations Development Programme/ Oxford University Press, <http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/1994/en/>.

P@X studies

Guinea-Bissau: is it enough to reform security?

P@X studies

The recent elections in Guinea-Bissau were considered a success, an example because of the peaceful climate in which they took place. However, in the aftermath of the celebrations by the winner party, there was a night of unsettling events in the eyes of a population which has recently undergone war and several state coups[1].

Despite uncertainties regarding the exact events that took place on the dawn of November 23, there is little doubt of its social effects: the fear, disbelief and anger resulting from these seem to send the message “don't be hopeful, nothing will change”. If the population of Guinea-Bissau wanted war, reasons for rebellion would not be short of. In fact, with public officials' salaries frozen for five months now, it is surprising that violent demonstrations and protests hadn't taken place so far. Elsewhere, in the same circumstances, the situation would not be as peaceful. In reality, Guineans expect little or nothing from their governments and military. They know that war would not resolve the stalemate that the country faces since 1998. With greater or lesser credibility, instability threats hinder the materialisation of projects, except power manipulation and parallel gains.

At first sight, these events seem to reinforce the certainties of the international community in Guinea-Bissau regarding the need to prioritise Security Sector Reform (SSR), perceived as paramount as a means to counter international drug trafficking. The idea of the responsibility to rebuild¹ has been emphasised, but is necessary to question the implementation mechanisms that this responsibility entails.

The centrality that this reform assumes is justified by the weight of the military in the history of the independent Guinea-Bissau. Since the aura of authority and legitimacy attributed to the former combatants active in the independence struggle, the military have taken up to today a central role in the country's political and economic evolutions. According to Koudawo (2001: 210), after the 1998 war, the debt to the military doubled. Nevertheless, it isn't clear how to separate the notion of historical debt from blackmail through history. Since the independence, the

military have maintained an (perceived) excessive weight in the conduction of State policies, mainly through permanent threat, rather than through the affirmation of another agenda. Unarguably, from then on, tensions within the military and political spheres, accentuated by political manipulation of group rivalries, namely ethnic, have determined decisively the country's stability and instability.

In face of a State in decay and lack of training and professionalisation of the security forces, the military ratio per 1000 inhabitants is surprisingly superior to the sub-region's – 2.73 and 1.23 respectively – as well as its composition, similar to an inverted pyramid – 41,9% of the military are officials (PBC, 2008: 2). Adding to this disproportional figure, the widespread worsening social image and mistrust of the population towards the military has been heightened by the association of the military to the drug trafficking. Despite this, the military institution can still exert some attraction among the youth, mainly rural, ensuring not only a salary but also food (albeit poor), housing, status and authority.

After the 1998-1999 conflict, both the opportunities for effective demobilisation and intensive employment creation were lost. The implemented demobilisation[2] programme was based on the attribution of small grants aimed at training activities and the creation of small businesses. Its outcomes in terms of reintegration[3] were far from successful, once it would require the existence of a national development strategy. It is important to note, however, that given the structure of the military (pyramidal), it becomes harder to reform the sector. In fact, officials won't settle for subsidies nor professional conversion since they have assured other types of benefits, such as status and authority. Moreover, the programme did not have a component of disarmament, which may prove alarming in the future, given the dissemination of firearms.

If the need and urgency of SSR[4] is consensual both nationally and internationally, disagreement arises when one reflects, on the one hand, on the capability and feasibility to conduct such reform, and, on the other hand, on the real political will of some groups in supporting it.

If some believe it to be possible, once adequate resources are made available, others question its potential scope and repercussions since it would clearly repel some of the military leaderships and offer no substantial alternatives in terms of resources obtainable through corruption and growing drug trafficking.

The capacity of local authorities to conduct SSR with international support, namely the European Union's Mission, already in place, depends, however, from factors beyond operational capability, namely the reasoning and principles that preside to "peacebuilding" endeavours. There are, at least, four factors at play. Firstly, the ability to ally SSR to memory of the past and justice, bearing in mind the implications of impunity in terms of social normalisation of violence. Secondly, the on growing depoliticisation of post-conflict analyses and interventions reflected on the assumption that sees the military as the only sources of instability and insecurity and a problem that can be solved through technical efforts and empowerment. Without analysing the issue of power legitimacy, the informal networks which determine the routes of governance and (un)governance will never alter State policies nor power structures. Thirdly, and once the main concern of the international community is to ensure, first and foremost, its own security, namely regarding people and drug fluxes, this can mean that the security of the Guinean population is/will not be taken into account. Hence, their security is not only threatened by eventual military upheavals, but also by internal spill over effects provoked by illicit economies and lack of alternatives, namely the dissemination and legitimisation of violence and illegal activities at the social level.

The latter element is particularly relevant, leading us to question: "whose" security are we reforming, or are we aiming at reforming?

In Guinea-Bissau, survival is questioned on a daily basis, being the informal economy one of its only forms of assurance. Emigration seems to be yet another form of avoiding the numerous challenges that Guineans face, especially the degradation of livelihoods, the on growing vulnerability towards external shocks, delays

and non payment of salaries, the reduction of formal employment opportunities and the loss of associated resources and status, the dependency from remittances¹ and social support networks and the absence of long-term public policies and development strategies, including in the realms of employment and justice. If to these we add up the permanent suspicion towards authority and impunity, the result is, and has been, the prevalence of private and communitarian strategies of survival, which exist both outside and in opposition/substitution of the State or in tandem with the State, at the economic level (through informal and parallel economy), as well as at the justice and security (through 'traditional' justice schemes, resort to witchcraft and neighbourhood militia).

In face of this scenario, one should question the effects and implications of these new forms of coping and survival. The development of the international cocaine trafficking can lead to an increase of the inequalities, the cleavage of consumption standards and the creation of an internal market, albeit small, based on easily available and increasingly destructive drugs. Amongst its likely consequences are the social normalisation and acceptance of trafficking and associated violence as a form of survival, similarly to what happened before with the army and public officials, and a potential escalation of criminality and social violence.

What sort of challenges does this scenario pose to SSR?

The first challenge concerns the expectations associated to this reform process. It cannot be expected to resolve all the country's problems. This reform won't work unless there are economic and social conditions to sustain it and this not only entails real political support, but also short-term changes in public governance that enable development and livelihood improvements. Institutional and bureaucratic change alone would not bring about changes in the power structures.

The second challenge consists in looking beyond the military, encompassing ideally the whole community/society. This is particularly important once the risk of sending a bad

message – namely, that those who resort to violence receive benefits – and failing to avoid the transference of violence to other levels and actors is too serious for not to be taken into account. Especially, it is important to think of benefits aimed at the community/society as a whole, instead of benefits targeted to the ones who resort to violence only. In this domain, it is particularly important to pay attention to the youth, not as a specific and isolated group, but as an integral part of the society, hitherto powerless to alter the modes of governance put in place.

Finally, it is necessary to pay attention to the military and security forces in general in a distinct manner. It is necessary to get to know them better, in their diversity, particularly their motivations, expectations and characteristics, including their gendered nature as well as the economic, political, social, and symbolic functions associated to their performance. We already know that micro-credit schemes are not enough to resolve the issues of self-esteem, authority and power exercise that come with the military status. But we also need to find out the degree to which the arbitrary use of force is due to violent behaviour seconded by the society in other contexts, namely in the private sphere.

For these reasons, the idea of sequential intervention that seems to drive the current thought and practice on SSR and according to which SSR is a *sine qua non* requisite for everything else – read development – appears to be increasingly fraught and jeopardises the potential of a complex and multidimensional approach to the fundamental causes of insecurity.

Sílvia Roque, NEP/CES

[1] Armed assault to Nino's Veira, Guinea-Bissau's President house, whose motivations and causes are still under investigation.

[2] ISIS Europe <http://www.isis-europe.org/>

[3] Led by the International Migration Organisation (OIM).

[4] See Rapport Final de la Mission de Suivi, Evaluation et Orientation du Programme de Démobilisation. Réinsertion et Réintégration des

NEP's attic

PublicationsNEP

Freire, Maria Raquel; Cravo, Teresa; Leitão, Augusto R.; Mendes, Carmen (2008), "Председательство Португалии в Европейском союзе: шаг вперед или отражение тупика? (A Presidência Portuguesa da União Europeia: Um Passo em Frente ou o Reflexo de um Impasse?)", *Европа (Europa)*, 8, 1(26), 7-34.

Freire, Maria Raquel; Mendes, Carmen (2008), "A Organização de Cooperação de Xangai como instrumento geopolítico sino-russo na Ásia Central", *Geopolítica*, 1, 2, 207-235.

Freire, Maria Raquel; Simão, Licínia (2008), "Política Europeia de Vizinhança para o Cáucaso do Sul: Interesses Competitivos e Oportunidades de Cooperação", *Nação e Defesa*, 119, 141-166.

Freire, Maria Raquel (2008), "The European Security and Defence Policy: History, Structures and Capabilities", in Michael Merlingen and Rasa Ostrauskaite (org.), *The European Security and Defence Policy: An Implementation Perspective*. London: Routledge.

Freire, Maria Raquel; Lopes, Paula Duarte (2008) "Reconceptualizar a paz e a violência: uma análise crítica", *Revista Crítica de Ciências Sociais*, 82, 13-29.

Freire, Maria Raquel; Lopes, Paula Duarte; Nascimento, Daniela (2008), "The Securitization of Environmental Policies: Grasping the Nexus? The Darfur Case", *The Bologna Center Journal of International Affairs*, Special Issue on the Environment, 93-105.

Lopes, Paula Duarte (2008), "Water With Borders: the Institutional Postponement of International Water Trade", in International Studies Association (org.): ISA.

Lopes, Paula Duarte; Freire, Maria Raquel (2008), "Rethinking Peace and Violence", in World International Studies Consortium (org.): WISC-ISA.

Nascimento, Daniela, recensão dos livros *Conflict Prevention in Practice: Essays in Honour of Jim Sutterlin* (B. G. Ramcharan) e *International Peacekeeping: The Yearbook of International Peace Operations* (Harvey Langholtz, Boris Kondoch and Alan Wells), *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding*, Vol.2, Issue 2, Junho 2008.

Núcleo de Estudos para a Paz (2008), *Mulheres e Violências. A invisibilidade feminina em contexto de violência armada*, Lisboa: Instituto Marquês Valle Flor

Moura, Tatiana; Roque, Sílvia; Santos, Rita (2008), "SCR 1325 National Plans: some perspectives", *Women At Work, Preventing Gun Violence*, 16.

Pureza, José Manuel (2008), "O que os jovens sabem e não sabem sobre direitos humanos", in Cunha, T. E Silvestre, S. (orgs.), *Somos diferentes, somos iguais. Diversidade, Cidadania e Educação*. Granja do Ulmeiro, AJP.

Santos, Rita (2008), *Um espelho embaciado. Mulheres e violências na imprensa diária portuguesa e brasileira*, Lisboa: Instituto Marquês Valle Flor.

JUNE

Katia Cardoso presented the communication "**Urban group violence in Cape Verde: localised globalism?**", Workshop Pré-colóquio, "Future paths: New maps for Social and Human Sciences", Centre for Social Studies, June 18 2008.

JULY

NEP/CES and **CESeC** (Rio de Janeiro, Brazil) organised the **II term of the Legal Educators' course aimed at relatives of victims of armed violence**, Rio de Janeiro, July-September 2008.

Sílvia Roque presented the communication "**La medición de la seguridad humana. El caso de Guinea-Bissau**", seminar "Seguridad Humana: Fundamentos Teóricos y Aplicaciones", Bilbao, June 30- July 1 2008.

José Manuel Pureza presented the communication "**Democracia limitada y paz liberal: anotaciones sobre el 'totus orbis' en tiempo de globalización liberal**", VII Encuentro Salamanca "La calidad de la democracia: las democracias del siglo XXI", Fundación Sistema, Salamanca, July 4 2008.

José Manuel Pureza presented the communication "**Human security: new news, old news, good news?**", EDEN Intensive Program, HumanitarianNet, Coimbra, July 7 2008.

Maria Raquel Freire and **Paula Lopes** presented the communication "**Rethinking Peace and Violence**", EDEN Intensive Program, HumanitarianNet, Coimbra, July 7 2008.

José Manuel Pureza, **Sílvia Roque** and **Rita Santos**, together with FRIDE and consultant David Sogge, organised the meeting of presentation of preliminary findings of the research project "**Portuguese co-operation and human security strengthening in institutionally fragile states**", aimed at IPAD personnel and other ministries, Fundação Cidade de Lisboa, Lisbon, July 8 2008.

Tatiana Moura presented the communication "**(In)visibilities of armed violence. The case of Rio de Janeiro**", EDEN Intensive Program, HumanitarianNet, Centre for Social Studies, Coimbra, July 10 2008.

Rita Santos presented the communication "**Surviving violence in Rio de Janeiro. The case of the relatives of victims of armed violence**", EDEN Intensive Program, HumanitarianNet, Centre for Social Studies, Coimbra, July 10 2008.

Sílvia Roque presented the communication "**Trajectories of violence in El Salvador**", EDEN Intensive Program, HumanitarianNet, Centre for Social Studies, Coimbra, July 10 2008.

Katia Cardoso presented the communication "**Urban violence: the case of Cape Verde**", no EDEN Intensive Program, HumanitarianNet, Coimbra, 10 de Julho de 2008.

Rita Santos participated in the **3rd United Nations Biennial Meeting of States on Small Arms** as a member of the IANSA network, New York, July 14-18 2008.

José Manuel Pureza presented the communication "**Global liberal peace and local autonomy of decision. The case of East Timor**", International Peace Research Association Conference, Leuven, July 18 2008.

Daniela Nascimento presented the communication “**The denial of economic and social rights as a cause of conflict in divided societies**”, Second Global International Studies Conference, Ljubljana, July 26 2008.

Daniela Nascimento presented the communication “**Humanitarianism and the ‘war on terrorism’: dilemmas and opportunities**”, Second Global International Studies Conference, Ljubljana, July 23 2008.

Maria Raquel Freire and **Carmen Mendes** presented the communication “**Realpolitik dynamics and image construction in the Russia-China relationship: forging a strategic partnership?**”, Second Global International Studies Conference, World International Studies Committee (WISC), Ljubljana, July 24 2008.

Maria Raquel Freire and **Paula Lopes** presented the communication “**Rethinking Peace and Violence**”, Second Global International Studies Conference, World International Studies Committee (WISC), Ljubljana, July 24 2008.

Maria Raquel Freire presented the communication “**The EU-Russia Partnership**”, Second Global International Studies Conference, World International Studies Committee (WISC), Ljubljana, 23-26 de Julho de 2008.

AUGUST

Maria Raquel Freire presented the communication “**Russian Politics towards Central Asia: Supporting, Balancing, Coercing or Imposing?**”, Central Eurasian Studies Society Regional Conference (CESS), Issyk-Kul, August 4-7 2008.

The documentary “**Uma mãe como eu**” [“**A mother like me**”], product of the partnership between NEP/CES, NGO **Instituto Marques de Valle Flor** (Lisbon) and **Cinema Nosso** (Rio de Janeiro), was awarded “Curta o Curta” at the São Paulo International Short Films Festival, São Paulo, August 22 2008.

Daniela Nascimento presented the communication “**Understanding conflict beyond ethnicity and religion: the denial of economic and social rights as a cause of conflict in Sudan**”, Graduate Conference, European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR), Barcelona, August 26 2008.

José Manuel Pureza presented the communication “**Las operaciones de paz de segunda generacion y el proyecto de paz liberal: los casos de Mozambique y Timor-Leste**”, Consejo Argentino para las Relaciones Internacionales, Buenos Aires, August 28 2008.

SEPTEMBER

José Manuel Pureza presented the communication “**Somewhere under the rainbow: human security, public security and liberal peace**”, International seminar “Security and Insecurity in debate”, Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, September 2 2008.

Maria Raquel Freire and **Paula Duarte Lopes** presented the communication “**Peacekeeping Missions: Keeping What Peace?**”, International seminar “Security and Insecurity in debate”, Pontifícia

Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, September 2 2008.

Tatiana Moura presented the communication "**Insecurities in war and peace: continuums, spirals and identities**", International seminar "Security and Insecurity in debate", Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, September 2 2008.

Paula Duarte Lopes presented the communication "**Water and violence**", International seminar "International conflicts in its multiple dimensions", Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil, September 8-11 2008.

Tatiana Moura presented the communication "**Weapons non proliferation regimes and security dilemmas**", International seminar "International conflicts in its multiple dimensions", Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil, September 8-11 2008.

José Manuel Pureza presented the communication "**Human security, public security and liberal peace**", International seminar "International conflicts in its multiple dimensions", Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil, September 8-11 2008.

José Manuel Pureza presented the communication "**The turbulence in the boarderlands: stereotypes, representations and real violences**", International seminar "Violence representations", Centre for Social Studies, Coimbra, September 19 2008.

Maria Raquel Freire presented the communication "**Russian policies to the Middle East**", IDN-Grupo de Estudos do Médio Oriente, Instituto de Defesa Nacional, Lisbon, September 25 2008.

OCTOBER

Maria Raquel Freire and **Licinia Simão** presented the communication "**Post-Soviet Transition in the South Caucasus: One Step Forward, Two Steps Back**", "Lisbon Research Seminar South European Democracies: Legacies of the Past and International Constraints", Lisbon, October 16-18 2008.

José Manuel Pureza presented the communication "**The importance of human rights in our time**", II Law and Citizenship Seminar, Macau Legislative Assembly, Macau, October 20 2008.

O **NEP/CES** organised the international seminar "**Violence and Small Arms: the Portuguese case**", Centre for Social Studies, Coimbra, October 30-31 2008.

Tatiana Moura presented the **Observatory on Gender and Armed Violence OGiVA**, Centre for Social Studies, Coimbra, October 31 2008.

NOVEMBER

Sílvia Roque participated in the "**ISIS European Security Contact Group Meeting Guinea-Bissau: Responsibility to Rebuild**" with an intervention on Security Sector Reform in Guinea-Bissau, Brussels, November 4 2008.

Teresa Cravo participated in the **Community of Portuguese Language Countries Electoral Mission** to Guinea-Bissau as observer to the legislative elections, Bissau, November 9-22 2008.

José Manuel Pureza presented the communication "**Refugees: international protection and**

security”, VIII Congresso do Conselho Português para os Refugiados, Lisbon, November 26 2008.

José Manuel Pureza presented the communication “**Civic blindness: human rights and security in the XXI century**”, International seminar “Challenges to human rights and global justice”, Centre for November 27 2008.

Sílvia Roque coordinated the training course “**Youth and violence: factors and responses**”, INEP, Bissau, November 29-30 2008.

DECEMBER

Sílvia Roque and **Katia Cardoso** presented the communication “**Why does youth mobilise...or not? Youth and violence in Bissau and Praia**”, 12^a CODESRIA General Assembly, Yaounde, Cameroon, December 7-11 2008.

Sílvia Roque lectured on “**Post-war reconstruction. The case of Guinea-Bissau**”, Curso de Estado Maior Conjunto, Instituto de Estudos Superiores Militares, Lisbon, December 16 2008.

NEP's PROJECTS

DECEMBER

Conclusion of the project “**Portuguese co-operation and human security strengthening in institutionally fragile states**”, funded by Portuguese Development Agency (IPAD).